HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

FIRST SESSION—THIRTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT

32 Elizabeth II

VOLUME XXV, 1983

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTIETH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1983
TO THE THIRTIETH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1983

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

Published under authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons by the Queen's Printer for Canada

Available from Canadian Government Publishing Centre, Supply and Services Canada, Hull, Québec, Canada K1A 0S9.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 20, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Tuesday, October 18, 1983 consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motions Nos. 39 (Mr. Gustafson) and 40 (Mr. Benjamin).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): When the matter was last in debate, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) had the floor. In his absence the Chair will recognize any other Hon. Member on Motions Nos. 39 and 40.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, today as the Chair has indicated, we are resuming debate on Motions Nos. 39 and 40. The motions are very similar. One is in the name of the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson), my friend in the Conservative Party, and the other one is in the name of my seatmate, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). Both of them are amendments that I would consider pro-producer, pro-farmer, which would strengthen things for the farmers of this country. Both motions would amend Clause 19.

• (1110)

The motion of the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson) reads:

> The provisions of this Part respecting the duties and functions of the Administrator do not restrict the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board under the Canadian Wheat Board Act to make available the quantities and types of grain necessary to achieve sales commitments on behalf of, and in the interests of, producers.

The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) says a similar thing in his amendment, but according to our legal advice, Motion No. 40 would make it a bit more certain and stronger in terms of the wording on behalf of farmers. It is also the wording suggested by the Canadian Wheat Board. I know Mr. Speaker is a distinguished lawyer and understands the law very well. Motion No. 40 of the Hon. Member for Regina West is the better motion. It is the one preferred by the Wheat Board. Of the two motions, it is the one that should be accepted.

If the House sees fit not to accept it, of course the fallback position could be Motion No. 39 moved by the Hon. Member for Assiniboia. Since we are trying to protect the Canadian Wheat Board, I suggest that we accept the motion which the Wheat Board is recommending and that the Wheat Board would like to see implemented.

Clause 19 of Bill C-155 refers to the functions and duties of the Administrator. The Administrator of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee has considerable power over the future of grain handling and grain movement in our country. He has considerable power in terms of the movement of grain, the quality of grain, the purchasing of grain, the selling of grain and the like. We want to ensure that the powers of the Wheat Board are not restricted.

The argument is very basic. It is so basic that it is very well understood by prairie farmers. For a prairie farmer to struggle through the Wheat Board many years ago, it was a very important and long struggle. It was a struggle in which both my grandfathers were involved. Of course, they are no longer with us; that was many years ago. They were struggling for some bargaining and collective powers in the marketplace.

I will not deviate from the narrow strictures of the motions before us today to give a history of the Wheat Board, because Mr. Speaker would call me to order. In any event I believe that has already been done by the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) and by other Members of the House.

Mr. Malone: I would call you to order, too.

Mr. Nystrom: Perhaps it was even done by the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone). The Wheat Board is vitally important, and perhaps a couple of analogies are relevant here in trying to persuade some of the urban Members of all Parties from central Canada, or indeed those from some of the western cities, that the Wheat Board for farmers is like a trade union for workers. It is something that will protect farmers. In fact, the Wheat Board for farmers is probably more important than a trade union for workers because unfortunately trade unions probably do not have as much power and influence over the income of workers as the Wheat Board has over the income of farmers. The Wheat Board has the power to sell grain and to obtain a really good price for it. The Wheat Board is financed by farmers and therefore is a very important institution.

Mr. Benjamin: It is just like the unions.

Mr. Nystrom: It is very similar to a union. That is why I drew that analogy.

We could also draw an analogy with many other associations; for example, many professional associations such as the bar association, the medical association and, for the business community, the Chamber of Commerce, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, associations for resource industries and the like. All those associations are considered to be very important by their member participants. In the same way the Wheat Board is very important for the farmers of Canada.

● (1115)

When we establish the Senior Grain Transportation Committee and give awesome powers to the Administrator of that Committee, we must ensure that those powers do not in any way restrict the powers and authority of the Canadian Wheat Board. It must remain the supreme agency in terms of the purchasing and selling of wheat, the organization of grain sales by farmers and so on.

There is something else that you, Mr. Speaker, as a fair-minded person would be very much aware of and in agreement with. As I said before, the Canadian Wheat Board is supported by the farmers' money. There is a Wheat Board Advisory Committee which is elected by the farmers. They have considerable influence over what the Wheat Board does. Before becoming a Member of Parliament, the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) was a member of the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee. Roy Atkinson, who has been well known for many years as a farm leader in this country, is now the Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Canadian Wheat Board. He is from Saskatchewan. He is the former head of the National Farmers' Union and has been very active in farming causes throughout his farming life.

A young man in my constituency, Michael Halyk, has been elected for a second term as a member of the Wheat Board Advisory Committee. This young man who is barely 30, if yet 30, is making a contribution to protecting the farming interests of our community. You can see, Mr. Speaker, that it is a democratic organization in terms of having an advisory committee elected by the farmers.

Stack that up against the kind of Committee that is being created in this House today under Bill C-155. Under Bill C-155 we will have a Senior Grain Transportation Committee. A lot of power will be given to the Administrator. It will not be very democratic. There will be some producers and Wheat Pool members on it, but it will not have the same democratic structure as the Canadian Wheat Board.

For reasons that I have stated, I recommend Motion No. 40 to the House. We welcome the support of the Conservative Party on this Motion of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). I appeal to the Liberal Members to listen to the voice of the western farmer, to listen to the voice of the people, and to stand up in this House and accept Motion No. 40. It is a motion that the Wheat Board wants. I can assure Members that it is not just the Wheat Board but the farmers, the farm pools, farm organizations, the UGG and other organizations which represent farmers which want Motion No. 40 to pass so as to ensure that the powers of the Wheat Board are protected.

The powers of the Wheat Board are very important to western farmers. Because of the powers of the corporations, multinationals and big grain companies like Continental Grain, Cargill Grain and the other big sisters of the grain trade, the Wheat Board could be gradually eroded over the next few years. Any kind of loophole left in the law could be the first step down the slippery slope of eroding the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board. We cannot afford to let that happen because it would be very dangerous to farm incomes.

I grew up on a small farm in central Saskatchewan. I recall the old timers in my community talking time and again about the days before the Canadian Wheat Board. They would tell stories of how they would plant their grain in the spring, harvest it in the fall and have no idea what price they would get for the grain. It depended on the grain traders in Chicago and the Richardsons in Winnipeg and the private grain exchange. The farmer always gambled on what he would get for a bushel of grain, oats, barley or whatever he produced. It was as though you would gamble with dice in a casino in Nevada. That is not the proper way to work. It is not a proper situation in which to put any human being. People need to know what their income will be so that they can plan their lives for themselves and their families. They have to have that kind of security. We, the citizens of Canada who are engaged in many occupations, want that kind of security so we can plan our own lives and futures. I suggest that that is not too much to ask for on behalf of the farmers of prairie Canada.

● (1120)

The motions now before the House would offer that kind of protection to the farmers. As we have argued for a long, long time, we of course would like to see the Crow rate remain intact and would like to see the powers of the Wheat Board expanded. However, we are not dealing with the expansion of the Wheat Board's powers in this particular motion but with preserving the kinds of powers it presently has.

I would like to make a direct appeal to my friend, the Hon. Member for Assiniboia. If his Motion No. 39 happens to fail, I would ask that he organize among his caucus unanimous support for Motion No. 40. I think I see him nodding his head in agreement. I hope that when the vote comes on Motion No. 40, all Conservative Members in the House will be present and will vote in support of Motion No. 40. Perhaps together we can persuade some of the more open-minded Liberal Members across the way such as the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Lumley) to support this motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, this motion is very important, and I would like to say to my colleagues from Quebec: We need your support for Motion No. 40. It is extremely important! As a member of the House for 15 years, I have often supported proposals by Quebec producers, by the Union des producteurs agricoles,

and I want to ask you now: Are you willing to do the same thing for us?

[*English*]

I hope that they will, Mr. Speaker, because if they do, then perhaps we can at least add a bit more protection for the prairie farmer from this horrible Bill that the Government across the way wants to force on prairie farmers through the use of closure.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to register in the strongest possible terms my objection to the fact that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) failed to take his place in the speaking order today after having been recognized and causing a procedural wrangle on Tuesday.

An Hon. Member: That is not a point of order.

An Hon. Member: It is a point of view.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Debate.

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments regarding the motions that are before us today and regarding some of the implications those motions have for the Canadian Wheat Board in particular. When any Member from the other side of the House who represents a riding from the prairie Provinces gets up to speak, we have heard him speak as if we have no comments to make that may be of any positive nature. However, I think there are some implications in this Bill in general, and specifically in these motions, that do apply to Hon. Members from ridings right across the country.

When thinking about this Bill, I think particularly of my own constituency of Nanaimo-Alberni. Constituents there are not happy with the way their particular railway system is functioning and they are not happy with the kind of say that they have in the process of scheduling passenger services and services for the export of commodities. The implications of Motions Nos. 39 and 40 correspond to some of the problems that Vancouver Island residents have with the E & N Railway, a railway that is under attack by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which wants to curtail the use of that railway system on Vancouver Island for passengers. People who live on Vancouver Island have the same need of that rail system as the prairie farmers do of theirs in terms not only of passenger service but more particularly as it applies to this Bill, the transportation of grain and the improvement of that system.

On Vancouver Island we have a company that is not very interested in scheduling rail transportation to meet the needs of the community but rather in scheduling rail transportation to meet their own specific needs. The railway company ignores to a large extent the promotion of the rail system on Vancouver Island. There is no attempt made to be innovative or to attract tourism despite the potential that exists.

We feel that Bill C-155 is an attempt by the Government to take the same position toward the grain farmers in the prairie Provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba in particular. We do not like what we see. We do not like the implications of Bill C-155 and I am sure that is why Motion No. 39 was moved by the Progressive Conservative Party and Motion No. 40 by this Party. I think the people on Vancouver Island relate to the demand of the Canadian Wheat Board that it have control over the direction and allocation of rail cars to move grain to port. We have the same kind of demand in that we want to have some say in how the rail system on Vancouver Island can be used to move commodities and passengers in the most efficient and cost-effective way.

• (1125)

In the testimony given before the committee a representative of the Canadian Wheat Board made some relevant points which have been enunciated very well in the debate in the House and in committee. I want to repeat the main goals of the Canadian Wheat Board within the context of Motion No. 39 and Motion No. 40. In committee the representative said:

> Any further reduction in the Board's ability to co-ordinate transportation will be a very important step backward for the export sales program for western Canadian grains.

Basically, what the Canadian Wheat Board is afraid of is that the transfer of authority over grain cars to the grain transportation administration will weaken its ability to transport grain to and sell grain on the export market. I think it should be recognized that the Board has the greatest opportunity to know what the needs of the producers are for transporting grain to port and where the greatest need lies for the cars if grain exports and sales overseas are to be improved. It is important that through the Canadian Wheat Board we have the authority not only to determine the quotas of grain produced but the mechanism by which it can reach port and the overseas markets.

Our amendment would not weaken the Bill but, rather, would strengthen our ability to increase the production of grain, its movement and our export sales. It is not significantly different from Motion No. 39 moved by the Progressive Conservative Party but it would change the Bill to reflect the needs of the Canadian Wheat Board and, therefore, of grain producers. It would allow the Wheat Board to retain the power to direct grain car allocation and to meet the needs of producers interested in rail upgrading as well as increasing sales on the domestic and export markets.

This Party has indicated that it supports Motion No. 39 if it is not successful in having the Government accept Motion No. 40, which is what we hope the Government will do, knowing the opposition to the particular mechanism within the Bill itself and the opposition not only of the two Opposition Parties but of the Canadian Wheat Board, which is responsible for moving grain and has had a great deal of success in the past in moving grain and marketing that grain overseas.

This Party asks that the Government look at these amendments sincerely and also look at the lobbying of the Canadian Wheat Board for amendments to the Bill. We ask it to consider particularly the Canadian producer of grain, his attempts to improve his product and to improve sales and

marketing of that product through continued authority over elevators, production and grain transportation.

● (1130)

Motion No. 40, which our Party has moved, is certainly an amendment which should be acceptable to the Government. The Canadian Wheat Board has strongly lobbied to have this motion accepted. I urge the Government to consider very seriously accepting this amendment which will strengthen the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board so that it can better serve Canadian producers of grain.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I also wish to enter into the debate on both Motion No. 39, which was introduced by the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson), and Motion No. 40, which was introduced by my colleague and friend, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). As Hon. Members have mentioned previously, the intent of the amendments is to strengthen the position of the Canadian Wheat Board, or at least to protect its historic role, a role which has evolved over years of experience and practice and has benefited and worked for the farmers and producers in western Canada.

The Bill as it stands without these amendments, Mr. Speaker, weakens the position of the Canadian Wheat Board in terms of allocating cars and organizing the transportation of grain to the ports. It opens the door to the Administrator so that he will be able to take on more and more of the responsibilities which have been handled by the Canadian Wheat Board. We stand opposed to this. Indications would show that Members of the Conservative Party, especially those who come from Saskatchewan, Alberta or Manitoba, understand that the Canadian Wheat Board is an essential organization for western Canadian farmers. They understand that one should not muck around with it.

Bill C-155, and particularly this clause, is just another example of a Government with no representation from the agricultural west. We have a Department, Mr. Speaker, which has a tremendous record of major mistakes wading in and totally disrupting and destroying a system which has been developed in western Canada over the years. This Bill, and this clause as well, is presented to us by the Department which brought us Mirabel Airport and the proposed Pickering airport, billion dollar mistakes, billion dollar "Oops, sorry, folks, we just miscalculated!"

These are the people who have been in charge of transportation policies in Canada over the years, who have allowed the rail service in this country to deteriorate, who have overseen the gradual demise of passenger rail service in Canada. This has been done to a country like ours which is so dependent on the railways. That Department has allowed the gradual erosion of these essential services and now this same Department is wading in and mucking around with the Wheat Board. I do not trust it, Mr. Speaker. None of my constituents in Regina East, whether they be Conservative, New Democrat or Liberal, trust it. There is an intense feeling in western Canada, Mr. Speaker, that that Department, and the Government, do not know what they are doing.

Our constituents depend upon us, their representatives in the House of Commons, to speak forcefully and often of their positions and their fears. These are dark days, Mr. Speaker, for this institution and for this Government, because the Government is determined to go ahead without any experience or representation, nor any sensitivity to the needs of western Canada. In its own blind, bureaucratic way it is determined to push ahead. It has cloaked itself with a sense of self-righteousness, claiming what it is doing is progressive and forward-looking. This is just bureaucratic talk. It has been convinced it is right by its own bureaucrats. It has stopped listening to the people and is blindly going ahead and destroying a system which has taken years to organize and which is working well right now. On top of that, it is now attempting to still the voices from the west. It is going to introduce closure. It is going to prevent us from talking on all these amendments.

All of the amendments which have been introduced by the Hon. Member for Regina West and many amendments introduced by the Conservative Party are valid amendments which must be taken into consideration, because the original Bill is so flawed—even technically flawed—that it needs this careful consideration of each clause. We have a right to speak. We have a right to present the points of view of our constituents in western Canada. But the Government now does not want to hear this. It just wants to close its eyes and ears and shove this Bill through. It is tragic that one of the important fabrics of our society, particularly in western Canada, is being torn apart and the representatives of western Canada are not even allowed to give their points of view, their objections, thoughts and comments on this Bill.

The events which have occurred in the last few weeks here in the House, and those which will occur in the immediate future, are sad events, not only for this institution but for Canada as a whole. What is occurring, Mr. Speaker, is that something which has tied us together as a nation is now being destroyed by a mindless bureaucracy with the consent of a heartless and insensitive Government.

Many Hon. Members have already talked about the important role of the Canadian Wheat Board, how it has evolved and how essential it is. The Canadian Wheat Board has a major say, if not the ultimate say, in the allocation of grain cars in order to facilitate the movement of our products in the most efficient way possible. What this Bill does in effect, as pointed out by other Hon. Members, is to allow that role to be whittled away, to deteriorate over time.

I urge Government Members to look at the merits of the motions which have been proposed both by the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party. I urge them to stand up and at least tell us where they stand on this issue. At least they should have the common decency to tell us why these amendments should not be included. But they sit there in silence, using their majority to ram this Bill through without even giving an intelligent reason for doing so. That is a further insult on insult on insult. I would urge Government Members

to stand up in this House and explain to us their reasoning for this particular clause. When they do not do so it just increases the fear which the people of western Canada have about this Bill.

Is it the Government's intention and secret agenda that the Wheat Board should in time be whittled down, that its role should be eroded? Is this the secret agenda? If it is not, then surely it is up to Government Members to stand up and say "No, it is not; this is the reason for it and we do not think you are right on this". Or they might stand up and say: "We think you have a valid point; it is certainly not our intention to erode the ability of the Wheat Board to allocate cars and we think you have some good arguments. Yes, we will accept your amendment." But at least they can stand up and say something if they have any guts at all, Mr. Speaker.

• (1140)

These two amendments, Mr. Speaker, Motions Nos. 39 and 40, are pretty similar. I prefer Motion No. 40 because it is a little bit more specific concerning other Acts and regulations which empower the Canadian Wheat Board to allocate cars. But essentially both motions try to accomplish the same thing, that is, to guarantee the Canadian Wheat Board has and retains the power to allocate grain cars.

I maintain that this Bill is an attack upon western Canadian agriculture as we have known it. It attacks the rate which farmers will have to pay for the movement of grain. It attacks the Wheat Board and the Wheat Pools. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), says, it attacks a way of life. The authors of this Bill have a different motion about what agriculture in western Canada should be. It is a motion which runs parallel to those who advocate the grain exchange and the break-up of the co-operative system, the collective method which has been developed both in pooling of resources and of marketing.

I see by your motions, Mr. Speaker, that my ten minutes on this particular motion have lapsed. I just wish to say that I hope at least one Government Member will stand up and address himself to this amendment. Give us the reasoning why they are either in favour of or opposed to this amendment. At least show some courtesy toward my constituents and others in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta and let them know why the Government is doing what it is doing in this particular clause.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member would read the transcripts of committee hearings and previous debate on this motion, he will find his answer there. That is why we cannot prolong this kind of filibustering. It has all been said, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I fail to see what the point of order was. I am asking him to stand up here in the House right now and address the Canadian public. Is it necessary for members of the public to go to committee hearings and read committee reports? Let us not be so devious. Stand up right now.

Mr. Flis: You should have attended the committee hearings. Where were you?

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on Motion No. 39. While we support this motion, we prefer Motion No. 40 which deals with the same topic only in a more detailed way. I wish to express my disappointment that the Minister is not in the House because this is an important piece of legislation.

Mr. Blais: Then why don't you deal with it as being important?

Mr. Parker: But he is not here.

I have worked for the railways for many years and have seen what they do regarding their commitments to the transportation of various types of grain. This is why I think these two motions are very pertinent to this legislation. The Government is going to change a major piece of legislation which deeply affects western Canada. I can remember in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s when railway workers waited day in and day out for wheat contracts to be signed with other countries so that their very jobs would be guaranteed. The fact is that this legislation could break down the authority of the Wheat Board. I refer to commitments made.

When the Conservatives were in Government, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) made agreements with the railways for upgrading of railway stock. I have seen some of that upgrading take place. Some of it was done with a stencil brush. They stencilled on the side of a car that this car has been upgraded, and I can say now that I did not see the actual work take place. Is that the kind of thing we want to see taking place, which the prairie farmers are going to have to pay for? Right now in my riding there are cars designated for upgrading of branch lines and it is stencilled right on the side. If this clause was in place they could see where these cars have been used. They are being used not only on the upgrading of branch lines but we see them out on western Canada on the main lines and in other areas. If that is what the Wheat Board wants and the administration works for it, it should be done through proper inspections and with proper authority.

Regarding the various types of wheat being shipped, I think it is imperative that the Wheat Board have some say in what grain is going to be shipped. I have seen grain sit for as long as two or three weeks on a siding because it was the wrong grain, the boats were not there to take the grain and the ports in Vancouver could not hold it. It is imperative that there be some kind of communication between the Wheat Board, the railways and the ports, and that must be through the Wheat Board. If this is not done, we are going to have the Cargills, the Richardsons and the Continental groups walking in and making a profit on the backs of the farmers. I know the Conservatives would support that kind of a process because they do not believe in orderly marketing. Well, we will not stand for that and this is why we feel it is so imperative that the administration have the authority to ensure that the equipment is being utilized properly.

As we on the Standing Committee on Transport travelled across Canada, we found there were many railways, such as the railway to Churchill, which can handle only certain types of cars. Again, it is imperative that the correct equipment is made available for areas such as this so grain can be moved when it should be. That must be done. It is imperative that the Administrator have a voice in how it is being done. It is a travesty to western grain producers that the Liberals and Conservatives sit in the House, remain quiet about this issue and do not participate by giving assurance that this kind of protection is there. We hear that they support the Wheat Board but they sit silent in the House.

• (1150)

During my travels with the Transport Committee the Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) attended meetings where he bragged to the prairie farmers about how much he had done and how many cars he had supplied during his term in office. I want to tell the House that I worked in the mechanical department of the railway company for many years and a boxcar cannot be built—

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder what days the Hon. Member is referring to when speaking about his travels with the Transport Committee. I travelled on many days—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. The Hon. Member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke has the floor.

Mr. Parker: Mr. Speaker, to begin with, that was not a legitimate point of order. If you look at the record, I said that I travelled across this country with the Transport Committee and the Member for Vegreville was there. If you check the record you will find that I was on that committee.

Mr. McKnight: On what dates?

Mr. Parker: I have no obligation to the Member to tell him what dates I was on that Committee. It appears that some Conservative Members—

Mr. Malone: The Member for Crowfoot.

Mr. Parker: If the Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) wants to check the records he will find that I travelled on the Transport Committee and met with grain growers in Winnipeg, Regina and Edmonton. We also visited Prince Rupert.

Mr. Taylor: You must have been under the table in Edmonton because I did not see you there.

Mr. Parker: These Conservative Members seem to be so uptight about it, but there was more than one Transport Committee. There was one working with regard to the Crow Bill and there also was a Transport Committee that travelled throughout this country about two years ago. If they cannot remember that, they were not very interested in what was taking place in transportation in Canada.

Mr. Taylor: There was one in 1917 as well. Were you on that one?

Mr. Parker: We hear rumblings from the Conservatives and the Liberals but let us hear some constructive advice on how we should deal with this very important problem.

The only efficient way that we can handle our grain is to give the Canadian Wheat Board, which represents the farmers, manages the grain economy and how our grain is sold to other countries, the authority and opportunity to demand that the companies operate efficiently and that the shipping of grain is achieved quickly. We should not continue a system in which the railway companies have told the prairie farmers that the railway workers are causing all the problems, when it is the railway companies that have put the cars on sidings and delayed the transportation of grain as a result of their poor management. If there was an administrator dealing with these problems, the farmers would know first hand who to blame and would ensure that it would not happen.

The Conservative Party is hoping and praying that Continental or Cargill can get involved and destroy one of the best marketing systems that Canada ever had. If these changes are going to be made we cannot allow Bill C-155 to pass without some protection of orderly marketing in Canada.

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

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The question is on Motion No. 39 and on Motion No. 40.

All those in favour, please say yea?

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11), a recorded division on the proposed motions stands deferred.

Motions Nos. 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 and 46 have been grouped for debate and are to be voted on separately.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out lines 12 and 13 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"during the period by railway companies; and".

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out lines 14 to 24 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"*(b)* implement a scheme that provides for sanctions to be applied to railway companies that do not meet the performance objectives referred to in paragraph *(a)*."

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21

(a) by striking out line 18 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"than the railway companies and the Canadian Wheat Board, that meet".

(b) by striking out line 22 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"participants, other than the Canadian Wheat Board, or any classes thereof that"

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster) moved:

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out lines 21 to 24 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"(ii) sanctions to be applied to system participants or any classes thereof, other than the railways, that do not meet the performance objectives referred to in paragraph *(a)*, shall be non-pecuniary."

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette) moved:

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out line 32 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"the commission, is equal to 20% of the"

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out lines 32 to 34 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"the Commission, is equal to 20% of the volume-related variable costs of the railway company plus 100% of the cost of capital portion of the line-related variable costs for grain dependent branch lines."

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 41 in my name seeks to remove any power the Bill gives the Grain Transportation Administrator over the Canadian Wheat Board or the elevators. I repeat what occurred during debate on the previous motions. This is a transportation Bill, not an agricultural Bill or farmers' Bill. It is an anti-farmer Bill. It should not give a transportation agency power over a non-transportation agency. In other words, the Grain Transportation Administrator, under the authority of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), should not have powers over the Canadian Wheat Board, which is under the authority of the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board who sits in the Senate. One Crown agency should not be in a position to exercise authority over another Crown agency, particularly when they are entirely different departments.

I want to quote Mr. Esmond Jarvis, Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board, from Issue No. 119 of the minutes of the Transport Committee at page 103. He said:

In addition to its detailed knowledge on supply and transportation, the board of course knows the exact requirements of the customer. Importer confidence in the Canadian system is very dependent upon the board maintaining a closely co-ordinated relationship between supplies, transportation and sales.

We were also told by the Wheat Board Advisory Committee, by Mr. Charlie Gibbings who is a former Wheat Board Commissioner and by farmers that the transportation of grain is inextricably linked to the purchase, marketing and sale of grain. You cannot separate transportation from those other operations. We want to remove any power that the Bill gives the Administrator over the Canadian Wheat Board and the elevator companies.

● (1200)

I have already said why he should not have powers over another agency of Her Majesty, but we include elevator companies because the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canada Grain Commission already have all the powers they need over the elevator companies. In fact, the Canadian Wheat Board has in place a system of sanctions. If a grain company or elevator company ships the wrong grade, the wrong kind or in any other way breaks the requirement for the shipping of grain, the Canadian Wheat Board places penalties upon that grain company. Similarly, the Canada Grain Commission has powers over the grain elevator companies in the matter of dockage, elevation, storage, handling charges and grades. Where an elevator company violates any of these conditions the Canada Grain Commission has powers over them. We do not need the Senior Grain Transportation Administrator as a third party with powers over the Canadian Wheat Board, the Canadian Grain Commission and the elevator companies. It is just sheer administrative, bureaucratic nonsense. The clause as it now reads can only be construed as a blatant, direct attempt by the Government to reduce the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canada Grain Commission. That is unacceptable to western Canada.

Motion No. 42 limits the application of sanctions which the Senior Grain Transportation Administrator can apply to the railroads. As I said earlier, the Wheat Board and the Canada Grain Commission already have the power of sanction over the grain companies, but the Wheat Board and the Canada Grain Commission cannot place any sanctions on the railroads. They have no authority to do so. We do not object to the Administrator having those powers over the railroads. As mentioned in earlier debate, Mr. Speaker, just imagine the spectacle of an agency of the Minister of Transport's Department applying sanctions and penalties upon the Canadian Wheat Board which comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board. What about the Minister of Transport through the Administrator applying sanctions on the Canada Grain Commission, which comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan)? You have three Crown agencies, each one under a different Department, which tells you something of the stupidity of the Government's organization.

I do not have sufficient time to go through each one of the motions that have been grouped for debate. I am sure my colleagues in the Conservative Party and my own colleagues will want to cover each one of these motions at length and in detail. They are extremely important to the authority of the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canada Grain Commission and are designed to prevent any bureaucratic duplication in the application of this Bill should it ever become law—if and when it ever becomes law.

I admit that there are other elements of transportation involved in the handling and transportation of grain. One can

think of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the ports of Thunder Bay, Churchill, Vancouver, Prince Rupert, and here again, will the Grain Transportation Administrator have some authority to put on sanctions against the St. Lawrence Seaway? At least that comes under the same Department, as do the ports. Will the Minister have authority to provide for sanctions or awards on trucking companies under the jurisdiction of a provincial Government? Will sanctions and awards be applied equitably as between the railroads and the trucking companies, or as between any of the what are called system participants? Again, the clause indicates what kind of mess the Bill is. This Bill is poorly thought out, poorly drafted, and obviously little, if any, consideration has been given to the ramifications of the legislation. What it means down the road if it ever became the law of the land, the Lord forbid.

There is an excellent reason for the number of amendments placed on the Order Paper by the Official Opposition and ourselves. If nothing else, they point out what a poorly drafted, poorly thought out piece of legislation it is. The Government is, in its single-minded, knee-jerk attempt, destroying the statutory grain rate and is giving money to the railroads with minimal accountability and no chance for a return on capital investment to taxpayers.

In the Government's blind attempts to meet those two relatively narrow objectives, the Government has failed completely and miserably to take into account the ramifications of the legislation which affect other agencies of the Crown, that affect transportation from Halifax to Prince Rupert, that affect grain companies and grain producers, and will result in the abandonment of at least another 1,500 miles of branch lines in western Canada. Most of those miles will be rail lines that are in the basic network that were supposed to be guaranteed until the year 2000.

There is excellent reason, and we have the grounds, Mr. Speaker, for opposing this legislation with every means that we have at our disposal under the rules. That has been our intent since day one and it remains our intent. If this Bill is passed as is, I want the Government and any successive government to be aware of my warning. Even the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in a telex yesterday made it very plain that unless at least five significant changes are made in this legislation it should be withdrawn. The three Wheat Pools and the UGG have tried to negotiate and bargain with the Government. I think they got euchred and sucked in. Now they realize the stubbornness on the Government side. What they thought they could bargain and obtain in legislation, the Government is still refusing to give.

A couple of items the Government is prepared to move on, and one in particular is the safety net. There is nothing wrong with the principle of a safety net, but the way the Government wants to do it would be so unfair to grain producers in western Canada that it does not deserve the attention or support of this House unless the Government makes a substantial change to that safety net.

For those reasons we urge upon the House that it accept these amendments that keep the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canada Grain Commission intact. We would allow the Grain Transportation Administrator to exercise his sanctions and awards over the railroads, which have been and still are the villains. These motions provide some good improvements to the legislation. I hate to be around helping the Government draft legislation, but it has done such an abysmal job that we are trying to be positive with amendments, even though our main objective is to persuade the Government to withdraw it or to persuade Members of the Official Opposition to join with us in stopping it. If they do, we can stop it.

● (1210)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It has been brought to my attention that I neglected to mention the seconders to these motions, and I think I should do so now. In the case of Motion No. 41, it is moved by Mr. Benjamin and seconded by Mr. de Jong; Motion No. 42 is moved by Mr. Benjamin and seconded by Mr. de Jong; Motion No. 43 is moved by Mr. Benjamin and seconded by Mr. de Jong; Motion No. 44 is moved by Mr. McKnight and seconded by Mr. Mazankowksi; Motion No. 45 is moved by Mr. Mayer and seconded by Mr. Gustafson; and Motion No. 46 is moved by Mr. Benjamin and seconded by Mr. de Jong.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to state that I agree with the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) when he said that this Bill is a mess. It is very complicated. It creates a great deal of uncertainty and anxiety. It is a Bill that should not be proceeded with unless there are substantial changes.

The Hon. Member referred to four or five changes that were advanced by members of the Wheat Pool organization. That has been our position all along. Unless these changes are incorporated, I submit that the Bill should not be proceeded with. It will not meet the objectives originally outlined by the previous Minister of Transport, nor will it meet the objectives of western Canadian agriculture. As it now stands, it enjoys literally no support in the western agricultural community. It does not enjoy the support of grain producers. It does not enjoy the support of cattle producers or livestock producers. It does not enjoy the support of the respective commodity groups. Certainly it does not enjoy the support of processors. The only group which supports the piece of legislation is indeed the railroads, because they have for themselves a sweetheart deal. By virtue of the fact that the whole Crow benefit will be paid directly to the railroads, it is even more of a sweetheart deal. All they are doing is perpetuating a cost-plus transportation system and a guaranteed annual income for the railroads, nothing more.

At the outset let me indicate that it is not always easy to speak to a group of amendments which involve different principles, but I will try to cover them in the order in which they appear. Motion No. 41 is an amendment to Clause 21 in which the Hon. Member for Regina West wishes to substitute "railway companies" for "system participants". Quite frankly,

Clause 21 outlines the method in which the Administrator can engage in establishing performance objectives and regulations for the various system participants. The Hon. Member for Regina West simply wants the Administrator, by virtue of his amendment, to establish objectives only for the railroads. We have contended all along that the grain handling and transportation system constitutes a much larger body than simply the railroads. It involves the elevators, the Canadian Wheat Board, the Canadian Grain Commission, the terminals, the lakers, the St. Lawrence Seaway, the port operations and some 25 to 30 unions. Each and every one of these groups plays a very significant and unique role. Each and every one of these groups has a certain responsibility to fulfil.

I appreciate what the Hon. Member is attempting to do. He is attempting to attack the railroads. They are responsible to a large extent for whether or not grain moves, but to single them out in this case is totally wrong.

Turning to the original terms of reference or objectives of the Grain Transportation Co-ordinator, they read:

(1) to increase the grain handling and transportation system's capacity to achieve a 20 per cent increase in exports in 1980 and a 50 per cent increase by 1985 (to 30 million tonnes);

Those objectives have in fact been achieved. They would not have been achieved by simply applying performance objectives to the railroads. They brought all parties together and said; "These are the objectives and these are achievable targets; let us put our shoulders to the wheel and do just that". They continue:

(2) to ensure that prairie grain moves to domestic consumption and export positions in a prompt, efficient and orderly manner;

That was not an objective of the railroads; it was an objective of the total community. Further they read:

(3) to secure the co-operation and participation of the industries concerned in providing the required transportation and handling services and facilities;

(4) to carry out the required planning and implement the changes necessary to make the forwarding system operate more efficiently and effectively, and to increase its capacity to meet the 1985 target of a 50 per cent increase in exports;

Certainly the railroads played a very significant role. They had to have sufficient rolling stock and their house in order to move that quantity of grain. To single them out as the only component which had to meet that objective is very wrong. The last objective reads:

(5) to keep all parties and the public fully informed about the system's operations and shortcomings.

This would mean that everyone knew what was going on. The producers and the community at large knew and understood the role of each significant component and their objectives. We as a Party cannot support the NDP proposal, which excludes the other players in this very important area.

Motion No. 42 really sets out to do the same thing. In part it reads:

—implement a scheme that provides for sanctions to be applied to railway companies—

Here again the Hon. Member has sought to substitute "system participants" for "railway companies". Again it suggests to the House that it is only the railways which make a difference in terms of whether or not grain moves. We will not be supporting Motion No. 42.

The intention of the Hon. Member in Motion No. 43 is honourable, except he may want to reconsider Clause 21(b). Clause 21(b)(i) reads in part:

—awards to be applied to system participants or any classes thereof, other than the railway companies—

The Hon. Member is proposing to substitute that with the following:

"participants, other than the Canadian Wheat Board, or any classes thereof that".

He is putting in a provision that would exclude the Canadian Wheat Board from receiving awards. If the Canadian Wheat Board performs satisfactorily and achieves its objectives, it should be entitled to rewards. Those advantages would in fact accrue to producers. The Hon. Member wanted to ensure that sanctions would not be imposed against the Canadian Wheat Board. We can support that, because we find it very wrong and offensive that sanctions would be applied to the Canadian Wheat Board which would then be transferred to producers. In effect, they would penalize producers for something over which they really have no control. If the Canadian Wheat Board, acting on behalf of producers, does its job, performs well and meets its objectives so that some benefit accrues to the Canadian Wheat Board and thereby to producers, we think it should be supported.

Other Members of the New Democratic Party may want to comment on this, but as it now stands we would have difficulty supporting it. We covered that same provision in Motion No. 44 which was introduced by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight). In part it reads:

—sanctions to be applied to system participants or any classes thereof, other than the railways, that do not meet the performance objectives referred to in paragraph (a), shall be non-pecuniary.

● (1220)

That means that any sanctions applied to the Canadian Wheat Board would be of a non-pecuniary nature and the producer would not be penalized. The Member may want to reconsider that.

Amendment No. 44 ensures that sanctions relating to performance objectives would be applied to system participants other than the railways in a non-pecuniary fashion. We think that is realistic and logical. I urge that Members of the NDP support that provision rather than Motion No. 43, which really achieves the same thing. It does not restrict the Canadian Wheat Board from receiving awards for performance and the meeting of targets that may in fact be realized, all for the benefit of the producers.

I turn now to Motions Nos. 45 and 46 which have to do with the imposition of sanctions against the railroads. They relate to the maximum level of sanctions that could be applied against the railway companies under the performance awards and sanction scheme implemented under Section 21. In the original Bill this level was set at 40 per cent of the contribution to constant cost.

Since we do not support the concept of a contribution to constant costs and we are calling for a three-year freeze or three-year deferral of any contribution to constant costs until such time as the CTC and the Government completes its study, we find it inappropriate to impose a sanction assessed upon a contribution which we do not believe to be satisfactory. We chose the 20 per cent of volume-related variable costs. That would be the total out-of-pocket costs or volume-related costs which would include the total cost of the movement of grain, including labour, fuel, depreciation on return and capital investment, all of those with the exception of a contribution to profit or constant costs.

We say that the sanction should be equal to 20 per cent of the volume-related variable costs. This would have the effect of providing some teeth. We believe that inasmuch as this Bill constitutes a sweetheart deal for the railways, the guarantees with respect to service, investment and performance objectives leaves much to be desired. In its amendment the Government reduced our 20 per cent. We moved this amendment in committee and chose the 20 per cent figure. The Government moved a subamendment reducing it to 10 per cent. This amendment seeks to restore the sanction to a level of 20 per cent of variable costs. We believe 10 per cent is far too low. It would mean a possible sanction of $65 million in 1983-84, $71 million for 1984-85 and $75 million for 1985-86. Given the level of payments that the farmers and the taxpayers of Canada are going to be paying, we think that is a very conservative sanction. We commend it to the House and ask that it be supported.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Motions Nos. 41 to 46 now before the House. I will describe and comment on some of them as I go along. The motions make amendments to Clause 21 of the Bill which outlines the performance objectives, regulations and the sanctions that could be placed on participants in the grain handling and grain transportation system. The last part sets out a method of settling any disputes concerning those awards of sanctions.

What seems to be at issue in the debate on these motions, and most of them are beamed at pretty much the same thing, is the Administrator. We will not know it until after the vote whether that will be a separate agency or part of the Canadian Wheat Board, but because the Government supports the separate agency concept we assume that will probably result when the vote is completed. The next general area which these motions deal with is what participants should have additional sanctions imposed upon them and, lastly, what the limits of those sanctions should be in financial terms.

The Conservative Transport critic, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), talked about the sanctions in this Bill being something that should be so generalized that they apply to all participants in the system. That sounds fine from a general theory point of view. Unfortunately, it ignores the sanctions and the system that have been in place for many years.

There is a built-in system of awards and sanctions which applies to most of the system participants at the moment. They exist under the powers of the Canada Grain Act and the Canadian Wheat Board Act. The one shortfall and a very important aspect of the whole grain handling and transportation system is that there is not a place where sanctions can be imposed or an order forced on the railways.

I would like to recall some of my time with the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee. I recall going to the fall meeting in 1977-78, one of the worst shipping years for farmers in recent times. We had a pretty good marketing program. The Board had plenty of sales contracts set up and ready to fulfil. The procedure followed in such a case is that once the sales commitments have been made, they approach the railways to see how many cars they will commit to the grain fleet, how many will be used in the next few months to haul grain. The railways give that commitment. The board uses that grain fleet, placing it at country elevator points to move the required grades and kinds of grain to water shipping.

That crop year started August 1. By the time we got to December 1, one railway company was almost 3,000 cars behind its commitment. It is rather silly to keep that many cars on the books as a negative balance, so it started over with new commitments. Within three or four months, that same railway company was between 3,000 and 4,000 cars behind its commitment. There was no way that that railway company could be forced to comply with its promise to supply cars for the shipment of grain. Therefore, the grain was not shipped.

Some Members of the House will recall that some farmers attempted to sue the Canadian Pacific Railway, the railway involved, for not supplying service. They were ruled out of order by the court because the court deemed that, though they had grown the grain, had delivered it to the elevators and had lost the markets as a result of the railway's actions, they were not deemed to have been shippers and could therefore not prosecute. I think that is probably what precipitated the actions that followed. Provincial Governments and the Wheat Board on behalf of farmers bought hopper cars and distributed them to the railways in order that there would be no excuse for not supplying rolling stock to producers.

• (1230)

Even with the user supplying the rolling stock, who in this case is the farmer assisted by the provincial Government, there is still no real clout anywhere in any Act to force the railway to put the three-man crew that is needed to move 110 cars on a railway locomotive in front of those cars. This Bill is the only Bill that has come before the House since that time that attempts to address the problem of how to apply sanctions to that very important system participant through legislation.

Elevator companies, farmers and terminal operators are now all subject to sanctions and penalties from the Canadian Wheat Board and the Canada Grain Commission. Those sanctions are already in place and I cannot understand why the former Minister, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), would say that we need to have those sanctions

spread broadly through this Bill, which, I suppose, would operate in competition with the Canada Grain Act and the Canadian Wheat Board Act, in order to, as he says, allow the Canadian Wheat Board to receive rewards. From whom would they receive the rewards, Mr. Speaker?

The only source of funds for the Canadian Wheat Board are the funds that are extracted from the farmers in the process of moving grain from the farm to the final market. That is done at the highest possible price in order to extract the highest price from the market and return all of the surplus funds back to the producer. How can the Canadian Wheat Board receive a reward? From whom would it receive it? Surely only from the seller or the farmer himself, who ultimately receives it anyway. There is no real, practical need for rewards to be allocated to the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Malone: Give them a trophy.

Mr. Althouse: The Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) says that we could perhaps supply the Wheat Board with a trophy. I believe that that has already been done on occasion. I have seen the trophy room of the Canadian Wheat Board. Those trophies include such things as large, regular trophies right down to a bronzed pitchfork, all of which were presented to the Wheat Board at one point or another in recognition of the good job it has done.

I see that you have motioned that my time is nearly up, Mr. Speaker. In conclusion, I would like to deal with the maximum level of penalties that can be levied against the railways. We argue that the railways should be named in this Bill because the other participants are already covered under previous Acts. We would like to keep it clear as to which Act applies in which case.

There are two motions in this regard, Motions Nos. 44 and 45. Motion No. 44 has the effect of saying that the railways should not be allowed to collect 20 per cent over and above operational costs until such time as the railways have complied with the shipping requirements of the Wheat Board and the producers to get the product to market. We have added something else to that through Motion No. 46, which has the effect of saying that 100 per cent of the capital cost of rehabilitating the branch lines should be withheld each year until it has been made very clear that the work has been done on the branch lines and that the railways are continuing to deliver grain according to the shipping orders and at the rate that the railways have committed to.

Motion No. 46 is very important because we all know of many branch lines which have ultimately been abandoned. There is one such line in my riding which runs from Foam Lake to Wishart. Moneys were allocated each year to keep that line in repair. Five years after the railways had already received more than half a million dollars for keeping that line in good repair, it was reported to the CTC that the line was not fit to run a locomotive over. It was in the very same state of disrepair the line had been in five years previous when the railway had appeared before the CTC.

The pertinent question asked by farmer interveners at the CTC hearings was what the railways did with the $500,000. The records of the railway showed that it had not spent anything like that on repairs to the line, even if the wages of the repair crew were included. The answer to that question never came out in the hearings. The CTC ultimately closed the line in spite of there being great gaps in the process.

There was nothing that could be done to force the railways to provide service in 1977 and 1978, and I submit that unless it is clearly specified that there must be higher penalties built into this Bill, there will be nothing to force compliance with the needs of the western grain transportation system if these motions are not adopted and included in the Bill. We must do this now when the Bill is before us and we do have the opportunity to adopt these motions.

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to apologize to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone). I am sure we will be hearing from him later. I did not realize that he would rise at this time.

I rise to speak to Motions Nos. 41 through 46, Mr. Speaker. All motions grouped here are designed to protect the interests of the producers and the interests of the taxpayers who are contributing so much through this Bill to the movement of grain in western Canada. In turn, Mr. Speaker, we believe those taxpayers should have some protection from a repetition of the past history of the railways, which have not really fulfilled many obligations on behalf of the producers in Canada and have not fulfilled commitments that have been made to the Government at certain times.

I would like to deal with Motions Nos. 41 and 42. These motions basically remove from the authority of the Grain Transportation Administrator the power to establish schemes that could be applied as a sanction against all system participants, not only the railways. The motions that follow, including Motion No. 44 which stands in my name, go on to state that, in the case of other system participants, the sanctions applied should not be pecuniary sanctions.

It is very difficult quickly to deny that sanctions are provided for at this time. We know that there are sanctions provided for by other Acts but most of those sanctions reflect upon the income of the producers, whether they be sanctions applied to the elevator companies, to individual producers in the shipment of producer cars or indeed sanctions applied to companies that are shipping grain other than the normal line elevator companies.

As the grain transportation system stands today, a line elevator company may be penalized a car if it ships the wrong product or if it underships by weight. A penalty can be applied in the allocation of cars through the block system to those elevator companies. In most areas, that in turn reflects upon the producers and the producers are denied the ability to ship grain because of the denial of that car as a penalty. I would put to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is indeed a pecuniary sanction on producers of grain.

Let us take a look at Motion No. 43, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) that he consider whether he would like to see the Canadian Wheat Board awarded. The Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) asked what awards we could have. As the Canadian Wheat Board is a Crown agency, I should think that the Government has the ability to award it for performance that has been met and I do not see anything wrong with putting that in the Bill. Even with the possibility that those awards would not be given in the future, it should be included to facilitate matters. Those awards could be made in several ways, such as by the Government purchasing cars and allowing the Canadian Wheat Board to control them. In turn, there would be a benefit to the farmers who use the Board.

● (1240)

Motion No. 45 was proposed by this Party in committee. We chose the figure of 20 per cent of the volume-related variable costs. That is really the full contribution to constant costs. We thought that because of the investment made by the taxpayers of Canada and because of the requirement in the Bill that producers pay additional funds for the movement of grain, the railroad companies should fulfil what is basically a verbal commitment. Everything we have as a commitment from the railroads is basically a verbal commitment that they "shall" expend funds given to them by the taxpayers of Canada and the producers to improve the rail system. There is nothing in the Bill that requires the railroads to invest in any special area.

We have statements from the presidents of the Canadian railroads to the effect that funds provided by the taxpayers of Canada for the upgrading of the rail system will be included in general revenue. If that general revenue will allow the railroad companies to diversify into oil companies and oil exploration or to establish larger hotel chains or enter the trucking business, as some Members of the NDP have suggested, then the Bill should provide for a sanction on the railroads that would require them to put that investment into structures designed to help them meet the commitment assigned to them by the Administrator.

At 20 per cent of variable costs, which is the full contribution to constant costs, in 1983-84 there could have been a sanction of $130 million out of $790 million; in 1984-85 a sanction of $142 million out of $893 million; and in 1985-86 a sanction of $150 million out of $987 million. Those figures relate to the removal of the contribution of constant costs that the railroads would receive. They are, in fact, guaranteed profits to the railroads. If they are to be given authority to allocate those funds at their discretion, we think the penalty for not doing so in a proper manner should be their profit. In effect, they would still be able to invest, but if they invested improperly, they would not have a profit.

Motion No. 46 in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) is basically the same as Motion No. 45, although it is a little more complicated. I suggest that if we want to simplify a Bill as complicated as Bill C-155, the best way to express sanction would be by a straight percentage point of the fixed number. The motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) would simplify the Bill and impose sanctions on the railroads as required by taxpayers and producers.

I should like to return to Motion No. 44. The reason for non-pecuniary sanctions on all system participants other than the railroads is quite apparent. In committee the Hon. Member for Regina West presented an amendment and then, as has happened to all of us, when the ramifications of it became apparent, he did not vote for it. He had suggested that sanctions be applied to elevator companies through a certain percentage of handling charges, elevation charges or storage charges to be fixed by the Administrator. It is quite apparent that, in turn, that would be a pecuniary charge on producers as the elevator companies would have to go to the Canadian Grain Commission and ask for an increase in elevator an handling charges because of the fine. The extra charge would be handed on to the producer.

Mr. Benjamin: They would not get it.

Mr. McKnight: I hear the Hon. Member for Regina West saying that they would not get it. Then I ask him why he did not vote for his amendment in committee. It is apparent that pecuniary sanctions cannot be placed on producers but awards can be given to the Crown agency, the Canadian Wheat Board, which in turn would benefit producers.

We will support Motion No. 44 and Motion No. 45, Mr. Speaker, and we will consider supporting some of the other amendments. I hope that Members of the Government and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister will explain what would be wrong with non-pecuniary sanctions being applied to all system participants other than the railroad companies.

In that vein, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the last time I was on my feet in the House the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) was rising to speak on another matter. I had hoped he was rising to enlighten the House on why the Government would not support Motions No. 39 and No. 40 which would protect the Canadian Wheat Board. I hope the Minister or his Parliamentary Secretary will tell us why the Bill should not include a clause specifying non-pecuniary sanctions to system participants other than the railroads.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on Motions Nos. 41 through 45. I come from the Province of Alberta which sends 21 Members to Parliament. In the last election it sent 21 Members of the Progressive Conservative Party to Ottawa. In this Chamber today we have a Government Party with 21 Members from eight Provinces and two Territories. As well as the debate on the Constitution, which was originally an attack on the regions of Canada and not just on the West, there was the energy program which was an attack on the West, VIA Rail which damaged much of Canada but did a lot of damage to tourism in western Canada, and now there is the Crow rate. With these measures there

was an attack against the three most important economic sectors in my Province, energy, agriculture and tourism.

I submit that the Government does not have the mandate for such an attack on that region of the country. It does not want to listen to people who are sent here as representatives because its instinct is for closure on one of the three most important economic aspects of that region of the country.

Against that background, I rise to speak on this set of motions. The very fact that the Government has 21 Members from eight Provinces and two Territories means that all its other Members come from Quebec and Ontario. They are not regionally representative, not regionally sensitive, and ought to be duty bound to listen to the arguments we put in this House.

• (1250)

The question today is whether or not we should have performance guarantees for shipping grain. The first motion states that that performance guarantee should be limited to the railways. That, Sir, asks the fundamental question, for whom are we performing? I submit that performance is for no one other than the producer. It is not a performance guarantee for governments, so that more paperwork can be checked. It is not a performance guarantee for the international marketplace except as it relates to our economy. It is a performance guarantee for farmers.

If it is a performance guarantee for the farmer, then he must obviously have every link which relates to performance guaranteed to him. There can be no system of performance if you call for performance on only one part of the system. As well, performance ought not to be a question of whether or not we like one of the links of the system. It is the view of some—in this case, perhaps the NDP—that they do not like the railways, but you cannot simply limit performance guarantees to the railways because it will not guarantee performance. Performance must relate to the whole system and its judge and jury must be the producers. Performance guarantees are not a question of morals. Fundamentally, it is purely and simply a question of performance. The farmer ought to be the final judge, and it is for that reason that performance objectives must be established.

There are many aspects to the whole question. I draw to your attention the country elevators, the grain terminals, the shunting yards at the port, the port authorities, the tugboat operators and operating system, international shipping, the St. Lawrence Seaway and, while I mention it last it is certainly not least, organized labour. I can understand the instinct of the New Democratic Party not to have any system which might have some persuasive influence on organized labour. I believe it is the obligation upon us all to recognize that fair and equitable treatment of labour organizations is an imperative part of today's society. However, the fact of the matter is that it is an integral link in performance and you cannot have performance without looking at every aspect.

The New Democratic Party has made much ado about CN and CP buying up trucking fleets on the Prairies. At this point it would not be relevant to this part of the debate to comment at length on that matter, except to say that we should not have performance guarantees which affect only the railways. If the trucking companies are as bad as the NDP allege, why would we not at least have a generalized performance guarantee system which could expand to the "evil" that Party claims is there? It seems to me it is obvious that we must have performance guarantees which do not apply to simply one unit, but rather to the whole system.

On that basis I would like to submit to you, Sir, the kind of country we would have if we took the present philosophy of the New Democratic Party and applied it to a number of systems governing Canada. In an NDP Bill 101 there would be a performance guarantee for only one link in a chain. In their Bill 102 there would be a performance guarantee for only one of the couplings on a train. In NDP Bill 103 there would be a performance guarantee that elevator doors would open and close at only one floor. NDP Bill 104 would have a performance guarantee that our medical services would keep only one of the organs viable in the human body. NDP Bill 105, a performance guarantee that only one of the sections of a scaffolding would meet safety standards. NDP Bill 106, a performance guarantee that the left side—that is the port side—of all boats must not leak. NDP Bill 107, a performance guarantee that one section of a rope for mountain climbing must be secured. NDP Bill 108, a performance guarantee that one child in each school gets immunization vaccinations. NDP Bill 109, a performance guarantee—and you will notice the NDP bias shows up here, Mr. Speaker—on all engines on the left side of all aircraft. NDP Bill 110, all automobiles and buses shall have performance guarantees on the brakes on the left-hand side.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Malone: The New Democratic Party are now asking about relevance. The relevance is that if we are going to talk about the concept of performance guarantees—and the NDP are taking the view that is important, as well as my own Party—then surely on a question of getting grain to market one cannot say that performance guarantees should apply only to the railway system. We have trucks, country elevators, terminals, shunting yards, the St. Lawrence Seaway. If we are going to have a system of authority and we are going to have performance guarantees, those performance guarantees have to apply to all parts of the system. Certainly, if you ask prairie farmers who they suspect is holding back on their performance, they will be quick to finger the railways. They are not far behind in fingering organized labour. And whether or not that accusation by farmers is correct, if the authority is there for the purpose of giving performance guarantees, it should affect every section of the transportation of grain to port. If it does not, then the final objective of acquiring a system in which we can achieve performance objectives will not be met.

I would like to accept the challenge of the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) who asked who will pay. Perhaps at this point it is not appropriate to say definitively who will pay for the rewards for improved transportation

when those objectives are met. However, let me submit to you, Sir, that there could be a system under which the farmers could both afford to pay and get richer at the same time. Today, under a system of inadequate transportation, farmers who combine in the fall of the year put their grain in their granaries and it may sit eight months to a year accumulating not one cent of interest. It is value stored. For their operating costs the farmers go to the bank and borrow at interest. If those farmers could move that volume of grain to market faster because there were performance guarantees, they would receive cash to meet their operating costs and be able to avoid interest charges. In that case they could afford to pay more if certain objectives were met, and both the railways and the producers would be better off. I submit that the New Democratic Party should do some rethinking of their motions.

Mr. Speaker, I will call it one o'clock, because it is now one o'clock.

Mr. Althouse: I think he has had about eight minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I believe we should proceed in that way, then, because I notice there are two Hon. Members seeking to be recognized. Accordingly, while the Hon. Member for Crowfoot has completed his remarks, when we reach Orders of the Day the Chair will look to whomever may want the floor at that time.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*Translation*]

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

CENTENNIAL OF "LA PRESSE"

Mr. Robert Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau): Madam Speaker, it took a lot of courage, back in 1884, to launch the daily newspaper *La Presse*. Highly politicized at first, the paper became a reflection of society as it evolved over the years. *La Presse* is 100 years old today. For 100 years it has reported the news, but above all, it became an institution, so much so that even our legislators tried to protect it. Madam Speaker, today we wish to salute the men and women who have defended our right to be informed over the years, the journalists, who are important, although we must not forget the printing staff, delivery boys and girls, and so many others.

About *La Presse* it can be said that although time goes by and nothing remains the same, we can always rely on *La Presse*. We are indeed fortunate in this democratic society of ours that not only allows freedom of the press and freedom of information but actually promotes those freedoms.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

WHITE FARM EQUIPMENT LTD.—CALL FOR CONTINUANCE OF COMPANY

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Madam Speaker, officials of the Government met yesterday with the receiver for White Farm Equipment Limited, which indicates a decision on the fate of the company is imminent. Nobody is more concerned about this decision than the approximately 120 White Farm Equipment dealers, their 1,000 employees, and the thousands of farmers who own White implements. The message many of these people have received from the Government is causing them great concern. For example, a White dealer in Warren, Manitoba, stated in a telegram to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Lumley) "The only solution is to keep White Farm ongoing and this must be done immediately".

This particular dealer, and others who have signed petitions calling for the continuance of the company, expressed their perception that the Government is not necessarily concerned about keeping the company alive as a separate, viable entity. Yet the Receiver has been given offers which would keep the company going.

Farmers who own White implements want assurances that they will be able to get replacement parts. White dealers do not want to lose their businesses. Nor do they want to go into other equipment lines, which in many cases are already being carried by their competitors down the street. What these dealers do want is assurance that they will stay in business. Surely that is not too much to ask.

* * *

DISARMAMENT

SIXTY-ONE-DAY FAST TO PROTEST WORLD MILITARY EXPENDITURES

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East): Madam Speaker, on October 5 Karen Harrison, a young Toronto dancer, completed a 61-day-fast to focus attention on the links between military spending and world-wide hunger. In ending her fast she asked Canadians to support the various rallies for disarmament to take place on October 22, this Saturday, and to make a one-day fast on October 24, United Nations Day, in order to divert the money saved to international development.

While one-third of the world's people lack the basic needs of life, world military spending is now over $600 billion a year.

The United Nations Centre for Disarmament has calculated that $18.5 billion yearly would provide adequate food, water, education, health and housing for the world poor. I plead with the Government and all Members of Parliament to take this message seriously. We now have enough nuclear armaments on both sides to destroy all life on this planet. We also have abject poverty, hunger, and suffering.

This Saturday Canadians are asked to show their support for disarmament by demonstrations, rallies, and other activities. On Monday several MPs in this House will fast for one day and send the money saved to OXFAM and other aid agencies. This action can be considered only one step in a continuing movement to make the world secure and reduce poverty.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member's time is up.

* * *

NATIONAL GALLERY

THEFT OF REMBRANDT ETCHINGS—REVIEW OF SECURITY PROCEDURES DEMANDED

Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Madam Speaker, Ottawa police and the National Gallery of Canada have confirmed that last Friday a man claiming to do research on our national treasures walked away with two Rembrandt etchings, replacing them with phonies. The man, using an alias, apparently had impressive enough credentials to be allowed to spend six hours in the Gallery's vault. In any event, the two etchings, whose estimated value is $100,000 each, are missing, along with the individual. This theft followed by a few months an incident at the Public Archives where another man, again with legitimate credentials, asked to study the calligraphy on the original Constitution proclamation. He defaced the document with red paint.

I urge the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) to meet with the directors of the National Museums of Canada, the National Library and the Public Archives to ask for a review of their security procedures. The need for security, of course, must be balanced with that of the legitimate requirements of scholarly research. However, Canada's cultural heritage, whether original copies of our Constitution proclamations or valuable art works, is held by these agencies in trust for the people of Canada. The Minister must ensure that trust is upheld. I hope to question the Minister of Communications on the matter later this day, Madam Speaker.

* * *

INCOME TAX

DEPARTMENT'S TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF TORONTO SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Madam Speaker, over the past eight months Revenue Canada has systematically focused its attentions on the tax status of participants in our cultural and artistic communities. Last week we had a situation where a prominent visual artist was forced by tax regulations to consider destroying his art. This week we have the case of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra and its musicians, traditionally self-employed, who have been told they must consider themselves employees of the Symphony, despite the fact that they work for the Symphony less than 20 hours a week, are frequently engaged in other activities, and pay for and supply their own instruments. The effect on the musicians is a substantial reduction in their already modest income, forcing some musicians to leave the Symphony. This ruling comes after two similar rulings on Symphony orchestras in other cities have been overturned on appeal.

On the one hand Revenue Canada acts to restrict the production by visual artists, forces musicians out of orchestras, and actors out of theatre companies. On the other hand the Government spends millions of dollars on inquiring into the problems of culture in Canada. Is there not a contradiction there? Musicians, artists, actors, and writers, those who invest their lives in creating art and culture in this country, and who have very modest incomes, are harassed and denigrated. Yet in 1980 close to 5,000 Canadians making over $50,000 a year paid no tax at all as a result of tax loopholes and generous investment breaks. We say, let the cultural community create and perform, and let the taxman focus attention where it is needed.

Madam Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member's time is up.

* * *

MEDICAL CARE

INCREASE IN DOCTORS' MALPRACTICE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, when evaluating the costs of Canada's health care system I am concerned with the inadequate consideration given to two recent developments in the practice of medicine in this country. First, the Canadian Medical Protective Association is proposing to raise drastically its annual fees for malpractice insurance, now set at $500 for every member, to between $300 and $2,900 annually, depending on the degree of risk of being sued according to each specialty.

In the past the difference in malpractice insurance costs incurred by the various medical specialties was distributed amongst all members. With the increased complexity and sophistication of medical and surgical procedures, the risk of litigation is becoming greater, and therefore serious consideration is being given to the feasibility of identifying categories of medical practice in terms of hazards and costliness of the medical legal problems which arise. Secondly, longer consultation times between doctors and their patients are required so that patients will have a better awareness of the possible complications which may be expected from surgical and other procedures before treatment is undertaken.

S.O. 21

We live in times of increasing numbers of lawsuits. It is necessary for the federal and provincial Governments to make financial allowances for compensation for increased medical legal litigation when deciding on adjustments to fee schedules under our medicare system and on the over-all health care budgets.

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

POST OFFICE BOX RENTAL FEES

Mr. Mel Gass (Malpeque): Madam Speaker, today I would like to address a problem brought to my attention by my constituents, which is the increase in cost of services offered by Canada Post. The cost to use a post office box has increased over 150 per cent in some cases. One constituent of mine in the town of Kensington has reported that a post office box, which he paid $15 for in 1982, now costs $33.92. This is an increase of over 100 per cent. Another constituent has informed me that in 1981 his post office box cost $5, in 1982 the same box cost $6, and in 1983 the cost is estimated at $16.96, again an increase of over 150 per cent.

In view of these examples of the rising cost of services provided by Canada Post, could the Minister responsible explain how these figures square with the Government's six and five program? I urge that the Minister check into these rising costs to see if the situation can be corrected or reversed.

* * *

● (1410)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

QUOTATION FROM 1956 "HANSARD"

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, *Hansard* records that it was Monday, June 4, 1956, when the Leader of the Official Opposition said, as reported at page 4644:

> The freedom that we have here to shape and guide legislation, no matter on which side of the house we may sit, is part of the very freedom which we cherish here in this country of ours.

The prior Thursday a Member had moved a motion found proper to the Chair. Mr. Drew, in his remarks, reminded the Members that the House:

> —had become seized of the issue raised in that motion . . . It was in the hands of the hon. members of this house—
>
> Under those circumstances I submit it was not the Speaker's right to withdraw this matter from the house . . . It could only have been withdrawn properly by a decision of the house itself—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I am afraid that statement is reflecting on a decision by the Speaker, and I cannot allow it.

Mr. Deans: I am quoting from *Hansard*.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for South West Nova.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order—

* * *

FOREIGN INVESTMENT REVIEW AGENCY

STATEMENT BY PREMIER OF NOVA SCOTIA

Miss Coline Campbell (South West Nova): Madam Speaker, on Saturday of last week the Premier of Nova Scotia, John Buchanan, told a party gathering that the Foreign Investment Review Agency was blocking investment in his Province by Japanese businessmen. Mr. Buchanan is not telling the truth and is using FIRA as a scapegoat for the failure of his own Government to attract new investment to Nova Scotia.

The facts are that no Japanese applications to invest in Nova Scotia have been disallowed by FIRA over the past two years. In all of Canada, 40 proposals by Japanese interests to invest in Canada have been allowed, and only one has been disallowed. The Japanese Ambassador to Canada, Kiyohisa Mikanagi, has stated that FIRA's review procedures are no longer a barrier, if they ever were, to Japanese investment in Canada. Similar statements have been made by the U.S. Ambassador to Canada, Paul Robinson.

It is understandable that the Premier of Nova Scotia should be distressed about the lack of investment in his Province. Perhaps if he looked to the deficiencies in his own policies instead of trying to blame others like the federal Government and the Japanese, in this case, wrongfully, the problem will correct itself.

* * *

INDUSTRY

MAISLIN TRANSPORT LTD.—CONSEQUENCES OF BANKRUPTCY

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Prince Edward-Hastings): Madam Speaker, my statement is in reference to the Maislin Company bail out and, now, bankruptcy. I would like to say that this is the most blatant, disgusting give-away of taxpayers' dollars ever, but given the record of the Government and the fact that only $34 million is involved, I suppose it ranks pretty low on any list of revolting excesses by those clowns.

The then Minister of Industry, Trade and Consumer waffled, sidestepped, and in other ways refused to deal with the matter in a forthright way. Knowing the problem, the Government then authorized, at an incredible salary, the hiring of a new manager who had just bankrupted another trucking company in the United States.

Even over the objection of the Canadian Trucking Association, the Government, with great glee, tossed over $30 million of taxpayers' money to its personal friends. That cost people in my riding over $100,000. Now the Government will ensure that ordinary creditors, many of them small businesses, will get absolutely nothing; workers will get 50 cents on the dollar

for back wages if they are lucky, and certainly no guarantee of future employment, but the poor banks will get nearly all their money.

In addition, the licences are now to be sold to another U.S. firm for a pittance, while no Canadian companies were given an opportunity to bid. The whole deal smells to high Heaven, and I, for one, will object to any FIRA application to allow these licences to leave Canada.

* * *

THE SENATE

REFORM URGED ON REGIONAL BASIS

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Madam Speaker, it was encouraging to read that the new Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Mulroney) recognizes that Canada has become a country of regions and has long since ceased to be a simplistic community of communities.

Permit me to quote my own words of March 10, 1981, on this matter:

> This nation, Canada, will increasingly evolve, and its interdependence will increasingly grow as a co-operative quasi economic and social federation of five national regions. Within these regions, Provinces shall co-operate and compete, shall integrate transportation and energy and other systems and shall evolve somewhat different and unique social and cultural systems. And over all, all these regions shall form the umbrella of a reorganized national Parliament.
>
> The relationship of the national umbrella and the regional well-being, aspirations and growth will be dynamic, changing and challenging. This then is, and will continue to be, the essence of Canada.

The patriation of the Constitution and the entrenchment of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms was a giant leap, and a mandatory one, toward this vision of Canada. Structural reform of the Senate on the basis of the five regions of Canada is also mandatory. Our nation shall endure and prosper.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—MURDER OF PRIME MINISTER IN MARXIST TAKEOVER—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. What is the position of the Government of Canada in regard to the reported Marxist takeover in Grenada which was accomplished by murdering the Prime Minister, a number of his colleagues, and leading trade unionists on the island?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the events in Grenada have been very unfortunate. That type of violence cannot be condoned.

The Government has made a statement, which I actually made earlier this morning, to express our distress as a Government at the events, as well as my own personal sorrow because, although Maurice Bishop had an ideology which is not ours, he was in the Commonwealth and engaged in dialogue with us. I dare say he was a friend. Therefore I am very sorry at the turn of events.

We have expressed our dismay. I believe the Minister of State may have further up to date details, but this was my response as of earlier this morning.

CANADIAN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, we share the thrust of the Prime Minister's statement of regret, of course, but in view of the brutality and murder involved, does this impact in any way on the thinking of the Government in regard to aid programs directed to that particular country in which, in this situation, the beneficiaries would become people, as the Prime Minister has indicated, with whom he would not like to do business?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I doubt whether that has been envisaged in the Department yet. I would only indulge in a bit of hindsight here.

This Government had given some modest assistance to Grenada. We did it in spite of cries—some of which I am afraid came from the other side—to the effect that that Government was left leaning. It is now apparent that there are more left leaners than Maurice Bishop was, and that it is wise not to cut off relations with Governments with which we may disagree if they are following policies which seem correct to them in their particular part of the world.

In other words, I have never been an advocate of cutting off countries because I disagreed with their ideology. I believe, and I have previously stated this precisely about the Grenada case, that when a country tries to export its revolution, then we indeed should show very great displeasure and take action. But I do not think we should try to influence the choice of independent peoples by using our aid programs.

Mr. Mulroney: Nor do I hold the view that one must necessarily reflect the political philosophy of the donor nation so as to benefit from foreign aid—not by a long shot.

REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, the instigator of the murder and revolution on the island was a member of the Government to which the Prime Minister refers. The takeover has been absolute and murderous. Since there are limits to the exercise of the philosophy to which the Prime Minister refers, and in light of the brutality and murderous nature of the takeover in Grenada, would the Prime Minister agree that it would be prudent to review diplomatic relations and aid programs of any kind that might

be construed as giving the blessing of the people of Canada, however inadvertently, to this kind of regime which, though in its infancy, is well on its way to exporting violent ideals inimical to the interests and philosophy of Canadians?

● (1420)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, when a Government is overthrown by force, we would do that as a matter of course. There is a practice in this Government to review diplomatic relations, to use the words of the Leader of the Opposition. I am glad that in the first part of his question the Leader of the Opposition agreed with me that we should not make aid conditional upon compatability of government views in countries we purport to aid. I hope this, too, is a new departure that his colleagues and his Party will both accept.

SAFETY OF CANADIAN CITIZENS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Madam Speaker, might I direct a further supplementary to the Prime Minister and ask whether he could indicate to the House and to Canadians, who are watching with interest the events in Grenada, what the condition is with respect to the safety and capacity to move and to communicate of Canadian families who are resident on the island, and of Canadians who may be travelling on the island on vacation?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, I might indicate that a four-day 24-hour curfew has been established on the island. As my colleague, the Minister of State for International Trade, said yesterday, there are about 80 to 85 Canadians registered there, but some of them go there only in the winter. Therefore there is no way of finding out who, among the registered people, is there. I understand they are in touch with each other, and I understand from External Affairs that they are generally in good spirits. They are being advised to stay put, not to move, not to try to get out because attempts to leave might be dangerous.

By way of further information, there are 12 CIDA co-operants, 5 CUSO, one CBC reporter, and one officer of the Department of External Affairs who is from the Canadian High Commission in Barbados and was the gentleman who carried the message of the Canadian Government which the Prime Minister sent expressing the hope that violence would not be used.

* * *

CROWN CORPORATIONS

CANADAIR—REAPPOINTMENT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister with regard to Canadair, whose survival is so important to all of us. The Prime Minister yesterday indicated, and I quote, "We do not want it", he meant Canadair, "to be dealt with by a parliamentary committee as is suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. We want it to be dealt with by this government-owned, this management company called CDIC."

How can the House and Canadians have faith in the Prime Minister's solution to the problem, management by CDIC, given the following two decisions taken by CDIC? First was the decision to reappoint the board of directors in its entirety last summer, in secret, notwithstanding the internal report prepared for Treasury Board which suggested or questioned the competence of the board. Second was the decision this week to reward effectively Mr. James Taylor, the President of the subsidiary in the United States, for his involvement in aircraft leasing to Canadair, by making him chairman of the board of the subsidiary corporation?

Can the Prime Minister tell us how we can possibly at the moment have any faith in his solution, and will he now reconsider and recognize the need, for the sake of Canadair, for a full inquiry by a committee of Parliament?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is repeating the very same questions I answered yesterday. I will answer them in the same way. The CDIC, which is the management company of Canadair, is a Crown corporation. It answers to Parliament through a Minister. That Minister will be appearing before a parliamentary committee. I would think it better, more conducive to the kind of co-operation which the Hon. Member's Leader was indicating would be forthcoming yesterday, if we heard from Senator Austin, if we heard what his objectives are, and if we heard the reasons for the actions about which the Hon. Member is now complaining.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER IN SENATE

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question relates directly to the Prime Minister's answer. In this case is the Prime Minister aware that the other day in the Senate when Senator Austin was asked about the CDIC, his answer about the press release this week was:

—I had authorized the making of a statement—

Senator Austin also said:

I do not propose to make it my own statement, in any parliamentary sense.

Can the Prime Minister now tell us how we can continue to have faith in a structure that appears to be making decisions contrary to Canadair's interest, and to the public's interest, when the Minister refuses to take any responsibility for the actions of the corporation? Can he now tell us whether he will not finally recognize that the future of Canadair is best dealt with by clearing the air through a parliamentary committee?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is misconstruing not only the thoughts, but the words of Senator Austin. Senator Austin has indicated he would appear before a committee, he would be answering questions and he would be stating the Government's

medium and long-term policy. This will be done soon. I repeat, if the Hon. Member is suggesting some kind of co-operative approach to a difficult problem, then let this take place. If he is trying once again to put the spikes in Canadair—

Mr. Stevens: You have done that.

Mr. Trudeau: —as has been the effective use of the debates by some of his colleagues—

Mr. Andre: Jack Austin, Maurice Strong, are playing with billions of our dollars.

Mr. Trudeau: —then I suggest that he is doing it in the right way, but then he is contradicting the spirit of co-operation that his very Leader indicated to this House yesterday.

Some Hon. Members: Nonsense.

* * *

FISHERIES

ROYAL BANK FORECLOSURE OF CASSIAR, B.C. PLANT—PLIGHT OF FISHERMEN

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. In view of the bankruptcy of Maislin and the treatment which the employees of that company received yesterday, in view of the same kind of treatment of employees in the fishing industry in British Columbia through Cassiar fishery where fishermen are only going to receive about 20 per cent of their income this year as a result of the Royal Bank foreclosing, and in view of the fact the Minister has had six weeks to review this situation, what attempts has he made up until now to see that fishermen are adequately compensated for their year's work?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Madam Speaker, I understand that the company and the receivers are considering a number of options to maintain operations. The fleet and the plants will continue to operate for the remainder of the salmon fishing season. I do not think it would be advisable for me, in an industry that is over-capitalized, as my friend knows, and as Dr. Pearse noted in his report on the Pacific fishery which shows that it is a very over-capitalized fishery, to intervene at this moment in this specific case.

GILLNET LICENCES

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Madam Speaker, I have another question for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. The Minister may be aware that one of the suggestions for a bail-out is that Cassiar's gillnet fleet may be sold to the Government. In view of the fact that the Minister has already rejected a buy-back program for individual fishermen, and in view of the fact that he has bailed out Pacific Packers and its gillnet fleet, would the Minister guarantee to this House that there will be no sale of licences for the gillnet fleet until there has been a thorough review of the implications of the closure of that plant, and until he decides on a buy-back program for individual fishermen in British Columbia?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Madam Speaker, I will certainly give the commitment to my hon. friend that I will study his request.

* * *

CROWN CORPORATIONS

CANADAIR—REQUEST THAT STUDIES BE TABLED

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition made our generous offer, and it has been repeated again today, to take this whole matter of Canadair out of politics and put it in a special committee.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blenkarn: The Prime Minister will know that there have been a number of studies made by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and by CDIC itself with respect to the viability of Canadair. Will the Prime Minister, in view of his co-operation and co-operative attitude, table those studies so they could be referred to a committee?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is suggesting that by putting this matter in the hands of a committee it will be taken out of politics. I cannot believe he is serious. I think we practise politics in this place. The last days have shown that they are particularly divisive when they have to do with the kinds of economic questions we are trying to solve with the Crow and with Canadair. They denote two different approaches by two Parties with different approaches to politics. That is precisely the case, Madam Speaker. Everybody knows it is the case and that it would be a mistake to throw the management, the surveillance, the report on operations of a Crown corporation, into a parliamentary committee. Crown corporations were created to remove them from politics.

Mr. Stevens: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: The suggestions we have been hearing, and the guffaw that we still hear today from Members of the Tory Party, are intended precisely to reintroduce politics into the management of Crown corporations. That is contrary to 100 years of tradition, not only in Canada but in most parliamentary systems.

● (1430)

CONTENTS OF STUDIES

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Prime Minister. He has had before him a report on Canadair dated January, 1982. There was a further report dated November, 1982. Both

of those reports have been kept secret. The Prime Minister now has before him another report which was completed by CDIC, with respect to how the company should go and how the technology should be preserved. Will the Prime Minister, to show some faith in the House of Commons, table those reports before the House today?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is asking me to comment on reports that I have not seen, of which I have no knowledge, and he is asking me to do it by the end of the day today. I suggest, if the Hon. Member were not playing politics with this, he at least would have given me notice of his question so that I would know what the heck he is talking about. Obviously he prefers to politicize this issue, once again showing that he is divided from his own Leader on this very subject.

REAPPOINTMENT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Madam Speaker, my question is also directed to the Prime Minister. I would like to point out to him that we are not trying to politicize the issue. We are trying to get to the heart of the problem of accountability for this $1.4 billion loss.

My question relates to the accountability of the Prime Minister in this case. In view of the fact that we have had this loss and it is the largest in Canadian corporate history, and in view of the fact that the entire board was reappointed in secret, in spite of a government report which condemned the board and the management of the company, did the Prime Minister ask Senator Austin to explain to him why the entire board was reappointed?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Opposition keeps making much of the fact that Canadair has been losing money. It obviously has. The Government had to go before the House in order to get money to keep the company operating. The point is that it was losing money when it was in the private sector.

Mr. Stevens: Not so.

Mr. Trudeau: The point is that this company was going belly up, that its owners no longer wanted to operate it, that they were trying to get rid of it. The result would have been that it would have closed down in Canada. Because the Government does not share the reactionary philosophy of the Hon. Member, we stepped in and thought that it was important to save the company, to keep the jobs here, and to ensure that the technology still existed in Canada. That is the difference between the Hon. Member's Party and this Party. We made that difference clear last spring when we were debating this subject. When the Members over there basically want to see Canadair shut down, I know the Leader of the Opposition does not, because he knows a little more about it than his Members.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wilson: I wish the Prime Minister knew a little more about it. Then he would take some interest in the fact that $1.4 billion of taxpayers' moneys have been blown because there has been inaction and a lack of interest in what is going on in Canadair. We are in no way trying to see this company shut down. If anything will cause it to be shut down, it is the inaction and the lack of interest of the Prime Minister.

POSITION OF PRIME MINISTER

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Madam Speaker, since the Prime Minister evaded my question and gave no clear answer, I presume he did not speak to Senator Austin in that way. Because the Prime Minister is the most senior member of the Government of Canada, would he explain to the House why, in view of his lack of interest in this case, we as Members of Parliament should have any confidence in the actions taken by the Government to avoid similar losses in the future?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, if the CDIC management and Senator Austin had not been forthcoming last spring, if they had not put the financial statements in front of the House, if we had not put the matter before two parliamentary committees, if these committees were not going to report within a few days, if Senator Austin did not agree to appear before it, then I could understand the concern of the Hon. Member. He does not want this corporation to be operated on a management-run basis. He wants to stick his political nose into it, and that is what they are trying to do.

Once again, I made it quite clear yesterday, and I repeat it today, that there will be a statement by Senator Austin in front of the committee when the report is made and that he will answer the questions. If the question is asked by the Hon. Member or one of his colleagues and Senator Austin does not answer it, indeed I will find out what the answer is. I think it is normal to give the Minister a chance to answer the question when it is asked of him in the proper way—and stop pointing your finger; that is not polite.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY WHETHER STEPS HAVE BEEN TAKEN TO AVOID WASTAGE OF PUBLIC FUNDS

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Madam Speaker, I have the impression that our questions are somewhat irritating to the Prime Minister, but considering the fact that Canadians know perfectly well that the Government has already poured $1.4 billion into this corporation, that the Minister responsible is recommending that the Government provide new funding of as much $400 million, while 1,300 jobs were lost in the past year, can the Prime Minister today, before the eyes of the Canadian people, inform the House about any guarantees he has to offer that there will be no further wastage of public funds in the future, as he said yesterday, while ignoring the past?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, if the Hon. Member is referring to the answers I gave yesterday and today, he will have to admit that the company suffered losses when it was still a private enterprise. It had closed down, so it was losing money. It wanted to stop operations. That is why it wanted to close down, why it wanted to get rid of Canadair. Madam Speaker, financial losses are not due to the fact that it is a Crown corporation. The same occurred when it was owned by the private sector. What the Hon. Member should decide is whether we should try and save the jobs in Montreal and the advanced technology, or whether we should say: Well, a private enterprise could not run Canadair so let us not try to run it either? If the Hon. Member is in favour of closing down the Corporation, let him say so outright. However, if he prefers to keep the technology and the jobs in Quebec, he should support us and check whether there is any improvement, but he should not evade the issue as his colleagues seem to be doing, in order to close down Canadair, because the people in his party are against Crown corporations. They prefer to privatize.

Mr. La Salle: Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister did not really answer my question. He is aware of this company's poor management. The Prime Minister is aware that public funds are involved. My question is: In the circumstances, since the Prime Minister is refusing to offer Canadians a minimum of guarantees, is the Prime Minister at least preppared to acknowledge that our party, the Progressive Conservative Party, was right in asking for more control over the expenditures of Crown corporations? And in this connection, I would ask the Prime Minister to at least give this House the authority to verify the expenditures of Crown corporations that are manifestly unco-operative.

Mr. Trudeau: Madam Speaker, as far as increased control by the Government and this House is concerned, the Hon. Member is aware that a bill on Crown corporations is before Parliament, specifically for the purpose of increasing control. We do not disagree on this point.

However, I am sure the Hon. Member will recall that all or almost all aerospace companies in the world have been in tremendous financial difficulty in the past few years, and that in all major countries, this industry is now highly subsidized, either through direct Government funding or through Government purchasing of military or other aircraft. These companies are not making a profit, that is understood. This is true in Canada and among all our competitors as well. Bearing this in mind, the Hon. Member will realize that the trouble is not that there were financial losses, whatever the figure. The trouble is that the Hon. Member, because we are losing money, fails to realize that it is in the nature of this industry at the present time to lose money. Therefore, his party will have to decide. Either governments do not help the aerospace industry, and it will collapse, or we do help this industry, and then we have to make sure that we help in the most effective way possible. Those are options open to the Hon. Member.

* * *

● (1440)

[*English*]

MULTICULTURALISM

FUNDING OF FRIENDSHIP CENTRES

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State. On May 30 the Minister announced Cabinet approval of a new financial package which he had negotiated with the National Association of Friendship Centres. However, as of yesterday Treasury Board had not approved any money. Considering that Friendship Centres across Canada are in difficulty and that some have closed, will the Minister tell the House whether the Government will keep its commitment? Will he ensure the flow of funds to Friendship Centres so that they can meet the needs of native people in urban areas?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Serge Joyal (Secretary of State): Madam Speaker, as announced last May, the Government has renewed its assistance program for Native Friendship Centres across Canada. The problems remaining to be settled with Treasury Board are now being examined, and we hope they will be cleared up by the end of this month, so that the program can continue to develop on the basis of the proposals we made last May.

[*English*]

INTEREST COSTS INCURRED BY CENTRES

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Madam Speaker, on September 22 the Minister assured Friendship Centres that there would be no difficulty in having those funds released. Will the Minister now assure the House that the entire package will be delivered to Friendship Centres, and will he fight to get additional funds available to cover the heavy interest costs resulting from the delay in funding?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Serge Joyal (Secretary of State): Madam Speaker, as I said before, during the past few weeks we have made representations to Treasury Board to ensure that problems that have arisen, especially in connection with the Government's guidelines on budget increases, can be resolved. Furthermore, I can assure the Hon. Member that we are in touch daily with the various departments concerned, to ensure that the program will be able to proceed as announced last May.

[*English*]

CROWN CORPORATIONS

CANADAIR—MANAGEMENT EXPERTISE

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister who, the House will recall, stated yesterday that departmental officials, referring to Canadair, do not have the expertise to deal with all of the businesses in which the Government is involved. Will the Prime Minister indicate where the management expertise is to run Canadair, a diversified aerospace company? Is it in Gil Bennett, the lawyer from Toronto who has been brought in on a part-time basis to be the chief executive officer? Is it Senator Austin, in the company described as the management company of Canadair? Is it Maurice Strong? Is it Joel Bell? Where is the expertise management which the Prime Minister referred to yesterday, to run Canadair at the present time?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, obviously if I say that it is in that collective management, the Hon. Member will say that they are not good enough experts for him. I will ask him a question in turn, although it may be a bit irregular. We have had suggestions in this House that they would like to run it by a joint parliamentary committee. Maybe the Hon. Member can tell me the greater experts on his side than the ones he just named. Judging by what they did with Canadair in the nine months they were in Government, I do not think they have great experts on that side.

Mr. Stevens: As all can recognize, Madam Speaker, that is a terrible distortion of the suggestion made yesterday. We simply ask that a select all-Party committee review the Government's plans, and take a look at whom is the expertise management in whom we can all have confidence to run Canadair.

APPOINTMENT OF JEAN-PIERRE GOYER

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): The Prime Minister has indicated that we must leave Crown corporations out of politics which, according to him, is a one hundred year tradition, and that the running of Crown corporations must not have any political influence. In view of that statement, will the Prime Minister indicate why he and the present Minister of Finance pressed so hard to have Jean-Pierre Goyer made Chairman of Canadair, something that was resented and resisted to the end by the old management of Canadair?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I am not sure about the Hon. Member's facts, but he and his Party have been complaining about the old management as being incompetent. Now he seems to think that they were competent enough to judge that they were good and that they should not be replaced by, as he alleges, Jean-Pierre Goyer. The Hon. Member has to make up his mind. Maybe Mr. Goyer is better in our mind than the old management and in that—

Mr. Stevens: Is that right?

Mr. Trudeau: It is right if I follow the Hon. Member's thinking, because the Hon. Member wanted to get rid of the old management. What is his position? Does he want the old management or does he want new management?

* * *

INDUSTRY

MAISLIN TRANSPORT LTD.—STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT'S LOAN GUARANTEES

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Prince Edward-Hastings): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Now that it is evident that yet another questionable deal by the Government has helped out its friends at Maislin, and particularly the banks, can the Minister tell me why the loan guarantees to Maislin were structured so as to give suppliers, mainly small businesses, no money, give employees only half of their back salaries, vacation pay and severance pay, and yet allow the banks to recoup nearly all of their money?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Madam Speaker, I am very disappointed that the Conservative Party does not think that 2,000 jobs in Canada are very important or that it was important to try to save those 2,000 jobs. Second, the allegation by the Hon. Member of what is contained in that loan agreement with respect to salaries is not accurate. When the Hon. Member has some accurate information, I will be happy to respond to him.

REPORTED SALE OF COMPANY'S LICENCES TO UNITED STATES FIRM

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Prince Edward-Hastings): Madam Speaker, there are only half that many employees, and they would have been working today had this been handled properly. The licences owned by Maislin were, I understand, sold to Consolidated Freightways of California for a pittance, on the agreement of the bank. Can the Minister tell me why no Canadian companies were allowed to bid on these licences, when a single Montreal-Toronto licence is worth $1 million on the free market today? Also, will he take steps to stop that sale and open it up to Canadian bidders?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Again, Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member's information is not accurate. Perhaps he would like to ask the responsible trustee. The Government of Canada did not negotiate that sale. In fact we were just advised of the sale a couple of days ago, and now we have to look and see if it is reviewable under the FIR Act. Perhaps the Hon. Member would like to write a letter to the chairman of the board of the bank. Maybe he can advise him on what happened during that transaction.

ENERGY

ATMOSPHERIC TEMPERATURE INCREASE—HYDROGEN ADVOCATED AS ALTERNATIVE FUEL

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. The United States Environmental Protection Agency in a recent official report warns about the greenhouse effect, saying the buildup of carbon in the atmosphere will lead to a disastrous warming of the earth, the effects to be felt as early as the 1990s. We have the technology to start correcting the problem. Hydrogen is the only fuel that burns clean. The parliamentary Committee on Alternate Energy reported and recommended that Canada move toward a hydrogen-based economy. Will the Minister make the same grants and subsidies available for the development of hydrogen that he now makes available for frontier gas and oil exploration?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, I think there are two problems that are entirely different in scope. I read with great interest the Committee's report on alternative energy sources, and the use of hydrogen is an interesting proposal, but I do not think we have reached the point where we should consider changing our policy on developing oil resources in Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. de Jong: Madam Speaker, very often those involved with fossil fuels acquire fossil minds. My next question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

● (1450)

FUNDS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HYDROGEN

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): My next question is directed to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance knows that hydrogen is an available fuel. In fact, on November 4, 1981, we rode together in a hydrogen fueled car, and he stated at that time that it was a very interesting technology that needs to be developed.

As well, the Minister knows that the National Research Council, through Mr. Brian Taylor, has stated that the technology for hydrogen exists and it is only political timing that is preventing its development. In fact, Madam Speaker—

Madam Speaker: In fact, does the Hon. Member have a question? It is incredible.

Mr. de Jong: My question, Madam Speaker, is directed to the Minister. Will the Minister recommend that in his next budget, grants and subsidies that are now provided to frontier oil and gas development should also be made available to individuals and companies attempting to develop hydrogen into an economical fuel for Canada in order that we can create some jobs and export some—

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I shall consider the Hon. Member's question as a proposal to be examined in preparing the Budget.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AID

SUCO FUNDING

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Madam Speaker, my qeustion is directed to the Minister of State for External Relations. The Minister is aware that the funding for the Service universitaire canadien outre-mer, known as SUCO and a partner of CUSO, has had its funds cut back and seems to have been totally eliminated. Could the Minister explain to the House why this was done, and does he have any program to see that funds will be reinstated?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, this was done with great regret. It became pretty obvious to most people that SUCO, notwithstanding increased budget support from CIDA and consulting services paid by CIDA to the group, was incapable of putting together a reasonably good accounting service. In this instance the Government tried to minimize the damage and we have ensured the co-opérants that they would be properly subsidized by CIDA until March 31. In the meantime we hope that the co-opérants will find association with other groups so that they can continue to serve the countries to which they have been assigned in the best possible way. Again, this is a regrettable action. It is an action that is not often taken by CIDA, but which had to be taken in this particular instance.

* * *

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

PRIME MINISTER'S 1980 STATEMENT

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister stated in a speech to the Liberal campaign college in Toronto on January 12, 1980: "First we must get the nation's finances in order. Our commitment is this. We will hold the line on government expenditure growth to under the rate of growth of the GNP". As the Prime Minister has said this and as, during the following three years between then and now, government expenditures expressed as a percentage of GNP have increased from 19 per cent to 22 per cent and are still going up, would the Prime Minister advise the House how this performance squares with the rousing rhetoric with which he wound up his speech on that day by saying: "There's a prior commitment I want to make clear. Liberals will do what we say we will do. And if we can't do it, we won't say it"?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the only thing wrong with the question asked by the

Hon. Member is that his facts are wrong. That is quite fundamental. The trend line has been down for a government share of public expenditures. He simply has to look at the facts.

Mr. Hees: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question to set the record straight.

Madam Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre.

* * *

ENERGY

EXPORT PRICE OF NATURAL GAS

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Madam Speaker, my question would be directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources if I could have his attention. On October 7 I asked the Minister if he was planning to reduce the export price for natural gas since the border price set by the Minister is too expensive for our American customers. In his answer the Minister said that there is no need to move at this time.

Since top U.S. energy officials in Washington are insisting that Canada will announce more cuts in natural gas export prices by the end of the month, and since these comments follow discussions with government officials here in Ottawa, is the Minister misleading the House, or is he too busy campaigning for the Liberal leadership to be able to be on top of the affairs of his Department?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, I think that the Hon. Member will see by the end of the month if the price is going down or not. Next week will be the end of the month, so she will know by that time.

Miss Carney: We shall certainly watch for the date at the end of the month.

EXPORTATION OF ELECTRICITY

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is also addressed to the same Minister. It has been reported that the Minister is willing to take steps to increase electricity exports to the United States. How can the Government justify promoting hydro exports when it is refusing to take similar steps to help the natural gas industry which is operating at about 40 per cent of its export capacity? How can the Minister justify helping one energy industry when it refuses to respond to the very real concerns of another, the oil and gas industry?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): First, Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is wrong. We have taken two steps since the Spring to help the situation regarding the export of natural gas. We have reduced the price to $4.40 from $4.94, and we have given an incentive price to added quantities of gas that were to be taken by the market.

Regarding the export of electricity to the Americans, I, of course, am very much interested in exporting it because there is a surplus. The hydro companies in Ontario, Quebec, and New Brunswick are trying to sell electricity. I told the people in New York that they should perhaps think a little bit about ceasing to burn the coal that creates acid rain, and should buy clean electricity from Canada.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

ACID RAIN—ACTION AGAINST SULPHUR EMISSIONS

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. I would like to compliment him and his predecessor, and his predecessor's predecessor, on their long and arduous struggle with the acid rain question.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fraser: The Minister will know that on this issue he has the strongest support from this Party for his representations to his American colleagues. Since the recent meeting with Secretary Schultz and EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus, is the Minister prepared to make a commitment on behalf of this country that, whether the U.S. administration goes ahead now or later, this country will begin immediately aiming for a 50 per cent reduction of sulphur emissions?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Madam Speaker, dealing with the Hon. Member's preamble, I would like to congratulate him for his touch of modesty. As to the commitment he is asking for, Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that Canada has already taken steps, as was explained yesterday to another Hon. Member, toward achieving reduction of emissions by 25 per cent. That is now being achieved in two of the major Provinces of the country. As to the balance, in order to achieve emissions of 20 kilograms per hectare per year, we know that we cannot achieve that alone. That is corroborated by a statement made yesterday in Washington by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, James Medas, who said that Canada cannot begin solving its own acid rain problems without a joint policy with the U.S.A.

REQUEST FOR CANADIAN COMMITMENT

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Madam Speaker, as Hon. Members on this side have said before, the problem cannot be solved by Canada alone. In view of the fact that the problem will only be solved in the United States if the Americans, who are allied with us in this campaign, are given sufficient support by this country, is the Minister prepared to make a commitment to the American government, and to Congress and the various public interest and citizens' groups

that are supporting the battle against acid rain in the United States, that we will proceed now to a 50 per cent reduction?

I ask this question, Madam Speaker, because on September 8 of this year Representative Dingell of the House of Representatives wrote a letter to the EPA Administrator, Mr. Ruckelshaus. In that letter he asks questions about what Canada is prepared to do, what our base line data is, and what the costs will be. In other words, here is a member who is involved—

● (1500)

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is raising a very important question. My answer to him is that we have in Canada, as a result of an effort in joint federal-provincial co-operation, achieved a plan in Fredericton last month among environmental Ministers, provincial and federal. We have a plan, we are ready to move, and we want to move with the Americans in order to achieve our targets.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITION

MR. BOCKSTAEL—DEMOLITION OF PETRO-CANADA RESTAURANT

Madam Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petition presented by the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael) on Wednesday, October 19, meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

[*English*]

POINT OF ORDER

MR. DEANS—S.O. 21 STATEMENT

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, during Statements by Members I was ruled out of order. I wonder if you would be kind enough to tell me which Speaker's ruling I was reflecting upon?

Madam Speaker: It seemed to me by what the Hon. Member was saying that he was indirectly reflecting on a ruling that I had made some days ago. However, if the Hon. Member feels that I have not been fair with him I will look at the blues. He has now sent me his complete statement. I shall look at it and if I have not been fair or if I have jumped to conclusions a little bit too soon, I will be only too glad to give the Hon. Member another chance to make that statement.

Business of the House

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I rise to ask the customary Thursday question of the Government House Leader, what he expects in the way of business for the remainder of this week and what he has in mind for next week.

While he is answering that question, would he also take the House into his confidence, if he can do so at this time, with respect to the contemplated date for prorogation and the contemplated date for a new session and Throne Speech?

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, on the latter part of the question, I will be in a better position to answer once Bill C-155 and Bill C-152 have received Royal Assent. Meanwhile, we are talking about a reasonable package and we hope that we will be able to get those two Bills through within the next few days so we can contemplate prorogation before the November break. We hope we will have the Speech from the Throne by mid-November. We must get Royal Assent on Bill C-155 and Bill C-152 first, and therefore the door is open for a Speech from the Throne, if need be, a bit later.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, as far as the business of the House for the next few days is concerned, today we intend to propose a motion to limit debate under Standing Order 82. Assuming that the motion is voted on today, Monday will be the first day of debate allocated for the report stage of Bill C-155. Tuesday will be the second day of debate on the same matter, while next Wednesday will be for private members' business and next Thursday we shall have third reading of Bill C-155.

If for some reason we are unable to dispose of the motion under Standing Order 82 today, and in any case if debate had started today, the order of the day for Monday morning shall be to resume debate on the motion under Standing Order 82, at 11 a.m. As far as the business of the House for tomorrow is concerned, I think the Hon. Member has changed his mind—he would not want it to be an Opposition day, I suppose, but I would like him to be clear about that.

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: Madam Speaker, I have a point of order on House business. I wonder if I might be allowed to ask the Government House Leader, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, if the Government might be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 43 by adding immediately after line 34 at page 24 the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the rate a railway company may charge a shipper for the movement of grain for the period January 1, 1984 to July 31, 1986 shall not exceed the existing rates in effect on August 1, 1983".

This motion would preserve the existing statutory freight rate until such time as the Government has concluded its studies and the full impact assessment upon producers is fully analysed.

In any event, I should like to ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of the report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I can assure the Hon. Member that any reasonable proposals for amendments at the report stage of Bill C-155 will be considered. But I also wish to make it quite clear I am not implying that we agree with the specific amendment for which he is requesting the unanimous consent of the House. However, although we do not directly agree with what he is proposing today, it does not preclude our entertaining other amendments and in some cases even agreeing with the unanimous consent of the House to having them put on the Order Paper before we consider amendments at the report stage next Tuesday evening. In the circumstances, we can not agree with the Hon. Member's request today. However, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and myself are prepared to negotiate in good faith on any reasonable amendment, until we are asked to vote on the report stage of Bill C-155.

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: Madam Speaker, this is a very genuine and sincere amendment that has been advanced. I understand that the Minister of Transport will be standing in his place at some point in time requesting that same unanimous consent to have one or two of his own motions, which were ruled out of order by Your Honour, put before the House.

I am pleased to hear that the Government House Leader has said that he is prepared seriously to entertain some of the amendments and proposals that we have to offer. This is one of those proposals that we have to offer which we believe could facilitate the debate and, indeed, improve the Bill.

I ask that you seek unanimous consent, Madam Speaker. If the Government House Leader and the Minister of Transport are serious in their contention that these very realistic, sincere and genuine proposals are going to be considered, it is going to be very difficult, Your Honour, if the Government is now going to proceed with its motion to move closure. Perhaps it might want to reconsider that in light of the comments of the Honourable House Leader.

Madam Speaker: The Chair is really embarrassed by what is taking place. This is a most unusual time to propose that amendments be introduced in the process of studying a Bill. Of course, if the House wants to do it and gives unanimous consent, all of this can happen, but I must say that it is a most exceptional use of the time that is allotted to discuss Government business.

There seem to be other interventions on this point. I would ask Hon. Members to be very brief because any kind of negotiation of this nature that might go on between Parties should, of course, not take place in the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I shall be very brief. I do not want to repeat what I just said. The request for unanimous consent has been denied. However, we are prepared to negotiate as soon as we have proposed our motion for time allocation this afternoon.

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I want to speak to the emerging point of order which the Chair has raised here, namely, the use of this period for asking the question the nature of which the Hon. Member for Vegreville raised.

I believe I heard you correctly when you said it was an unusual time to entertain questions on Government business. I heard the words "Government business" and, of course, it is House business which we are—

• (1510)

Madam Speaker: Order, please. No, I said it was a most unusual time to discuss possible modifications to a Bill which the House was presently studying. This kind of negotiation, I reminded Hon. Members, should take place somewhere else, but certainly not on the floor of the House. I did not rule out the Hon. Member. I was tolerant with the House and allowed the House to hear what the Hon. Member for Vegreville had to say. I allowed the President of the Privy Council to reply.

My impression is that the Hon. Member for Vegreville does not have the unanimous consent of the House. As I indicated, if the House wanted to do this, despite the fact that I find it a bit unusual to be doing it at this particular time, I could ask the House if it gives its unanimous consent and I would be in the hands of the House. Obviously, the Hon. Member did not receive unanimous consent so I suppose he will seek other means of accomplishing what he wishes to do.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, again you have said that you found it unusual to be discussing a matter such as the nature of the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. It is to that point that I wish to address my submissions before the Chair comes to any firm conclusions.

In my submission, this is a most appropriate and proper time for this kind of discussion. I see you nodding your head in the negative. Perhaps after I have presented my submissions I might be successful in having you nod your head the other way.

Madam Speaker: No, really, the Hon. Member is raising a point of order when there is no point of order. I did not make a ruling on this. I just expressed surprise that such negotiations were taking place on the floor of the House, as I have done many times.

It is good politics, I suppose, good policy, for the Chair to be tolerant sometimes when the Chair senses that some kind of agreement might be reached, despite the fact that the proce-

dure is somewhat unusual. The Chair simply looks the other way and allows Hon. Members to discuss this. That is all I said, not more than that and not less. I do not feel there is a point of order. I do not feel I should be hearing argument on that. There is no point of order there.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, there are two points I would like to make, again arising out of what you have said. The first is that they are not negotiations, as I perceive what the Hon. Member for Vegreville has done. It is a submission to the Chair asking her to seek unanimous consent of the House. I will say no more about that.

I want again to disagree with the Chair, with respect, that this is an unusual procedure or time for this kind of thing to be taking place. I am prepared to speak to that point of order should we reach that stage. I would hope that the Chair would call for submissions before making any firm ruling as to the propriety of what the Hon. Member for Vegreville is going now, or any other Hon. Member, should he choose to do so.

Madam Speaker: I can assure the Hon. Member that I am not going to rule on this. I just expressed surprise. I said that I was willing to hear what Hon. Members had to say. Does the House give its unanimous consent? If there is not consent, I do not feel there is any point in adding any argument. Does the House give its unanimous consent to the proposal made by the Hon. Member for Vegreville?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Hargrave: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order dealing with House business. It relates to the fact that the livestock sector, and the value added industries in this piece of legislation, Bill C-155, have been very poorly served throughout this entire debate. My point of order is addressed to the Government House Leader. I would ask him if he would consider giving consent to a motion which I would like to read now being placed on the Order Paper:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 58 by immediately adding after line 13 at page 34 the following therefor:

"58.(3) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, based upon the recommendations of the committee established under section 59(2) to examine the method of payment, the Governor in Council may, subject to approval by Parliament, make regulations prescribing the manner in which, and the parties to whom, payment of the government contribution, including the Crow benefit, shall be made."

I would appreciate, Madam Speaker, if you would ask for the unanimous consent of the House for the motion I have just read to be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration of the report stage of Bill C-155.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the proposal made by the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Gustafson: Madam Speaker, on House business I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate on Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended by striking out the heading "Part IV" preceding Clause 59 at Page 34 and substituting the following therefor:

"PART IV
SHIPPER SHARE LIMITATION

59. In this Part,

"freight to price ratio", in respect of any calendar year, means an amount equal to the quotient, expressed as a percentage obtained by dividing the average cost to the shipper of moving one tonne of grain in that calendar year by the weighted average price for that calendar year;

"shipper share limitation adjustment", in respect of any calendar year, means an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying

(*a*) the number of percentage points by which the freight to price ratio in that calendar year exceeds 7 per cent,

by

(*b*) the product obtained by multiplying the weighted average price for that calendar year by the total number of tonnes of grain moved in that calendar year;

"six grains" means wheat, oats, barley, rye, flaxseed and rapeseed;

"weighted average price", in respect of any calendar year, means the weighted average determined under paragraph 60(1)(*b*) in respect of that calendar year.

60. (1) The Commission shall, on or before March 1st of each year, using the information that it deems appropriate, determine, in respect of the preceding calendar year,

(*a*) the average price per tonne at which each of the six grains, in storage, was available for sale on each trading day at the port that handled the largest volume of that grain in the calendar year;

(*b*) the average of the average prices referred to in paragraph (*a*), weighted on the basis of the number of tonnes of each of the six grains moved in the calendar year;

(*c*) the average cost to the shipper of moving one tonne of grain in the calendar year; and

(*d*) the freight to price ratio.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1)(*a*), the average price per tonne at which each of the six grains was available for sale shall be determined on the basis of the price per tonne of the grade of each of those grains the largest volume of which was moved in the calendar year.

PART V"

and by renumbering the subsequent Parts and Clauses and amending all references accordingly.

The importance of this motion to the producer, Madam Speaker, is the 7 per cent safety net, the same as the Minister proposed, and which has not been debated in the House. The protection of the producer is the important factor which is presented in this amendment against unreasonable, should I say, freight rates which would give a safety protection to the primary producer.

● (1520)

In any event, Madam Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration at

report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain, and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Axworthy: Madam Speaker, I would hope we might be able to respond to this intervention by the Official Opposition and try to facilitate the time of the House. Obviously we are very serious about our willingness to receive relevant and pertinent amendments after the decision has been made by the House according to the rules on allocation of time. What we obviously have to do, particularly on the question of the safety net, is find the proper means by which we can negotiate that time. I am quite prepared to meet with Members of the Opposition to work out how that might be done during the two days of report stage so that the amendments they are proposing as well as those we have in mind might get their fair share of attention, which they were not allowed to have because of the filibustering during the previous 11 days of report stage.

If Members of the Opposition are as serious as they are asking us to be, we are prepared to consider their amendments, but in light of a decision, once it is taken, on the application at report stage. Therefore I suggest we proceed with the Orders of the Day and discussion of that motion.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I appreciate what the Minister has said with respect to the consideration the Government will give to these very legitimate suggestions for amendments to be placed on the Order Paper. We are asking for unanimous consent to have these matters brought forward as proposed amendments to the legislation. The Government will then have the opportunity of responding to the proposals put forward by the Hon. Member for Vegreville, the Hon. Member for Assiniboia and the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat. That is precisely the reason we now put these matters forward, not that the Government will accept them without debate, but rather that they simply be put on the Order Paper for consideration. They are new and novel propositions.

The Minister knows that he is going to bring forward suggestions with respect to safety net and other matters he thinks should be included in the legislation. Clearly this is an opportunity for him to allow these legitimate suggestions—he will understand how important they are in western Canada and across this crountry—to be put forward for consideration by the House at report stage. There is nothing offensive with respect to this proposition. In fact, it is precisely what the Minister has asked for. We are now giving formal notice in these instances of some amendments we think should be given serious consideration by the Minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I call this a clear abuse of parliamentary procedure and a waste of the time of the House. The Hon. Member who just spoke said that the amendments in question were new amendments, and the House is aware that according to our procedure, amendments that cannot be considered at the report stage are not those for which notice has been given 24 hours before starting consideration of the report stage. The Hon. Member said that he thought the Minister intended to try and obtain the unanimous consent of the House, at some point, regarding an amendment about the security net, but I would like to point out to the Hon. Member that notice was given of these amendments, they had appeared on the Order Paper and were judged to be inadmissible. There is a difference. In any event, Madam Speaker, I can inform the Chair that we intend to refuse unanimous consent for any amendment to Bill C-155 proposed at this time, and as I explained earlier—

[*English*]

If you do not want to listen to the translation I will say it in English.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): It is offensive in either language.

Mr. Pinard: I said earlier we are willing to negotiate in good faith outside this House, but certainly not to co-operate with the Opposition in filibustering our own Bill.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That is your story. You think any debate on this is a filibuster.

Mr. Pinard: We are saying we should move the motion to limit debate today. We will have until Tuesday evening to negotiate. We will make proposals to the Opposition and we will be willing to listen to their proposals. But today it is out of order. We are wasting time and we are not willing to give unanimous consent to any amendment to Bill C-155 at this time. We are willing to negotiate in good faith before we come to a final vote on report stage of the Bill. That is very clear.

I submit as an additional point that they are not allowed to refer to the substance of a Bill under discussion in the House. That is what they are doing by seeking unanimous consent to deal with the substance of the Bill.

For all those reasons, Madam Speaker, we ask you to stop this obvious filibuster and waste of time. We want to proceed with our motion and I give notice to the Opposition that we are willing to negotiate in good faith all the time about Bill C-155 until it is voted on.

Mr. Mazankowski: Madam Speaker, I sense a bit of a conflict between the two Ministers. One suggests they are prepared to negotiate in good faith—

Mr. Axworthy: After the vote.

Mr. Mazankowski: —and the Minister of Transport says he is serious. I ask you, Madam Speaker, how can either one of those hon. gentlemen be serious in advancing any realistic negotiations under the threat of closure? If the Minister of Transport is genuine and serious about his attempt to reach some satisfactory solutions, and he says "I am", then he should recommend to the Government House Leader withdrawal of the threat of closure.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Then and only then can there be genuine and realistic negotiations.

Mr. Axworthy: Good try, Don.

Mr. Mazankowski: The Minister of Transport, in committee and in the House, has talked about his willingness to co-operate and to accommodate new ideas. The Government House Leader has now suggested they will rule every proposal out of order before they have even heard it. We have some very unique propositions and we have responded to the invitation of the Minister of Transport. We are presenting them now because the Government, being so paranoid about its legislation being examined and debated in a vigorous way, wants to move closure and put the slammer on. It is not really interested in the real proposals we have.

I say in all sincerity, Madam Speaker, unlike the other Opposition Party, that we have tried to seek realistic and workable solutions. That has been our approach from day one. We have done it in committee.

Mr. Deans: That is the sound of one hand clapping.

Mr. Mazankowski: We have done it on second reading. I remind you, Madam Speaker, that this Government, attempted to move closure on second reading after two days. It imposed an artificial time frame during the course of the committee hearings. A 70-clause Bill resulted in 85 amendments, plus about 20 or so subamendments. The Bill is still not complete but the Government is taking the position that we are not even going to have an opportunity to debate the amendments it is proposing. I have never seen anything so ridiculous in my life.

We want to present our alternatives and debate them. If the Government is serious about negotiating, lift the veil of closure and we can get down to some serious discussions.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, this Bill has been debated for months. At committee stage we accepted over 80 or so amendments. We have been debating report stage for the last 11 sitting days and over 170 speakers have participated in that unusually long debate. Last Friday we were willing to negotiate the amendments suggested by the Hon. Member but his Party saw fit to waste a day by forcing the House to debate a subject matter other than Bill C-155 which the Government intended to call. That is publicly known. They tried again to waste the time of the House on Monday, but failed. They succeeded yesterday in letting the bells ring for over an hour and a half, time during which we would have negotiated in good faith.

I can understand the Hon. Member being a bit obfuscated by the fact that we are attempting to limit debate at this time, but it is our duty to do so after having agreed to such a long time for debate on Bill C-155. I can understand that he does not like the idea. He says that he saw nothing more ridiculous in the past, but he will agree it is very ridiculous for him to show so much indignation in light of the fact that his own Party, he being part of the whole scheme, prevented debate from going on last Friday and for an hour and a half or so yesterday. So if he is in good faith as he says, he will allow the Government to proceed under the Standing Orders, and he will negotiate.

● (1530)

Certainly he is dead wrong when he says that the Government has not been reasonable in that debate. That debate has lasted for months. He had ample opportunity to propose his amendments. We have accepted some 80 of them.

While we are still prepared to negotiate, we are certainly not stupid. We will move on that Bill and get it through. In the meantime, until we vote we will negotiate if the Hon. Member wants that. But he should not complain about our attempting to limit debate at this point, because he and his Party are the ones who have prevented debate from occurring during the last days on Bill C-155.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I would like to address my proposal to the Government House Leader because I want to facilitate the debate and do what I can to improve the Bill, as suggested by the Minister of Transport. Once they hear the proposal which I put forward, I ask Government Members to allow the following motion to be put to the House.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I see that the Hon. Member is again asking for unanimous consent on another amendment. I believe that he must have heard the Hon. President of the Privy Council tell the House that his Party would not give unanimous consent to any amendment at this particular time. What they would do at other times is their business, but it was quite clear to the Chair, as it should be to Hon. Members, that they will not get unanimous consent for the inclusion of these amendments at this time.

I am afraid that what I saw as an unusual procedure is becoming apparent. It seemed to me a bit awkward that the time allocated for questions on House business was being used to introduce modifications to a Bill, which modifications, if introduced, would not be easy to make at this particular stage. Now it is quite clear to the Chair that this is what is being sought.

Of course, amendments can be proposed, but Members must follow the usual procedure, unless the House gives its unanimous consent. As I see it, it is not prepared to give its unanimous consent. As well, they require notice following a procedure which is well known to all Members in the House. It is obvious to everyone, even to anyone watching us on television, that we are debating and not at all dealing with questions on House business. Members have entered into the debate and are suggesting alternatives which, legitimate though they may be, should be suggested at another time. The time of the House might be used for this if the House consents, but not at this particular time.

Another reason that it is difficult for me to allow these kinds of proposals to take place at this time is that Members are obviously anticipating the Orders of the Day and are not really asking questions about the business of the House.

Therefore, for all these reasons and since it is obvious to the Chair and everyone else that no unanimous consent will be given, and because this is not the proper time—

Mr. Nielsen: I would like to be heard, Madam Speaker. I would like to be heard before the Chair makes any firm ruling.

Madam Speaker: I will hear the Hon. Member because I have no interest whatsoever in not allowing the House to come to some kind of agreement if it can. If I can stretch the rules at some point when everyone agrees that perhaps we should have more discussion, I will do so. But I am warning Hon. Member that they are using a procedure that is not to be used at this time. That is not a ruling but a comment on what is usual under this particular item of business.

An Hon. Member: They are the rules of the House.

Madam Speaker: They are the rules of the House as well. However, perhaps Hon. Members could seek another time to propose these matters, which are very promising if I understand what Hon. Members are saying. Some of the amendments which I have declared out of order are being resuscitated, but if they can be worded in such a way as to make them admissible, and if Hon. Members on both sides of the House want those amendments, I see no reason why they should not have them.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, in a preliminary way I suppose, you have made observations from the Chair with respect to the rule against anticipation which I submit has no application in the process that is going on here, notwithstanding the usually brilliant arguments of the President of the Privy Council. I submit to you that he was wrong on that.

We are not proposing amendments. The Members who have risen so far and the Member who was on his feet—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: I see the Speaker smiling again. She obviously believes that I am not serious in making that statement. Well, Madam Speaker, we are not proposing amendments. The process that is before us is the seeking of unanimous consent to amendments so that they might be placed on the Order Paper for discussion. Failing that unanimous consent they will not be placed on the Order Paper for discussion, contrary to what they are saying on the Government side. The place in our proceedings for discussing House business is the proper and appropriate place for this process.

I have several citations, including some of your own, which I would like to cite in support of that proposition. It is a well established fact that the House is master of its own rules. The Standing Orders outline the ordinary methods or rules of procedure, but they in no way restrain the House from deciding by way of unanimous consent to alter the manner in which it will proceed with respect to a given matter that is to be considered by the House.

You might give great weight to the statement of the Government House Leader that they intend to refuse consent to anything proposed by this side of the House. We are used to that kind of arrogance coming from the Government side. However, let us stretch the imagination, and not the rules, by asking if the Government House Leader would take that position if one of our Members stood up and moved that we adopt passage of all remaining stages in the next hour? I suggest to you that he would not. I suggest to you that the Government would consent to that rapidly enough.

Therefore, I believe that a global approach to consent is wrong. During my time in this place we have always approached items seriatim. These Members who are rising to seek consent of the Chair must be dealt with seriatim, and consent must be asked and either granted or denied on each occasion. For who is to predetermine whether some Member will rise to make a proposal that will find acceptance on the Government side?

My understanding of the authority of the House to proceed as it choosed is contained in Citation 13 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition where the following words may be found at page 6 under the heading "Unanimous Consent". Citation 13 reads:

> 13. (1) Within the ambit of its own rules, The House itself may proceed as it chooses; it is a common practice for the House to ignore its own rules by unanimous consent. Thus, bills may be passed through all their stages in one day, or the House may decide to alter its normal order of business or its adjournment hour as it sees fit.
>
> (2) The House is perfectly able to give consent to set aside its Standing Orders and to give its unanimous consent to waive procedural requirements and precedents concerning notice and things of that sort.

● (1540)

As authority, the *Debates* for June 28, 1977, at page 7154, are cited.

If, as practice and Beauchesne indicate, it is within the authority of the House to waive its rules through unanimous consent, it follows that Members have the right to seek unanimous consent to waive procedural requirements and precedents. The only means by which a Member can seek unanimous consent is to ask, through the Chair, for the consent of the House to waive the ordinary rules.

I submit that the Chair is bound to seek unanimous consent when that consent is sought by any Hon. Member. Citation 411 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition describes the process of debate. Citation 411(1) reads as follows:

> Every matter is determined in the House of Commons upon a question put by the Speaker, on a proposition submitted by a Member, and resolved either in the affirmative or negative as the case may be. This proposition, called a motion, is a proposal moved by one Member, in accordance with certain well-established rules, that the House do something or order something to be done or express an opinion with regard to some matter.

As Citation 411(1) clearly states, every matter is determined in the House of Commons upon a question put by the Speaker on a proposition submitted by a Member. Citation 412 considers the definition of a question. It states at page 150:

> The question is the subject matter of the motion, and on the merits of that subject matter the House has to give a decision either unanimously or by the majority of the members present. Every question when agreed to assumes the form either of an order or a resolution of the House. By its orders the House

directs its committees, its members, its officers, the order of its own proceedings and the acts of all persons they concern; by its resolutions the House declares its own opinions and purposes.

(2) When a motion is adopted, it becomes the resolution or order of the House. Therefore, its form must consequently be so framed, and its language so expressed that, if it meets the approbation of the House, it may at once become the resolution or order of the House which it purports to be.

On the basis of the citations to which I have referred, Madam Speaker, it would seem that the House may, by unanimous consent, set aside its usual rules and practices and that within that authority the House may consider motions that could not otherwise be moved. Because unanimous consent may be granted to set aside rules that would otherwise block a motion from being moved, the seeking of unanimous consent from being moved, the seeking of unanimous consent cannot be said to be out of order, in my submission.

As well, the seeking of unanimous consent to move a motion is a separate proposition submitted by a Member to the Speaker who must, according to the ordinary practices of the House, put the question, that is: Is there or is there not unanimous consent? The question, in this case, requires the unanimous decision of the House and should meet the other requirements set forth in Citation 412, such that if it is agreed to it may at once become the resolution of the House that it purports to be.

In this case, the question, the seeking of unanimous consent, if agreed to becomes a resolution of the House to permit the Member to move his or her motion. Thus, the motion is completely regular within the terms of Citation 412.

The next issue that has to be considered, Madam Speaker, is whether or not the House business question is the appropriate occasion for Members to rise on points of order to seek unanimous consent to move motions dealing with business that is now, or will soon be, before the House. I can think of no more appropriate time to seek the consent of the House to move a motion that would facilitate the business of the House than during the House business question. Indeed, this is a practice often followed by the House Leaders for all Parties in the House. Citation 158 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition refers to the House business question in the following manner in paragraph 4, found at page 50:

(4) As a matter of practice, since 1968, each Thursday following the Question Period, the Government House Leader states, in reply to a question put by the House Leader of the Official Opposition, the projected business of the House for the forthcoming week.

The practice with respect to the House business question has evolved somewhat further since the Fifth Edition of Beauchesne's was published. It is now quite common for Members to seek unanimous consent for motions during the business question, while still retaining the understanding that matters should not be debated in the course of the question. In fact, this practice is evident in a ruling that you made in the course of a House business question, as reported at page 21845 of *Hansard* for December 22, 1982, found under the heading Business of the House. There was quite a discussion that day. At page 21845 you are recorded as having said:

Order, please. I am just asking Hon. Members to please not debate the Bill now. It has not been put to the House. I can allow a few questions back and forth on what the order of business might be in the House, but I cannot allow Hon. Members to debate this matter.

It is becoming obvious to me that there is no unanimous consent as to the manner in which this Bill could be passed through the House today. Unless some other Members have something specific to say on the manner in which we could proceed to put the Bill through the House today and try to seek unanimous consent on a particular proposal, I will not allow any debating of the question.

Further on, at page 21846, you are reported as having said:

Order, please. Members at this point are obviously debating. It is clear to the Chair that there is no unanimous consent over the manner in which this Bill can be put through the House.

Clearly, Madam Speaker, while you felt that it would not be permissible to debate the matter of the passage of a Bill that was before the House that day, you indicated that it would be permissible to bring forward various proposals to expedite the passage of the Bill and that it was in order to seek unanimous consent to deal with those matters.

The situation that faces the House today is identical to that which faced the House on December 22 of last year. Members on this side of the House are attempting to find a means of facilitating debate on a Bill that will be before the House this afternoon and are rising to seek an indication of the Government's intent and to seek the unanimous consent of the House to be allowed to put their motions, which certainly cannot be the subject of any valued judgment of any Member until they are heard. If this was in order on December 22, 1982, then, I submit, Madam Speaker, that it should be in order today.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I would like to return to my contention that you are obliged to put the question to the House when Hon. Members rise to seek unanimous consent.

I have a further reference from *Hansard* that I think will firmly establish the existence of this obligation. I take delight in citing as authority for my arguments the well-reasoned and sound judgments of the Chair which have been rendered from time to time, and this is the finest I have seen in your tenure in the chair. It is to be found at page 27997 of *Hansard*. It arose again under Business of the House, Weekly Statement. There was a fairly long discussion involving myself, the Government House Leader, the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton, the Hon. Member for St. John's East and a few others. You had this to say at the page quoted:

● (1550)

At any rate, perhaps that is a good suggestion. I leave it to Hon. Members, but I do have an obligation to ask the House if it will give its unanimous consent to move acceptance of the seven reports on parliamentary reform.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, on the basis of those most excellent authorities I submit that any Hon. Member can rise in his or her place and ask you to seek unanimous consent of the House on the specific proposal on which the Member rising seeks to obtain unanimous consent. There is no other decision you can come to, Madam Speaker, and I would respectfully submit that you allow the process to conclude in its normal, healthy fashion.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, a fascinating process indeed; so much for the tyranny of the minority. However, let me say two things about this. First of all, I think the arguments of the Opposition House Leader are sound. More important, on behalf of my colleagues, we would be prepared to consider the matters the Members have put on the floor, at least to this point, and for which they are seeking unanimous consent. However, in order that we do not take up all day on it, which of course is my normal, reasonable approach to everything, I would like to suggest that if the Government would agree not to proceed at this point in time with its motion for closure or time allocation, as it chooses to call it—

Mr. Nielsen: We want our ideas to be heard.

Mr. Deans: The Hon. Member for Yukon says that he wants his ideas to be heard.

Mr. Nielsen: I said, "Our ideas".

Mr. Deans: I am sorry, he wants "our ideas" to be heard.

An Hon. Member: Their ideas.

Mr. Deans: What he is saying is that in fact he wants to get the views of his Members on the record. If the Government would like to adjourn for the rest of the day, I would be prepared, on behalf of my learned colleagues, to agree to have our Members sit down with whoever is appropriate on the Government side—perhaps the Minister of Transport, if he knows anything about the Bill—and the appropriate Members from the Conservative Party, to look at the various amendments, attempt to achieve a consensus and come back on another day to discuss how the matter could then be proceeded with.

It would seem to me, looking at the question before us, that the Hon. Member for Yukon is correct that a Member ought to be able to seek unanimous consent for a motion. It would also seem to me that there are other important matters of which we could be determining the outcome this afternoon, tomorrow or next week, such questions as unemployment and how the Government proposes to deal with it. If the Government House Leader or his surrogate would be prepared to agree either to call another order in order that meetings could be held or to adjourn until six o'clock, coming back tomorrow to go on with tomorrow's normal business, we could sit and discuss this matter and in fact come to some satisfactory, rational and sensible conclusion.

Mr. Evans: Tomorrow is an Opposition day.

Madam Speaker: In reply to those interventions, I want to remind the House of a few things. I do not think I ever said that unanimous consent was not allowed at this time. I just said that Hon. Members had heard the President of the Privy Council say that he would not give unanimous consent to any of the requests to waive notice for certain of their amendments. I never said that to seek unanimous consent was out of order. Of course it is not out of order. The Chair is always in the hands of the House if, by unanimous consent, it wants to set aside certain rules. Of course the Chair will do that.

I am afraid the Hon. Member for Yukon in his usual way of arguing was quoting me at times like these, when the House is a bit nervous and is trying to reach some kind of agreement and when the Chair is lenient with the rules. These periods should not be invoked as precedents. When the Chair decides to go along with the mood of the House and to allow the House to discuss a certain number of things, even if some of the rules are being stretched a bit, that is normal procedure and practice in our House. What the Chair has to do once an occurrence like that has taken place is quickly to return the House to the very strict observance of the rules. I think the House has generally accepted that. It is the duty of the Chair once that period is over to remind the House that the rules are there and that they will be adhered to as strictly as possible.

In the course of his argumentation, I think the Hon. Member for Yukon has persuaded me of one thing. I had told the House that obviously the Hon. President of the Privy Council would not give his consent to any of the requests that were being made by the Opposition. The Hon. Member for Yukon suggested that the Chair should ask for consent seriatim on all the suggestions that were made by the House. I think I am convinced that unanimous consent or refusal of unanimous consent cannot be a sweeping thing because obviously there might be one or two that could be agreed to—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: —and, therefore, it is the duty of the Chair to put every possible proposal before the House so that the House can agree to it or refuse it according to its own will.

This being said, I will allow Hon. Members to seek consent for the different proposals they have to make to the House.

Mr. Axworthy: Madam Speaker, taking into account the ruling you have just made based upon the rules and precedents of the House, I think it is important, if we are to take at face value the protestations of the House Leader and of other Members of the Official Opposition that their entire purpose is simply to facilitate the operation of the House, to suggest that they are going about it the wrong way. What I have said quite clearly is that if they are serious in trying to present amendments over and above the some 70 or 80 amendments that are already on the Order Paper, I would be quite prepared, once we have decided on the time allocation, in the next two days to sit with them and work out those amendments which would be appropriate.

Mr. Mazankowski: You are not serious.

Mr. Axworthy: The Hon. Member for Vegreville is becoming a little agitated again.

Mr. Mazankowski: Because you are not serious.

Mr. Axworthy: I am perfectly serious, and we have proven it because we have already accepted amendments from the Opposition. It is the Hon. Members opposite whose sincerity

must be questioned. All we see happening is their intent to delay further the Bill, which means that for every further hour's delay, we lose a hopper car in Trenton or a new construction job in British Columbia. If that is their intention and purpose, then it should be clearly stated.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Axworthy: If Opposition Members want to facilitate debate, when report stage is reached after time allocation, we can consider the amendments. However, all we have here is a clear, unequivocal, blatant case of delay of important economic development and job creation initiatives, and the people of Canada should know it.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I do not propose, as did the Minister of Transport, to challenge your ruling. I propose to follow it and to propose an amendment with respect to this particular legislation, Bill C-155. Before doing so, Madam Speaker, may I remind you that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Assiniboia, made a proposal with respect to the so-called safety-net provision of the legislation now before us. It was responded to by the Minister of Transport who said he was very receptive to that particular proposal. In fact, it is identical to the proposal that the Minister will make, except for the percentage. I do not think you ever did ask if there was unanimous consent on whether that particular matter was going to be allowed by the House. If I am correct, Madam Speaker, you may want to put that matter before the House with respect to my colleague for Assiniboia, and I will then proceed with my brief intervention.

● (1600)

Madam Speaker: My recollection is that I did ask for unanimous consent in the case of the Hon. Member for Assiniboia. I did not in the case of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West because I interrupted him before he was finished. Does the House have any recollection? My feeling is that I did. At any rate, does the House give its unanimous consent to the proposal made by the Hon. Member for Assiniboia?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I make this proposal to facilitate the debate on this legislation and in order to improve the Bill. In view of the fact that the Government is intending to invoke closure on the legislation, I want to have this brought forward as a reasonable Bill which, I am sure, will receive the unanimous consent of the House. I therefore propose:

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after Line 43 at Page 16 the following:

"ACCOMMODATION FOR GRAIN TRAFFIC

34.(1) The railway companies shall,

(a) furnish, at the place of starting, and at the junction of the railway with other railways, and at all stopping places established for such purpose, adequate and suitable accommodation for the receiving and loading of grain offered for carriage upon the railway;

(b) furnish adequate and suitable accommodation for the carrying, unloading and delivering of grain;

(c) without delay, and with due care and diligence, receive, carry and deliver all such grain;

(d) furnish and use all proper appliances, accommodation and means necessary for receiving, loading, carrying, unloading and delivering such grain; and

(e) furnish such other service incidental to transportation as is customary or usual in connection with the business of a railway company, as may be ordered by the Commission.

(2) Such adequate and suitable accommodation shall include reasonable facilities for the junction of private sidings or private branch railways with any railway belonging to or worked by the company, and reasonable facilities for receiving, forwarding and delivering grain upon and from those sidings or private branch railways, together with the placing of cars and moving them upon and from such private sidings and private branch railways.

(3) If in any case such accommodation is not, in the opinion of the Commission, furnished by the company, the Commission may order the company to furnish the same within such time or during such period as the Commission deems expedient, having regard to all proper interests; or may prohibit or limit the use, either generally or upon any specified railway or part thereof, of any engines, locomotives, cars, rolling stock, apparatus, machinery, or devices, or any class or kind thereof, not equipped as required by this Act, or by any orders or regulations of the Commission made within its jurisdiction under the provisions of this Act.

(4) Such grain shall be taken, carried to and from, and delivered at the places aforesaid on the due payment of the toll lawfully imposed by this Act.

(5) For the purposes of this section the Commission may order that specific works be constructed or carried out, or that property be acquired, or that cars, motive power or other equipment be allotted, distributed, used or moved as specified by the Commission, or that any specified steps, systems or methods be taken or followed by any particular company or companies, or by railway companies generally, and the Commission may in any such order specify the maximum charges that may be made by the company or companies in respect of any matter so ordered by the Commission.

(6) Every person aggrieved by any neglect or refusal of the company to comply with the requirements of this section has, subject to this Act, an action therefor against the company, from which action the company is not relieved by any notice, condition or declaration, if the damage arises from any negligence or omission of the company or of its servant.

(7) The Commission may make regulations, applying generally or to any particular railway or any portion thereof, or may make an order in any case where it sees fit, imposing charges for default or delay by any company in furnishing accommodation, appliances, or means as aforesaid, or in receiving, loading, carrying, unloading or delivering grain, and may enforce payment of such charges by companies to any person injuriously affected by the default or delay; and any amount so received by any person shall be deducted from the damages recoverable or recovered by such person for the default or delay; and the Commission may, by order or regulation, determine what circumstances shall exempt any company from payment of any such charges.

(8) The railway companies shall afford to the carriage of grain a level of accomodation equal to that afforded to the carriage of other traffic and failure to provide such a level shall be remedied by such orders as the Commission deems appropriate in the circumstances.

(9)(a) Where the Administrator is of the opinion that reciprocal and other arrangements between railway companies are required to facilitate the efficient, adequate and reliable movement of grain on behalf of, and in the interests of grain producers, the Administrator shall apply to the Commission for such order or orders as may be required to achieve the necessary reciprocal and other arrangements between railway companies, and the Commission may make an order granting in whole or in part the Application of the Administrator.

(b) If the special circumstances of any case so require, the Commission may exercise any of the powers given to it by Sections 59 and 71 of the National

Transportation Act and may thereby make an interim ex parte order or orders.

Mr. Tobin: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order, for clarification. The Hon. Member is reading a motion which he has not yet received unanimous consent to present to the House. Technically, it may take one or two hours to present the motion before my consent as a Member or the consent of any Member of this House is received to even read the motion. It is clearly out of order for the Member to be reading a motion to the House which this House has not yet given its consent for him to present in the House.

Madam Speaker: I fail to see how Members could give their consent or refuse their consent if they have not heard what the motion is all about. I believe what the Hon. Member is referring to is that if consent is given, then of course the Speaker will have to put the motion to the House. However, we are now just hearing the Hon. Member tell us what the motion is all about so that the House can pronounce itself on whatever he is proposing.

Mr. Flis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the Hon. Member could clarify something for the House. I know that he is an excellent reader. I have been following very closely and it seems to me that he is reading Motion No. 58, which is already on the Order Paper. Can he clarify for the House why he is re-reading an amendment which is on the Order Paper as Motion No. 58?

• (1610)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, first of all, I agree wholeheartedly with the point made by the Hon. Member who spoke before the previous speaker. As I said earlier, it is clear that we are not consenting to any request at this time for amendments to Bill C-155. Obviously this is a waste of time and a clear case of filibustering, and I may refer the Chair to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition, Citation 238, which allows the Chair to interrupt these silly games, since, and I quote:

Points of order are justified when there is some flagrant misuse of the rules, but they are unfortunate necessities which should not be regarded as usual phases of procedure and ought not to develop into long arguments with the Speaker who, being in a quasi-judicial position, should not be drawn into controversial discussions.

Furthermore, Citation 234(2) prescribes, and I quote:

(2) A Member cannot rise on a point of order to move a motion.

So when they ask for unanimous consent, they are proposing a motion. That is clear. It is common knowledge. It seems we have wasted one hour and ten minutes. The Progressive Conservatives did not want a vote today. There will be none on the time allocation motion. We are going to propose the motion to limit debate just the same, but it seems to me that for the sake of order in this House, the Chair should not allow members to abuse the authority of the House and the Standing Orders in this fashion.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member is simply asking whether the House could waive the usual notice for proposing an amendment. I am very sorry, but I fail to see how I could agree with the arguments of the Hon. Minister. I think I have no choice but to ask the House whether . . . I cannot allow the House to refuse unanimous consent outright without knowing what for. I think that goes beyond the duties of the Speaker. I think the House may dispose of the matter, but it cannot do so unless it knows what that matter is.

That is why I am allowing Hon. Members, notwithstanding all the time this is taking . . . I agree with the Hon. Minister, it is taking a lot of time, but I am not in the Chair to decide whether the business of the House should be accelerated or slowed down. I am in the Chair to apply the Standing Orders of the House. According to my best judgment, it seems to me quite legitimate at this time to allow Hon. Members to ask the House that notice of motion for their amendments be waived.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I may refer you to *Hansard* for Monday afternoon. The Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) himself maintained, and he is on record as saying so, that asking for unanimous consent is in itself a motion, which should be submitted in writing if requested, and in fact, Monday afternoon a Government Member was asked to make a written request for unanimous consent, seconded by another Member. I am referring to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport, who decided to withdraw his request. Thus, to get back to the point made by the Member for Yukon, a request for unanimous consent is a motion in itself. We are asking that it be submitted in writing today, and since it is a motion, the citation from Beauchesne to which I referred earlier forbids a Member to use a point of order to propose a motion. That was Citation 234(2).

The Clerk was in the House Monday afternoon. He can tell the Chair what happened. It is the same point that was made by my Hon. Colleague for Yukon who said: Asking for unanimous consent is a motion. If a Member demands that a request for unanimous consent be made in writing, it then becomes a motion and that is what we are doing now. We are demanding that the request for unanimous consent be made in writing, duly seconded, thereby becoming a motion and consequently inadmissible on a point of order, in accordance with Citation 234(2) of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, Fifth Edition.

Madam Speaker: I am afraid the Hon. Minister is confusing a request for proposing a motion, a request for unanimous consent for proposing a motion and a request for waiving the notice required to propose a motion. I must therefore allow the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) to proceed.

[*English*]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, in order to save time, I will not begin again. I have lost the drift of the motions. The

Hon. Member for Parkdale-High Park had a question on a point of order.

Madam Speaker: I think I will have to seek clarification from the Hon. Member. Is he asking for unanimous consent to waive the notice on a motion which is already on the Order Paper? It is not.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I will deal with that now.

Madam Speaker: Of course, if Hon. Members are reading texts that are too long, the Speaker at some point may say that it might be sufficient to seek unanimous consent for waiving the notice and that the Hon. Member shall just give the House the gist of the proposal. I trust that the Hon. Member will read as fast as he has been reading since he began his intervention.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I can assure you that if there was ever an important issue that came before the House in my political career, this is the most important one. I do not take it frivolously and I am—

Madam Speaker: There is no debate. The Hon. Member will just read the motion.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I meant what I said. The fact of the matter is that the Hon. Member for Parkdale-High Park asked whether this motion varied from the motion that is on the Order Paper. Of course, if he had been following closely, he would know that it is not the same. It changed "the company" to "railway companies". Clause 4 that I have added is a new proposition with respect to the matter of the appropriate toll that will be the Crow rate as opposed to the new rate proposed by the Government. He will understand that Clause 10, which I am about to read, is quite different. The provisions of this proposal which are designed to protect the producers of the country are much stronger than the Government's proposals, and that is what I want to include in the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I shall just carry on and read the balance of this motion, if I may, Madam Speaker. It goes on to read:

(c) Any railway company or person directly affected by an interim *ex parte* order made pursuant to paragraph 9(b) may at any time within ten days after becoming aware of such order, apply to the Commission to vary, amend or rescind such order and the Commission shall thereupon, on such notice to other parties interested as it may in its discretion think desirable, hear such application, and either amend, alter or rescind such order, or dismiss the application, as may seem to it just and right.

(d) Any interim order made pursuant to paragraph 9(b) shall apply for a period not to exceed one hundred and eighty days but any such order may, within the said period, be converted by the Commission to a permanent order.

(e) If railway companies affected by any order requiring them to provide reciprocal and other arrangements are unable to agree as to compensation each should receive or pay, the Commission may, by order, fix the amount of such compensation but in no instance shall such compensation exceed the variable costs associated with the provision of such reciprocal and other arrangements.

Mr. Flis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have been following the Hon. Member and he read subclause (c), (d) and (e) which are identical to the words of Motion No. 58 on pages LXXVIII and LXXIX of the Order Paper. I have just followed the wording of three subclauses and the Hon. Member used identical words, Madam Speaker.

I would like a ruling on this, Madam Speaker. The Hon. Member said that he had new amendments. If those amendments are new, we are prepared to hear them out and either give them unanimous consent or not. However, if they are a repeat of motions on the Order Paper, simply to change one or two words does not change the intent of the motions.

Mr. Taylor: You're wasting time.

Madam Speaker: To begin with, it is very difficult for the Chair to determine whether or not it is exactly the same text. The Hon. Member said that it was not exactly the same text. He did say that there were a few words changed, but I do believe that the change of even a few words within the clauses of a Bill can be quite important. According to the Hon. Member's own admission, it is not exactly the same text. Therefore I would ask the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West to continue.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, thank you very much. The fact is, of course—

Madam Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please read the motion.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Would you like me to begin again, Madam Speaker? No, I will not.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. All of that fuss made me lose track of the gist of what the Hon. Member was saying. May he go back and start from the beginning so that I will know what he is talking about?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: I am afraid I cannot allow that.

Mr. McKnight: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Just to satisfy your mind, Madam Speaker, and the mind of the Hon. Member for Parkdale-High Park, the motion that he is referring to on the Order Paper stands in my name. I can assure the Hon. Member that the motion that the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West is seeking consent to move is different from the motion that stands in my name. It has a different meaning, Madam Speaker, from that of the motion that stands in my name on the Order Paper.

Madam Speaker: That clears up the matter. It is not the same text. The Hon. Member will please continue to read.

● (1620)

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The motion continues as follows:

(10)(a) For the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, on behalf of any grain shipper or group of grain shippers, commence any proceedings

before the Commission or the Courts to secure any of the remedies herein provided.

(b) Where any remedy, against a railway company, other than the remedies provided herein, is available to shippers pursuant to this Act, the Railway Act, or the National Transportation Act, the Administrator is deemed to be a shipper and he may pursue such a remedy or remedies and any remedy or remedies he obtains, shall to the fullest possible degree, apply to all grain shippers."

and by renumbering the subsequent clauses accordingly.

You will understand that there is no provision which is similar, Madam Speaker. There is a motion on the Order Paper in similar but not identical terms. This is a stronger provision, a provision out of the Railway Act, which will allow the railways to provide adequate equipment to move grain across the country. While there is a similar provision in the motion on the Bill, this is much stronger in that it allows the Senior Grain Transportation Administrator to be given power to act as the shipper on behalf of producers and to go to court and pursue legal proceedings.

Accordingly, because I think this is a matter of very serious interest, I would ask you to seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for waiving of notice for the amendments proposed by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Oberle: Madam Speaker, it will be immediately apparent that the Government might have made a grave error had it not permitted, or indeed, had you not permitted, the reading of some of these motions, because the motion that I am seeking consent for—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I ask Hon. Members not to debate. They should use the simple formula, "Could the House give me unanimous consent for so and so". That is all I will allow.

Mr. Oberle: Madam Speaker, of course I respect your ruling. I will ask the House Leader of the Government, through you, whether it would not be in the interests of the Government to give unanimous consent to the following motion:

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 43 at page 16 the following:

"Agreement with railway companies other than railway companies subject to the jurisdiction of Parliament

34.(1) The Minister may, on behalf of Her Majesty, enter into agreements with railway companies in Section 2, where he finds that such railway companies carry grain from any point on their lines of railway west of Thunder Bay or Armstrong to Thunder Bay, Armstrong, Churchill or a port in British Columbia for export.

(2) Any agreement entered into by the parties pursuant to subsection (1) shall impose obligations and grant rights which are in no substantive way any different from the obligations and rights contained in this Act, and without limiting the generality of the foregoing, such agreement shall

(a) not result in any enlargement of the Crow Benefit as defined in Section 34(1);

(b) impose on the railway company a requirement that it be subject to the same obligations which are imposed by this Act on railway companies as defined in Section 2;

(c) be subject to revision whenever any review of costing or other issues is performed pursuant to any provision of this Act; and,

(d) be subject to any regulations made pursuant to Section 69."

and by renumbering the subsequent clauses accordingly.

Naturally, Madam Speaker, I would also ask consent that any subsequent clauses be accordingly renumbered. I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House for this motion since Bill C-155 explicitly deletes one of our major railways in the country. Naturally—

Madam Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member is beyond reading his amendment. Has he finished reading his amendment to the House?

Mr. Oberle: The amendment is read, Madam Speaker, and I ask that you put the motion.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. McKnight: Madam Speaker, I rise on House business to ask the consent of the Acting Government House Leader, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, if the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 3 at page 1 the following:

"1. It is hereby declared that an economic, efficient and reliable grain transportation system making the best use of all available modes of transportation at the lowest total cost is essential to protect the interests of the grain producers and to maintain the economic well-being and growth of western Canada, and that these objectives are most likely to be achieved under conditions ensuring that

(*a*) grain producers retain the benefit of a statutory freight rate and are protected from freight rate increases disproportionate to international grain prices;

(*b*) the railway companies and the Government of Canada accept a continuing obligation to provide—

Mr. Flis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am following Motion No. 1 and so far the words are identical. Would the Hon. Member please indicate to the House how his new amendment differs from Motion No. 1 on the Order Paper?

Mr. McKnight: Madam Speaker, I do not want to embarrass the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport

but if he had been following the debate on this Bill he would have realized that the motion I am reading was ruled out of order by the Chair. I am now asking the unanimous consent of the House to put this motion forward, as is the right of any Member on any side, and the Government will be rising to do the same thing. With that, Madam Speaker, I should like to continue.

Mr. Flis: Madam Speaker, I seek your ruling. If you, together with all your Table officers, made a ruling that Motion No. 1 was out of order, and the Hon. Member now, via the back door, wants to introduce it again, he is really challenging your ruling.

Madam Speaker: I am afraid that I cannot allow the Hon. Member to continue reading his motion since that is one I had declared out of order. If the Hon. Member wants to resuscitate that motion, he can do it at another time when the item is called before the House. He cannot do it at this point because we are asking now to waive notice, so the Hon. Member would have to correct the beginning of his intervention. We are not asking the House to give unanimous consent to a motion. Since that motion was declared out of order I am afraid I cannot continue to hear the Hon. Member.

Mr. McKnight: Madam Speaker, as a point of clarification, can you tell me, would that mean that in asking for consent to waive the notice, the motion would have to be put forward at another time? If, in reading this motion, it is found to be different, as it is, to try and assure us that the Government and the Speaker would find it in order, then in my opinion it would be in order to continue to read it, only not in the way that I would be asking the waiving of consent. We would do that at another time if unanimous consent is not allowed for the presentation of this motion.

The point is, Madam Speaker, that until I come to the part in the statement of purpose of this motion that is different from the main part that was ruled out of order, I do not know whether you can say if it was out of order or if Members of the Government would be able to say it was acceptable to them.

Madam Speaker: That motion was ruled out of order, therefore the Hon. Member cannot resuscitate it at this time. If the Hon. Member wants to resuscitate his motion with some changes, first of all the Chair would have to find it admissible, then the Hon. Member could ask anything he wants by unanimous consent. However, in this particular case, I am afraid I cannot continue to hear the Hon. Member.

● (1630)

Mr. McKnight: Madam Speaker, the point I am making is that the basis of this was ruled out or order. The last paragraph has been changed from that which was ruled on by the Table. If the Parliamentary Secretary would like me to read the last paragraph, as he is looking at the original, then I could do so and both he and you would know, and so would all Hon. Members of the House, that there has been a change in the intention of this motion.

Madam Speaker: If we are going to go through all the amendments which I declared out of order, it is going to take some time. If the Hon. Member is telling me now that he is asking to waive notice for a new amendment—

Mr. McKnight: This is new.

Madam Speaker: It is new? The first paragraphs which were read indicate to the Chair that it is the one which I had declared out of order. If I must hear it until the end in order to realize it is a new motion, I suppose I must hear it. However, you understand that I was reluctant to allow Hon. Members to bring back amendments which I had declared out of order. If it is a new one, of course, I have to hear the Hon. Member.

Mr. McKnight: Madam Speaker, I will read you the last part of the amendment so you are assured, as well as Hon. Members of the House. Paragraph (h) reads:

All these being a statement of purpose proposed by the Progressive Conservative Party and has been consistent with the five principles put forth in the initial debating of Bill C-155.

That is the difference, Madam Speaker. Therefore, I contend it is a new motion.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to waiving the notice on this particular motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Cooper: Madam Speaker, I have one motion to which I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader will be quite happy to give unanimous consent. I am sure he will understand the importance of it. It is:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 17 by immediately adding after line 25 at page 8 the following:

"17.(5) The Administrator shall examine the feasibility of the utilization of off line elevators on grain-dependent branch lines designated as abandoned by the Commission, or where no grain-designated branch line exists, where, in his opinion, such utilization of off line elevators would be in the best interests of producers."

I am sure the Parliamentary Secretary can see the importance of this motion to one of the unique regions of this country, namely, the Peace country.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Schellenberger: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to put a new amendment before this House, as follows:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 17 by adding immediately after line 25 the following:

"(5) The Administrator shall, in consultation with the Senior Grain Transportation Committee representatives, allow representatives of the livestock producers, feed grain users, the Minister and anyone else the Administrator deems appropriate, develop for implementation a program to utilize an agricultural adjustment fund to reduce the economic distortions existing within the western agricultural sector, with particular reference to the livestock industry."

I ask for unanimous consent to put this very important amendment to the House as the Minister said that that money is in the envelope and should be used.

Madam Speaker: I am afraid I have to correct the Hon. Member. He is asking, of course, for unanimous consent to waive notice.

Mr. Schellenberger: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, I also wish to rise on House business. I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Clause 62 of Bill C-155—

Madam Speaker: Could I correct the Hon. Member? Hon. Members are not asking for unanimous consent to put a motion to the House but, rather, to waive notice. That has to be very clear because we are not putting motions to the House nor asking unanimous consent for that.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I would like unanimous consent to waive the notice, Madam Speaker. The amendment I have is:

That Clause 62 of Bill C-155 be amended by deleting lines 19 to 23—

And I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport will not find this particular wording in the Order Paper.

—at page 35, and substituting the following therefor: "thereto, the Government of Canada shall, so as to be in conformity with the terms of Section 92A(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982, return to the Government of British Columbia all lands and any mineral, coal or other rights on those lands it acquired pursuant to paragraph 1(i) of the Crow's Nest Pass Act, and the Government of British Columbia may hold, dispose of, or otherwise deal with such lands in any manner and on any conditions it thinks fit."

An explanation of that particular—

Some Hon. Members: No!

Madam Speaker: There is no explanation allowed. If the Hon. Member has finished reading the amendment, I will ask the House, is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Towers: Madam Speaker, by your ruling today you certainly have made a lot of friends in western Canada, allowing a prairie boy to be heard. I would like to—

Madam Speaker: I must, I would think, ask the Hon. Member not to refer to any decision of the Speaker in those terms. The Speaker does not seek to have friends. As a matter of fact, I think the Speaker does not have very many friends.

Mr. Towers: Madam Speaker, I would ask the Government House Leader, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, if the Government would be prepared to waive notice and grant unanimous consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 42 by immediately adding after line 20 at page 24 the following:

"(a) The Commission may, on its own motion or on receiving information by complaint or otherwise conduct an investigation with respect to any condition of carriage contained in the tariff.

(b) Should the Commission find, as a result of such investigation that the condition of carriage is not in conformity with the provisions of this Act or the purposes and objectives thereof, it may disallow such condition of carriage or order that it be amended so as to comply with the provisions of this Act or the purposes and objectives thereof."

I ask, Madam Speaker, that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration of the report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain, and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Huntington: Madam Speaker, on House business I would like to ask the Government House Leader if, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to waive notice and consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 58 by striking out Lines 40 to 42 at page 33 and substituting the following therefor:

"(1) Notwithstanding Section 55, the Governor in Council may, subject to subsection (2), make regulations prescribing"

"(a) the manner in which and the parties to whom payment of the government contribution under this Part shall be made;"

I ask, Madam Speaker, that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain, and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

● (1640)

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to waive notice and consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House. This motion may well save the cattle industry, the hog industry and the processing industry of western Canada. The motion is as follows:

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 6 at page 35 the following:

"60(1) Following the completion of any review or study carried out under section 59, the Minister, within 120 days, shall prepare a detailed and comprehensive response to such review or study, including the Minister's acceptance or rejection of each conclusion and recommendation contained in any review or study and the reasons therefore.

60(2) The Minister shall cause a copy of his response referred to in subsection (1) to be laid before Parliament on any of the first fifteen days that either House of Parliament sits after the preparation of that response and such response shall stand permanently referred to any Committee of Parliament established for the purpose of reviewing matters relating to transportation."

Madam Speaker: Order. Has the Hon. Member finished reading the amendment?

Mr. Taylor: In any event, Madam Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House to waive notice that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain, and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to waive notice of this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Nystrom: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the unanimous consent of the House to waive notice of a motion to amend Bill C-155. The motion is very important and it reads as follows:

[*Translation*]

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 14 to 18 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

Grain means Alfalfa meal, pellets or cubes; dehydrated, Barley. Buckwheat. Canary seeds. Corn. Faba beans. Field beans. Field peas. Flaxseed. Forage seeds. Lentils. Mustard seed. Oats. Pulse. Rapeseed or Canola—

[*English*]

—Rye. Seed grain in sacks. Sunflower seeds. Wheat. Barley, crushed. Barley, pearl. Barley, pot. Barley sprouts. Bran.

[*Translation*]

—and also, Madam Speaker—

—Breakfast Foods or Cereals (uncooked) in bags, barrels or cases. Manufactured from commodities only as listed in this Schedule.

[*English*]

—Corn, cracked. Feed, animal and/or poultry (not medicated or condimental), containing not more than thirty-five per cent (35 per cent) of ingredients other than commodities as specified in this Schedule, in bags or barrels or in bulk. Flour, made from grain or malt only in bags or barrels or bulk flour, pea. Grain, feed, in sacks. Hulls, oat. Malt (made from grain only). Meal, barley. Meal, corn. Meal, linseed. Meal, oat. Meal, pea. Meal, rye. Meal, wheat.

[*Translation*]

—Meal, Oil Cake, Linseed. Meal, Oil Cake, Rapeseed or Canola. Meal, Oil Cake, Sunflower Seed—

[*English*]

—Middlings. Oats, crushed. Oats, rolled. Oil, linseed. Oil, rapeseed or canola. Oil, sunflower. Oil cake, linseed. Oil cake, rapeseed or canola. Oil cake, sunflower seed. Screenings (applicable only on screenings from grains specified herein). Wheat germ. Wheat, rolled.

Many of these things are what the Government wants as well, and I would like to ask unanimous consent to waive notice.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Madam Speaker: Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling)—Trust companies (a) Refusal to rewrite mortgages at lower rates. (b) Protection requested for home owners; the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm)—Air Canada—Gimli accident (a) Request for public inquiry into safety procedures. (b) Disciplining of employees—Request for postponement; the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie)—Medical care (a) Development of preventive health care systems. (b) Health care funding.

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Mayer: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Government House Leader, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, if the Government would be prepared to waive notice and consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 70 by striking out deleting Lines 27 to 37 at Page 37 and Lines 1 to 14 at Page 38 and substituting the following therefor:

"70(1) For the purpose of applying this Act in respect of the period beginning on January 1, 1984 and ending on July 31, 1986, notwithstanding anything in this Act,

(a) the rate a railway company may charge to a shipper for the movement of grain shall not exceed the rate scale provided in Schedule II;

(b) the contribution to constant costs referred to in the definition "estimated eligible costs" in section 34(1) shall be zero percent of the volume related variable costs; and

(c) the Commission within thirty days after the coming into force of this Act, shall designate and in the manner it determines publish a list of the railway branch lines or segments thereof in the Western Division that shall be deemed to be grain-dependent branch lines for the 1983-84 crop year."

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. King: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to waive notice and consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 55 by adding immediately after Line 29 at Page 32 the following:

"(5) The Commission shall undertake to develop a costing system, for possible application after the 1985-1986 crop year, which will allow the railway companies a contribution to constant costs for the movement of grain based on and reflective of new railway investment required to accommodate the movement of grain."

This amendment would leave with the CTC the responsibility to approve the principle of contribution to constant costs based on an assessment of the performance of the railways in fulfilling their obligation to producers in the movement of grain over the period 1984 to 1986. It would further permit the railways sufficient—

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member is giving explanations, I believe.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: He is still reading the amendment?

Mr. King: It is an explanation.

Madam Speaker: It is an explanation, I was right. I am listening. The Hon. Member has finished reading his amendment?

● (1650)

Mr. King: I am finished with the amendment. I thought the House would benefit from the explanation.

Madam Speaker: I am sure they were great words of wisdom, but I am afraid that I cannot allow the Hon. Member to continue. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Hawkes: Madam Speaker, I also rise on a point of order concerning House business. I would ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to waive the usual notice and allow the following motion to be put to the House.

[*Translation*]

(*a*) by striking out line 14 at page 34 and substituting the following therefor:

[*English*]

"59. (1) The Minister shall, during the 1985—

(b) by adding immediately after line 6 at page 35 the following:

(2) The Minister shall cause a copy of the results of any review or study carried out under this section to be laid before Parliament on any of the first twenty days that either House of Parliament sits after the completion of such review or study and such copy shall stand permanently referred to any committee of Parliament established for the purpose of reviewing matters relating to transportation."

I do so, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of parliamentary democracy.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The proposal has been read. No explanation is needed. Does the House grant its unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 3 at page 1 the following:

1. It is hereby declared that an economic, efficient and reliable grain transportation system making the best use of all available modes of transportation at the lowest, reasonable total cost is essential to protect the interests of the grain producers and to maintain the economic well-being and growth of western Canada, and that these objectives are most likely to be achieved under conditions ensuring that:

(a) grain producers retain the benefit of a statutory freight rate and are protected from freight rate cost increases disproportionate to international grain prices;

(b) the railway companies and the Government of Canada accept a continuing obligation to provide producers with a special transportation rate for the movement of grain;

(c) the Government of Canada makes an annual financial contribution to the grain transportation system to ensure fair compensation for the movement of grain;

(d) the railway companies provide adequate equipment and plant capacity to move grain efficiently and reliably;

(e) the natural advantages of western agriculture are recognized and strengthened;

(f) the economic distortions within the western Canadian agricultural sector—

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Just previously it was ruled that a motion that had been ruled out of order by the Speaker cannot be raised here again today. Just changing a few words but not the intent of the motion does not change the amendment. I suggest that you rule this amendment out of order. The Hon. Member is strictly out of order. He is repeating Motion No. 1 which the Speaker ruled out of order at report stage.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The submission has been made that a change of a word or two may not make a significant difference. I bring to your attention that the expression "execute, not wait till I come" as changed by the expression "execute not, wait till I come" is different only by a comma. I submit that the Hon. Member opposite would not like to make his choice of those two.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that you are asking me to proceed. The motion goes on to read:

(f) the economic distortions within the western Canadian agricultural sector stemming from a statutory rate are reduced livestock products and processed agricultural products;

(g) grain producers receive adequate guarantees of system performance and service,

and this Act is enacted in accordance with and for the attainment of so many of these objectives as fall within the purview of subject matters under the jurisdiction of Parliament relating to grain transportation.

and by renumbering the subsequent clauses accordingly.

I am pleased that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport is also helping us in this endeavour. Therefore, I ask, in view of the support from the Parliamentary Secretary and others, that you seek unanimous consent that the matter be put before the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): There is not unanimous consent.

Miss Carney: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order on House business. I ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House. This is the notice of motion:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 47 by adding immediately after line 44 at page 26 the following:

(5)(a) Ancillary charges are charges for services performed by a railway company in addition to the line-haul movement of grain.

(b) The Commission may, by order, prescribe the level of ancillary charges but in no case shall that amount exceed the level that in the opinion of the Commission is necessary to meet the variable cost of an ancillary service.

In any event, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House for the motion as read to be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Would the Hon. Member explain how the amendment she read differs from Motion No. 49 on the Order Paper?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Does the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre wish to respond?

Miss Carney: I will read the motion referred to.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am not sure which motion the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary is looking at. Motion No. 94 stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West. It reads as follows:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 25 by striking out lines 10 to 17 at page 13 and substituting the following therefor:

debated and on the conclusion of the debate the Speaker shall forthwith put every question necessary for the disposition of the motion

Mr. Flis: I asked for the difference between the amendment read and Motion No. 94.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The House heard the proposal put by the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre. Does it grant its unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Yurko: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order because, as a Member of the House, I am quite confused at this particular moment. I will ask you to clarify the rules of the House for me.

It seems to me that we have reintroduced a form of Standing Order 43 in our rules today. We have reintroduced a selective and extended form of Standing Order 43 in a substantive way.

I want a ruling from the Chair before tomorrow as to whether or not I, as an independent Member of the House, can use exactly the same procedure being used here today to request unanimous consent to certain motions that I would like to put to the House as I used to move under Standing Order 43. I suggest to you very strongly that that is exactly what we have done here today. I want a ruling from the Chair at the

earliest opportunity as to whether or not we can use this type of procedure tomorrow, the day after and the day after that, even though it may be related to other Bills on the Order Paper or to matters before the House. I would like some direction from the Chair with regard to this ruling at the earliest opportunity. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I hoped to have asked Madam Speaker this very question but I could not get recognized. I hope the Chair will provide some guidance in this regard at the earliest opportunity because, in my view, we have reintroduced Standing Order 43 in this House.

● (1700)

Some Hon. Members: Right on.

Mr. Siddon: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I think the Hon. Member for Edmonton East appears to misunderstand the process that is under way at the present time. Under House business, Members are merely asking that the normal notice period be waived and that the Government give consideration to certain proposed amendments to the legislation. This is quite different from the old practice of presenting motions under Standing Order 43 for the immediate consideration of the House which required unanimous consent in order that they be introduced and debated immediately.

I submit that the present process is quite different and consistent with the rulings of the Speaker earlier and is well justified by the case made by the House Leader for the Official Opposition and the critic for transport on this side.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I want to support the Hon. Member for Richmond-South Delta. Many of the points he made were similar to the ones I was going to make. But let me just point out that what we are dealing with here is House business and is different from Standing Order 43 which, in fact, has the full range of questions. The other significant difference which should be brought to the Chair's attention is that Standing Order 43 traditionally was used any day the House sat. House business is a process that takes place only on Thursdays. The point which the Hon. Member for Edmonton East is attempting to make that this is a situation that can carry on in the same way as Standing Order 43 simply is not an understanding of what Members are doing here today.

I would submit that the Chair has no way in which it would be able to say, as the Hon. Member for Edmonton East is implying, that there is a connection between what we are doing today and Standing Order 43.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. I am sure that when the Hon. Member for Edmonton East reads the full record of today's proceedings he will find ample explanation of what is presently going on. I advise him to check that record in print tomorrow.

Mr. Siddon: Mr. Speaker, as we are dealing with House business at this time, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to waive the normal notice requirement and consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House at some future date. The proposed motion reads as follows:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 59 by striking out lines 22 to 34 at page 34 and substituting the following therefor:

"(a) the appointment of cost increases between the Government of Canada and the shippers of grain in respect of the period beyond the 1985-1986 crop year, having due regard to the producers' ability to pay, having regard to trends in the incomes of producers, the relationship between transportation costs borne by the producers and the price of grain and the economic position of the producers relative to other major sectors of the national economy and to any other factors that the Minister considers relevant;"

I emphasize the words "having due regard to the producers' ability to pay". In any event, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

May I ask that the question be put?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The House has heard the proposal. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on House business. I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to waive the normal notice requirement and to allow the following motion to be put to the House. I wish the Government House Leader were here to hear the amendment. It reads:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 44 by striking out lines 43 to 44 at page 24 and by striking out lines 1 to 6 at page 25 substituting the following therefor:

"44. (2) In establishing rates, the distance from any point on any line of railway of the Canadian National Railway Company west of Edmonton to any port in British Columbia shall be deemed to be equal to the distance from that point to Vancouver on the line of railway of the Canadian National Railway Company."

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion, as read, be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The House has heard the proposal. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Greenaway: Mr. Speaker, I rise on House business. I, too, would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, and Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow notices of motion to be waived and the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by striking out lines 10 to 15 at page 15 which reads as follows:

"(5) The members of the Committee shall treat in a confidential manner any information submitted under this section that is identified and treated as confidential by the railway company that submitted the information."

In any event, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The House has heard the Hon. Member's request. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I rise on House business. I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to waive notice and consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 25 by striking out lines 8 to 17, at page 13, and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) A motion taken up and considered in accordance with subsection (1) shall be debated for not more than five sitting days and at the expiration of the five sitting days the Speaker shall forthwith without further debate or amendment put every question necessary for the disposition of the motion."

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The House has heard the proposal of the Hon. Member for Bow River. Does the House give its unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I rise on House business. I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by adding after line 5 at page 18 the following therefor:

" "line-related costs" means the costs associated with branch line operations consisting principally of maintenance and the cost of capital and depreciation of assets used in the branch line;"

● (1710)

That is a new definition of a phrase which the Government uses over and over in the Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The House has heard the proposal. Does it grant its unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Gurbin: Mr. Speaker, on House business, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, a Bill which is important not only to western Canada but vital to the long-term interests of Ontario and other parts of central Canada, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow a notice of motion to be waived for the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 44 by striking out lines 35 to 42 at page 24 and substituting the following therefor:

"44.(1) In establishing rates, the distance from Edmonton or Calgary to any port in British Columbia on any line of railway shall be deemed to be equal to the distance from Edmonton to Vancouver on the line of railway of the Canadian National Railway Company."

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The House has heard the Hon. Member's proposal. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, on House business, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to give unanimous consent to waive notice

so that a motion could be put which would allow the continuance of the canola crushing industry in western Canada, without which that industry would die. Surely that is not something the Government would like to do.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please read his motion.

Mr. Andre: I was just going to do that, Mr. Speaker. The motion is:

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding "(1)" after "41" on line 15 at page 24 and by adding a new subsection 41(2) immediately after line 17:

"41(2) Rates for that part of domestic and grain movements east of Thunder Bay or Armstrong, Ontario on canola oil and canola meal crushed in the Western Division shall be established by order annually by the Commission at minimum compensatory levels."

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, on House business, I would like to ask the Government House Leader, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, if the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out lines 25 to 34 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) The sanctions referred to in subparagraph (1)(b)(ii) shall, in respect of any railway company, consist of a reduction in the government payment to the railway company under Part III, as prescribed by regulations made by the Governor in Council, not exceeding an amount that, in the opinion of the Commission, is equal to 25 per cent of the volume-related variable costs of the railway company."

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to request an explanation. I understand that when you call for unanimous consent the one Member of the House who is saying "no" and therefore is not granting unanimous consent is the Hon. Member for St. Boniface. I have noticed that he has been saying "no"—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not making a point of order. The Chair asked if there was unanimous consent, and the Chair distinctly heard a voice saying "no".

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I too would like to ask the Government for unanimous consent to waive notice for a motion that will improve Bill C-155—

[*Translation*]

—and the motion is as follows, Mr. Speaker:

That Bill C-155 be amended by striking out the heading "Part IV" preceding Clause 59 at page 34 and substituting the following therefor:

"PART IV
SHIPPER SHARE LIMITATION

59. In this Part,

"freight to price ratio", in respect of any calendar year, means an amount equal to the quotient, expressed as a percentage obtained by dividing the average cost to the shipper of moving one tonne of grain in that calendar year by the weighted average price for that calendar year;

"shipper share limitation adjustment", in respect of any calendar year, means an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying

Mr. Speaker—

(*a*) the number of percentage points by which the freight to price ratio in that calendar year exceeds 3 per cent,

by

(*b*) the product obtained by multiplying the weighted average price for that calendar year by the total number of tonnes of grain moved in that calendar year;

"six grains" means wheat, oats, barley, rye, flaxseed and rapeseed;

"weighted average price", in respect of any calendar year, means the weighted average determined under paragraph 60(1)(*b*) in respect of that calendar year.

60. (1) The Commission shall, on or before March 1st of each year, using the information that it deems appropriate, determine, in respect of the preceding calendar year,

(*a*) the average price per tonne at which each of the six grains, in storage, was available for sale on each trading day at the port that handled the largest volume of that grain in the calendar year;

(*b*) the average of the average prices referred to in paragraph (*a*), weighted on the basis of the number of tonnes of each of the six grains moved in the calendar year;

(*c*) the average cost to the shipper of moving one tonne of grain in the calendar year; and

(*d*) the freight to price ratio.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1)(*a*), the average price per tonne at which each of the six grains was available for sale shall be determined on the basis of the price per tonne of the grade of each of those grains the largest volume of which was moved in the calendar year.

And finally—

PART V"

and by renumbering the subsequent Parts and Clauses and amending all references accordingly.—*The Minister of Transport.*

Mr. Speaker, do I have unanimous consent to move this motion which is very important for the producers of Western Canada?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

● (1720)

[*English*]

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, on House business, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to the following motion which, if agreeable by unanimous consent, I would like to put to the House. If I may first mention that this is one motion—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I invite the Hon. Member to read the proposed motion only. Is the Hon. Member asking for unanimous consent for the motion he has read?

Mr. Stevens: I have not read it yet, Mr. Speaker. My motion is:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 55 by adding immediately after line 29 at page 32 the following:

"55.(4) No payment shall be made to any company which is one of the railway companies until such time as that company has

(a) obtained a certificate of continuance under the Canada Business Corporations Act; and

I note, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is writing it as I read it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please read his motion.

Mr. Stevens:

(b) legally committed itself to pay interest at a rate of not less than 11 per cent on any of its bonds, notes, mortgages, debentures or debenture stock which had been issued prior to 1897 and each of its subsidiaries has made a legal commitment to pay interest at a rate of not less than 11 per cent on any of its bonds, notes, mortgages, debentures or debenture stock which have been issued prior to 1897 and in each case payable in the same currency and at the same times as previously payable."

In short, this is to help the widows and orphans—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has finished reading his motion. Is he asking for the unanimous consent of the House?

Mr. Stevens: I am, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Miss Carney: Mr. Speaker, on House business, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House. This is the motion:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by adding after line 7 at page 18 the following thereto:

" "minimum compensatory rate" means a rate which only marginally exceeds the variable costs;"

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there consent for the Hon. Member to present the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, on House business, I would like to ask the Government House Leader, or in his absence the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader, if he would be prepared, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, to waive notice and to allow for unanimous consent for the following motion to be put to the House. This is the motion:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by deleting lines 20 to 40 at page 17 and lines 1 to 3 at page 18 which read as follows:

"estimated eligible costs", in respect of any crop year, means an amount equal to the aggregate of

(*a*) the volume-related variable costs of the railway companies for the movement of grain and their line-related variable costs for grain dependent branch lines, as estimated by the Commission pursuant to section 39, and

(*b*) the following phased-in contribution to the constant costs of the railway companies, namely,

(i) in respect of the 1983-84 crop year, 5% of the volume-related variable costs,

(ii) in respect of the 1984-85 crop year, 10% of the volume-related variable costs,

(iii) in respect of the 1985-86 crop year, 15% of the volume-related variable costs, and

(iv) in respect of the 1986-87 and subsequent crop years, 20% of the volume-related variable costs;

and substituting the following therefor:

" "estimated eligible costs" in respect of any crop year means an amount equal to the aggregate of the volume-related variable costs of the railway companies for the movement of grain and their line-related variable costs for grain-dependent branch lines."

In any event, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you seek the unanimous consent of the House to waive notice so that the motion that I just read can be placed on the Order Paper for debate and consideration at report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, on House business, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to waive notice and to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 38 by striking out lines 31 to 36 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*b*) compute the cost of capital in accordance with such principles as the Commission deems appropriate and adjust that cost by any amount it deems justified in light of any risk associated with the movement of grain as determined by the Commission;"

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the next motion in English.

[*English*]

I would like to ask the Government House Leader, who has just come into the Chamber, whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, he would be prepared to waive notice and allow the following motion to be put to the House:

● (1730)

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by adding immediately after line 45 at page 14 the following:

"(3) The Government of Canada shall provide sufficient funds to rehabilitate those railway branch lines, protected by order in council against abandonment to the year 2000, to a level of utility allowing reliable train service year-round in reasonable circumstances and such rehabilitation shall be disbursed by August 1, 1990."

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, of course to seek the unanimous consent of the House for this motion as read to be placed on the Order Paper, as requested by the Minister of Transport, for debate during consideration of the report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, on House business, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 6 at page 35 the following:

"60.(1) Following the completion of any review or study carried out under section 59, the Minister within 90 days, shall prepare a detailed and comprehensive response to such review or study, including the Minister's acceptance or rejection of each conclusion and recommendation contained in any review or study and the reasons therefor.

(2) The Minister shall cause a copy of his response referred to in subsection (1) to be laid before Parliament on any of the first 20 days that either House of Parliament sits after the preparation of that response and such response shall stand permanently referred to any Committee of Parliament established for the purpose of reviewing matters relating to transportation."

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House on that motion as read and that it be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of the report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. King: Mr. Speaker, on House business, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to waive notice and to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 46 by striking out lines 41 to 46 at page 25 and by striking out lines 1 to 2 at page 26 and substituting the following therefor:

"46(1) Notwithstanding Section 45, but subject to subsection (2), a railway company may, in respect of any crop year, include in its tariff a rate that is lower than that provided by Schedule II in respect of any point of origin that was treated as a competitive or contiguous point in the tariff of rates applicable to the 1981-1982 crop year or which are subsequently declared to be competitive or continguous points by the Commission; thus ensuring that producers receive the benefit of any economics affected by railways or as a result of changing national circumstances."

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a somewhat different matter I wish to raise on House business, if I may. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council will recall that last week and the week before, I raised on one occasion with him and on another occasion with the Government House Leader the question of the disposition of Bill C-653. He will also recall that it has been a matter of considerable concern to this Party for quite some time.

I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader is in a position today to respond to my inquiries in regard to that particular piece of legislation, whether it is the intention of the Government to facilitate its being brought forward and whether we might expect it to be considered along with the business that the Government House Leader indicated earlier today would be considered prior to the projected date of prorogation.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will know that there have been ongoing discussions between the various Parties with regard to the disposition of Bill C-653 and Bill C-12. I cannot tell the Hon. Member at this time precisely what the disposition of those discussions will be, but I would certainly speak to the Minister about the Hon. Member's question and representation.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, to pursue this issue for a moment, I get the impression that there may be other opportunities for the Parliamentary Secretary to respond to this question. I wonder if he might be able, given that I understand we do not have a great deal of time before prorogation, to check it out and report to me, even though it is out of turn, so to speak. I wonder if he might find it possible to respond to me tomorrow or on Monday at the latest, even though it will not be Thursday.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, yes, I will do my best to do that.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a proposal forward on House business to the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council in the capacity of House Leader. In the interests of facilitating the debate and improving Bill C-155, I wonder if the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put before the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 13 at page 34 the following new Clause:

"59.(1) Where pursuant to Sections 55 and 58, the Governor in Council authorizes payments other than payments to the railway companies, or has authorized part of the payments to the railway companies and part to a party or parties other than the railway companies, the Governor in Council, nothwithstanding any other provision in this Act, shall prescribe by regulation such measures as will be required to ensure that the aggregate rate per tonne to be paid to the railway companies shall be equal to the aggregate rate per tonne as if all payments were made to the railway companies.

(2) Where regulations have been prescribed pursuant to sections 58(1)(a) and section 59, sections 22 to 28 inclusive apply *mutatis mutandis*."

and by renumbering the subsequent cLauses accordingly.

I would like to ask, Mr. Speaker, particularly in view of the Parliamentary Secretary's keen interest in this matter, whether you could inquire of the House and the Government if they would agree to giving unanimous consent to placing this motion on the Order Paper for the report stage of Bill C-155 for purposes of debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I rise on House business and I would like to ask the Acting House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and the improvement of Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Schedule I at page 39 by adding the following:

Beet pulp. Brewers' dried grain. Canary seed. Chopped feed. Dehydrated alfalfa meal or pellets or cubes, round or square. Distillers' dried grain. Faba beans. Field beans. Field peas. Flour in bulk. Flour, pea. Forage seeds. Lentils. Meal, pea. Meal, feed. Mustard seed. Pulse.

● (1740)

Pulse refers to all those crops described as pulse crops which, Mr. Speaker, are an innovation and very important in western Canada.

Shorts. Sunflowerseed. Sunflowerseed oil. Triticale. Barley. Barley, crushed. Meal. Oil Cake Linseed. Oil Cake, Rapeseed, Canola. Oil Cake, Sunflower Seed. Meal, Rye. Meal, Wheat. Middlings. Oats. Oats, Crushed. Oats, Rolled. Oatcake, Linseed. Oatcake, Rapeseed or Canola. Oilcake, Sunflower Seed. Peas, including splits and screenings. Pea. Pea derivatives (flower, protein, isolates, fibre). Rapeseed or Canola. Rye. Screening or Screenings pellets (applicable only on Screenings from grains specified herein). Seed Grain in Sacks. Wheat. Wheat Germ. Wheat, Rolled. Sunflowers in Bags, paper or jute. Barley, Pearl. Barley, Pot. Barley, Sprouts. Beans, Split. Screenings. Bean derivatives (flour, protein, isolates, fibre). Bran. Breakfast Foods of Cereals (uncooked) in bags, barrels or cases. Manufactured from commodities only as listed in this Schedule or such commodities that may be added by Governor in Council. Corn, Cracked. Corn (not popped). Feed, Animal or Poultry (not medicated or condimental), containing not more than 35 per cent (35%) of ingredients other than commodities as specified in this Schedule, in bags, or barrels or in bulk. Flax Seed. Flour, made from grain or malt in bags or barrel or in bulk. Grain, Feed, in sacks. Groats. Hulls, Oat. Malt, (made from grain only). Meal, Barley. Meal, Corn. Meal, Linseed. Meal, Oat. Meal, Rapeseed or Canola. Beet pulp. Brewers' Dried Grain. Dehydrated Alfalfa, Pellets or Cubes. Distillers' Dried Grain. Faba Beans. Field Peas. Flour in bulk. Flour, pea. Forage seeds. Barley, Crushed. Barley. Triticale. Sunflower Oil. Sunflower Seed. Pulse. Mustard Seed Pulse. Millfeed. Meal, Pea. Lentils. Forage Seeds. Sprouts. Barley. Pearl Barley. Pot Barley. Split Beans. Screenings and derivatives of Beans, derivatives of—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the Hon. Member sure he is not repeating one of the pages of his notes?

Mr. McKnight: I may be, Mr. Speaker. I started reading from the bottom the last time.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I have been following this with great fascination and I can attest to the fact that the Hon. Member has not repeated one item on that list.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has listened with great attention and there certainly is repetition. Would the Hon. Member please read his motion.

Mr. McKnight: I should like to do that, Mr. Speaker. It goes on:

Durum. Durum derivatives. Durum Flour. Durum, processed. Durum milled. Durum, consumed. Durum packaged commercially. Thatcher. Thatcher Wheat. Marquis. Marquis Wheat. Wheat, No. 1 CWRS, No. 2 CWRS, No. 3 CWRS, No. 1 utility, No. 2 utility. Durum. Durum, Red Amber. Amber Durum No. 2, No. 3 and No. 4 Durum.

Unless someone has anything else to add, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member finish reading his motion, please.

Mr. McKnight: I would ask that "commodities may be added by Governor in Council but not removed by Governor in Council unless so authorized by Parliament".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to introduce his motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There does not appear to be unanimous consent.

The Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, while we are on House business I wonder if I might direct a question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader. I would not want to add fiddleheads to the distinguished Member's list.

The Government having given a lot of attention in the early part of this session to Bill C-163, I should like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary whether he might not now be in a position to give me the right to seek waiver of consent so that we might bring on, at some point before Christmas, Bill C-163, an Act to establish the Canadian Aviation Safety Board, an Act to amend certains Acts and certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is asking for unanimous consent from the House—

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —or is the Hon. Member seeking information?

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, had you been paying attention, you would know I was seeking information.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, the Chair was paying as close attention as possible. He put a question to the Parliamentary Secretary, but at one point it appeared to imply that unanimous consent to bring in a certain measure was in his mind. Would the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East make clear what it is he wants.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, had you been listening to me, you would know that I asked if the Parliamentary Secretary would be kind enough to consent to give us some indication this afternoon when the Government, having indicated to us the urgency of the Canadian aviation safety Bill, intends to deal with this very important matter and the amendments that would be laid down with respect to certain clauses in that Bill that need extensive amendment.

The other purpose was to add fiddleheads to my hon. friend's list. I was not being disrespectful, Mr. Speaker, I was just asking that you pay some attention.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair pays careful attention to everything the Hon. Member says but sometimes has difficulty.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the President of the Privy Council would give very careful consideration to the Hon. Member's representation as soon as we finish with Bill C-155 and Bill C-162.

Mr. Deans: On the same matter, Mr. Speaker, I want to offer speedy passage should the Government decide to bring the Bill forward.

Mr. Bosley: On Government business, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, it would be prepared to consent to the following motion being put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 6 at page 35 the following:

"60. (1) Following the completion of any review or study carried out under section 59, the Minister, within 100 days, shall prepare a detailed and comprehensive response to such review or study, including the Minister's acceptance or rejection of each conclusion and recommendation contained in any review or study and the reasons therefor.

(2) The Minister shall cause a copy of his response referred to in subsection (1) to be laid before Parliament on any of the first fifteen days that either House of Parliament sits after the preparation of that response and such response shall stand permanently referred to any Committee of Parliament established for the purpose of reviewing matters relating to transportation."

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion, as read, be placed on the Order Paper for debate during the consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

● (1750)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 8(4) I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre:

That the House continue to sit this day until 11 a.m., October 21, 1983, in order to consider Bill C-155.

I move this, Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Opposition Members have many more suggested amendments to make to Bill C-155.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Flis: We would like to hear those amendments. If they are really serious, Mr. Speaker, we are ready to hear those amendments.

Mr. Nielsen: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must call to the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary that for such a motion to be in order there must be business before the House. There is no specified business before the House at this point.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on House business. I would like to ask the Government House Leader, and in his absence his Parliamentary Secretary, whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain, and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, the Government would be prepared to waive notice and consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 59

(*a*) by renumbering Clause 59 as subclause 59(1);

(*b*) by striking out lines 1 to 3 at page 35 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*d*) the appropriateness of the provisions of sections 41 to 53 respecting rates and tariff of rates;

(*e*) the operation and effect of Part IV; and

(*f*) the need for future comprehensive reviews of the operation and effects of this Act."

(*c*) by adding after line 6 at page 35 the following:

"(2) The Governor in Council shall, on or before March 31, 1984, appoint a committee consisting of not less than three and not more than five persons who have expertise in matters affected by this Act and represent various regional interests.

(3) The committee shall examine all matters that, in its opinion, pertain to the method of payment in respect of grain transportation that would be the most conducive to agricultural development in Canada.

(4) The committee has, for the purposes of carrying out its duties, the powers of a commissioner under Part I of the *Inquiries Act* and may, for those purposes, engage the services of such experts, professionals and other staff as it deems necessary or advisable at such rates of remuneration as the Treasury Board approves.

(5) The committee shall, on or before March 30, 1985, make a report to the Minister containing its recommendations pertaining to the method referred to in subsection (3) and the Minister shall cause a copy of the report to be laid before Parliament on any of the first fifteen days that either House of Parliament sits after the report has been made to the Minister."

In any event, I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you seek the unanimous consent of the House to waive notice so that the motion I have just read can be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, there is not.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, again on House business, I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to waive notice and consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34, by striking out lines 15 to 21 at page 18 and substituting the following therefor:

[*Translation*]

(2) To avoid any uncertainty and remove any doubts, all sections of the Railways Act, with the exception of paragraphs 276 and 278, and of the National Transportation Act, shall apply to the transportation, shipping and handling of grain under the provisions of the present Act, unless such is not feasible.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, there is not.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I rise on House business to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader if the Government would consider the following motion to be included for discussion on Bill C-155 in order to facilitate debate and to improve Bill C-155. I seek the unanimous consent of the House that the following motion be presented for debate:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 37 by striking out lines 32 to 46 at page 19 and lines 1 to 7 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), the percentage of a rate to be borne by the shippers of grain is equal to the quotient, expressed as a percentage, obtained by dividing

(a) the rate that was in effect on June 16, 1983,

by

(b) the rate prescribed by the Commission, pursuant to section 35.

(3) For the purposes of subsection (1), the percentage of a rate to be borne by the Government of Canada is equal to the difference between 100 per cent and the percentage to be borne by the shippers of grain, as calculated in subsection (2)."

I request that the House give unanimous consent to waive notice so that the motion can be placed on the Order Paper for debate during report stage of Bill C-155.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not.

Mr. Gurbin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on House business. I would like to ask the Parliament Secretary to the Government House Leader, in the interests of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, if the Government would be prepared to consent and allow notice to be waived so that the following motion might be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by striking out lines 20 to 40 at page 17 and lines 1 to 3 at page 18 and substituting the following therefor:
"estimated eligible costs" in respect of any crop year means an amount equal to the aggregate of the volume-related variable costs of the railway companies for grain movement and their line-related variable costs for grain-dependent branch lines as determined by the Commission.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration of report stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain, and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not.

Miss Carney: Mr. Speaker, on House business, I would like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader whether, in the interest of facilitating debate and improving Bill C-155, the Government would be prepared to consent to allow the following motion to be put to the House:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by adding after line 14 at page 18 the following thereto:
"variable costs" means the sum of the line-related and volume-related costs, including the allowances in each case for the cost of capital"

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I ask that you seek the unanimous consent of the House that the motion as read be placed on the Order Paper for debate during consideration of report state of Bill C-155, an act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain, and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

● (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

AIR CANADA—GIMLI ACCIDENT—REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO SAFETY PROCEDURES. (B) DISCIPLINING OF EMPLOYEES—REQUEST FOR POSTPONEMENT

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) is in the House. I am sure he will want to stay long enough to respond to my concerns about the Gimli accident. We are going to discuss a glider plane known as a 767. Captain Robert Pearson and First Officer Morris Quintal probably saved the Canadian taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars by safely landing that aircraft at Gimli, Manitoba, not to mention the 69 lives aboard that plane.

It appears very likely to me as a Member of Parliament that the President of Air Canada, Claude Taylor, has, with the assistance of the Minister of Transport, committed a blatant cover-up of the Gimli accident by having a behind closed doors hearing—not one but two—on this accident and then trying to cover up, intentionally or otherwise, the information given at those two hearings. We have conflicting information. First we have a statement on October 6 in *The Toronto Sun* reporting the Minister of Transport as saying:

Meanwhile, Transport Minister Lloyd Axworthy rejected demands for a public inquiry into the controversial landing.

Then we go to the Air Canada report. I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that that report was brought in by seven members of a commission, five of whom were employees of the Boeing Company, manufacturer of the aircraft in question. If that does not indicate a direct conflict of interest, then I do not know what would. However, after a couple of behind closed doors investigations, we then had the statement, as reported in *The Globe and Mail* on September 30, by Mr. Taylor, the President of Air Canada, who said on September 29:

—the report shows that Air Canada's operations are "still of the highest order.

It is reassuring to know from recognized independent experts that the series of incidents during 1983 do not reflect a deterioration in Air Canada's technical and operating proficiency."

Mr. Taylor also said:

At the outset it should be clarified that the independent audit was initiated by Air Canada—

He goes on to say:

—as to whether there were any fundamental or substantive flaws in our technical and operating procedures.

I am pleased to state that the audit team confirmed that these were still of the highest standard.

Having reviewed his comments, I would like to move now to the comments of the Chairman of that Commission. These comments will give an entirely different picture. First, as reported in the Montreal *Gazette* on October 18:

The checks of the Edmonton-bound jet with 69 people aboard at Montreal and Ottawa failed to discover a malfunctioning fuel-indicating system and the problem was further compounded by a failure to convert from metric volume to metric weight, the report says.

The accident investigation report concludes the maintenance and flight crews acted "in contravention of the Minimum Equipment List", and transport officials in Canada and the United States agree that would mean the aircraft was not airworthy.

If we go one step further in this report which was never released to the public, we find that he told *The Gazette* that the 767 pilot had never received any training in the refueling procedures for the 767. According to this accident report which has never been made public:

—the flight crew maintain the calculations made by them were to cross check figures provided by maintenance" while the maintenance technician "insists that he did not . . . supply the flight crew with fuel figures in kilograms."

● (1805)

Remember that these are the only flights in Canada, North America and the world, except Russia, that use the metric system. The report says that this was the first time they were asked to perform a drip check manual measurement of fuel on the Boeing 767 and had not received any formal training on the procedure.

My concern is that if they have not received any training as ground crew or technicians, why are the pilot and co-pilot reprimanded, demoted or dismissed for an error that was caused by the lack of procedural guidelines laid out by Air Canada?

Let us proceed to Mr. Robert Buck, who is the Chairman of the Commission that investigated this accident. He said, "You cannot have a bastard group of metric planes flying in an Imperial fleet." He also said that this special behind closed door hearing never reviewed the Gimli accident. We have the President of Air Canada saying "We are 100 per cent safe", and the Chairman of the Commission appointed by the President of Air Canada saying, "We never even discussed the Gimli accident", and "You cannot have bastard planes flying around."

The Minister has left the House since I started to speak and does not wish to respond as Minister responsible. He has now determined that we need a public inquiry. There is one county court judge from Gimli, Manitoba, who will be able to call witnesses. I wonder if he will call Mr. Buck? I wonder if he will call the Air Line Pilots Association of Canada? I wonder if he will call in the air traffic controllers?

I am only concerned that we are getting another ramrod job by the Minister of Transport trying to whitewash, using a pilot and co-pilot as scapegoats to take the fall for the errors of Air Canada.

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am going to check *Hansard* tomorrow morning to see exactly what the Hon. Member said. If I heard him correctly, he accused Mr. Taylor, President of Air Canada, of blatant cover-up. How low can a Member get, to use the protection of the House to discredit a person such as Mr. Taylor who put Air Canada on its feet. It takes Canadians and others to appreciate and recognize that Air Canada is the best airline in the world, but the Hon. Member would not appreciate that.

The Hon. Member might also speak to his leader because such an occurrence would be investigated by the Canadian Aviation Safety Board under Bill C-163. However, we saw in the House the despictable behaviour of the Official Opposition filibustering Bill C-155. Therefore we cannot bring in Bill C-163. We have an all-Party agreement to put it through the House quickly.

The Minister told the Hon. Member in the House last week of his intentions to hold a public inquiry into the events surrounding the July 23 occurrence when an Air Canada aircraft ran out of fuel and made an emergency landing at Gimli, Manitoba. George H. Lockwood, a county court judge in Manitoba, has been appointed to lead the inquiry and report to the Minister within two months. The inquiry will examine the circumstances of the accident, including Air Canada practices, procedures and maintenance standards; whether or not there had been a breach of regulations by personnel and any steps that can be taken to prevent a similar occurrence in the future.

I think the Hon. Member will agree that this inquiry provides a suitable forum for public discussion of all events relating to this incident and, as such, will dispel any public apprehension as to the circumstances surrounding this incident.

TRUST COMPANIES—REFUSAL TO REWRITE MORTGAGES AT LOWER RATES. (B) PROTECTION REQUESTED FOR HOME OWNERS

Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington): Mr. Speaker, on September 28, as reported at page 27534 of *Hansard*, I raised a question in the House with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola) regarding the plight of approximately 750,000 Canadians who have mortgages with high interest rates. This matter has been raised a number of times in the House. In fact, it goes back as far as April, 1980, when the Government, in its Throne Speech starting this Session of Parliament, mentioned the difficulty being faced by home owners in securing mortgages for their homes. Many times since then, Ministers have expressed concern and indicated they would do something about the difficulty in which 750,000 Canadians find themselves.

● (1810)

Briefly, the situation is as follows. Mortgages have been acquired by a large number of people from a handful of trust companies on the clear understanding that they could prepay the mortgages upon the payment of a three-month interest penalty. We have established in writing that three months interest penalty was a standard policy in the industry. When the home owners tried to prepay their mortgages they were told that the policy had been changed, and it was now required that an interest differential charge be paid in addition to the three-month interest penalty.

This move by the trust companies was clearly to dissuade mortgagors from prepaying their mortgages. The reality is that a few trust companies stand to make enormous profits if they can discourage mortgagors from prepayment and thus carry their mortgages to full term. Look at it this way, some of the mortgages the trust companies hold have interest rates at more than double today's rates. I am not against anyone making a profit. But if they make that profit at the expense of the mortgagor, by changing the rules in the middle of the game, then I must stand against them, and I will try to assist the mortgagor.

It is like playing with a double-headed coin. If you are a home owner with a 19.5 per cent mortgage, and a trust company can force you through the interest differential charge to keep your mortgage to full term, then the trust company is the winner.

If, however, you decide to prepay the mortgage and you agree to the interest differential charge demanded, the trust company is again the winner. Not only do they get the 19.5 per cent interest to full term of the mortgage but they demand an additional three month's interest penalty. Do you know of any parallel situation when you pay the full interest charged in a contract plus an additional three months' interest, plus other costs associated with the discharge of a debt?

The Minister, in her reply, said she was seeking a solution under the Canada Interest Act. Any action she may take under that statute may assist some home owner in the future but would not help those who are presently trapped.

The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs should use the leverage she has with trust companies and require them to fulfil their verbal contractual agreements and adhere to the standard industry policy. They baited mortgagors to sign a multiple year mortgage on the understanding that they could prepay the mortgage upon the payment of three months' interest penalty, then they switched their policy.

Let me say that not all trust companies have used these devious plans to strip the home owner of his right to exercise an option that was standard in industry at the time the mortgage was written. Not all trust companies have engaged in this devious practice. But a handful of trust companies are holding at ransom 750,000 Canadians, and this should not happen.

Mr. David Berger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member referred earlier to the clear understanding that has existed, or the tradition in the industry that home owners can prepay mortgages on the payment of three months' penalty. He asks the Minister to use the leverage she has. Unfortunately, while Members on all sides of the House sympathize with the predicament in which home owners may find themselves, a contract, as we all know, is a contract, and it is not for the Minister or any other Party to open a contract which has been signed between two parties. If there has been misrepresentation, however, this is a matter which a home owner can take up in a court of law. There are civil law remedies to settle disputes over contractual agreements. These cases of alleged oral misrepresentation have been referred to the Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigations Act.

● (1815)

In this regard, the Director has examined and is still in the process of examining the complaints received within the Department on this subject. The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has always strongly supported and promoted full disclosure of all terms, conditions and obligations to borrowers.

The chief concern regarding those citizens unfortunate enough to be locked into high interest mortgages is that they may not have been fully aware of their current agreements. Unfortunately many did not realize that they had no legal right to prepay their mortgages prior to maturity with a maximum prepayment charge set at three months' interest. While a prepayment penalty of three months' interest has been a longstanding tradition, it is not rooted in law and lenders are under no statutory obligation to adhere to that practice.

However, officials in the Department have been asked to review the Canada Interest Act in order to determine means to ensure that borrowers in the future are fully informed of all rights and conditions at the time of signing.

In conclusion I would add that the allegations concerning oral misrepresentations are not solely against the Canada Trust Company. Other trust companies, life insurance companies, banks and investment firms have to date been implicated by complainants. These are the matters which are being looked into by the Director of Investigation and Research.

MEDICAL CARE—DEVELOPMENT OF PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE SYSTEMS. (B) HEALTH CARE FUNDING

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I rise to pursue a question I asked of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) on October 12. Before doing that, I remind the House of how we have repeatedly urged the Minister to stop playing politics with the health care needs of Canadians and to proceed without delay to the introduction of a new Canada Health Act which would reaffirm, clarify, strengthen and make enforceable the five basic principles of medicare from coast to coast, namely, universality, accessibility, portability, comprehensiveness and non-profit administration.

Such things as rising premiums, the spread of user fees to five out of ten Provinces, increasing levels of extra billing in certain areas of Canada and Government cutbacks are slowly but surely destroying medicare. We do not really know just when we will arrive at the point of no return. We do know that Conservative provincial Governments are definitely permitting new erosions of the principles of medicare.

Despite plenty of rhetoric from the Minister of National Health and Welfare about her concern for medicare, the Minister has still not put any concrete legislation before the House which would address these serious problems. She continues to dangle the idea of a new Canada Health Act before those Canadians who are concerned about medicare. And I have to admit she has been successful, at the political level at least, of appearing to be a great defender of medicare. However the moment of truth is near. For every day that goes by that we do not see a concrete proposal, cynicism grows among Canadians concerned about medicare as to whether or not the Minister is actually concerned about preserving medicare or whether the Liberal Party is concerned about preserving medicare not in itself but as an issue for the next election.

Unfortunately the Minister is also unwilling to address the very real need in our country for alternatives to the present health care model with which medicare must co-exist. The Minister has recognized that the greatest strides to be made in health care today are in the area of preventive medicine and health promotion. By improving the over-all health of the Canadian population we can reduce the need for Canada's current curative, doctor-dominated, high-tech and expensive health care system. Not only would Canadians be healthier but their health care system would be more cost-efficient, although in the final analysis that is not a good enough reason to do something. We want to do these things because they improve over-all health; that must be the real reason.

On October 12, I asked the Minister whether she intended to provide federal leadership in the development of such a health-oriented, broad-based and popular health care system for Canada. She resorted to the tired old cop-out that health was a provincial matter. Who is the Minister trying to kid? The federal Government has always played an important role in the evolution of medicare in this country. National medicare would not even be here today, sick as it is, if it were not for federal initiative. It would not be here at all if it were not for the initiative of the CCF-NDP in Saskatchewan, both in terms of hospital insurance and medicare. My constituents know that. They know the history of it, as do many Canadians. That is appropriate.

● (1820)

The Minister is at the very least being inconsistent. On the one hand she claims to be providing federal leadership by threatening sanctions against those Provinces which allow extra billing and impose user-fees. On the other hand, she claims she is constitutionally helpless when it comes to initiating the development of novel health care alternatives that would make Canada a healthier place in which to live, and which would take some of the pressure off the increasing costs that people are wrongly blaming on medicare when they should be blaming it on the health care model with which medicare has to co-exist.

The people of this country are sick and tired of political games such as the Minister is playing. They want the Minister to stop beating around the bush and to enact legislation that would address all the financial and structural problems plaguing medicare.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Canadians must realize that in the final analysis health is not just related to a particular health care system, but to the social, economic and environmental dimension of our lives. The best principles of medicare imaginable, enforced to the limit, will not overcome the consequences of malnutrition caused by inner city poverty. They will not overcome exposure to hazards in the workplace. They will not overcome the fact of carcinogens in our food, water and environment. For in the final analysis, we are not just fighting for our health care system, but for that total health that will only come as we achieve greater social, economic and environmental justice.

Adjournment Debate

Mr. David Berger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is very amusing to hear the Hon. Member talk about how the Government has been playing politics with medicare. It is a common cry that we hear from the other side, as if it is beyond them to play politics or that they never do it. I suggest to them that the Minister is not playing politics. It would be much better if he and his Party would stop playing politics with the Crow and a number of other matters and allow Parliament to proceed with the business of the country.

Mr. Blaikie: Get to the prepared answer.

Mr. Berger: The Hon. Member asks me to proceed to the prepared answer. If he wants us to deal with the matter at hand, he could try the same game when putting the question. He was three-quarters of the way into his statement before getting into the issue of preventive medicine.

The Hon. Member is anxious that we develop alternatives to the way in which health care services are currently delivered. However, he says we should forget the constitutional realities of this country.

Under our Constitution, each Province is responsible in its own right for determining the practice privileges of different types of health professionals, organizational arrangements with respect to their health services and payment arrangements. In this connection, it may be of interest to note that the federal Government from 1968 until 1977 recognized the costs of alternative payment arrangements for the insured services of medical practitioners for cost-sharing purposes under the Medical Care Act and these costs have been included in the base-year costs that are used for determining the amount of block funding under the current EPF arrangements.

● (1825)

It also may be of interest to you, Mr. Speaker, that under EPF, the federal Government does make a per capita grant yearly to each Province in respect of the extended health care services program.

Mr. Blaikie: Extended care is not preventive care.

Mr. Berger: Again, it is up to each Province to determine the extent to which it will implement services which the extended health care services program grant is intended to support, namely, nursing home intermediate care, adult residential care, home care services and the ambulatory health care services that I have described. This federal contribution will be continued.

With regard to preventive care, this is covered to some extent under the existing legislation and will be continued in the proposed Canada Health Act. Health promotion programs involving Government are funded by and large outside the health insurance programs per se.

The Hon. Member has been talking about cutbacks and arguing that the Government has cut back its share.

Mr. Blaikie: You have.

Mr. Berger: The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that the federal share of hospital and medical care insurance was about 50 per cent in the cost-sharing period prior to 1977 and is now about 50 per cent. If we take a wider view of provincial health spending including programs which were never cost shared, then federal contributions were about 40 per cent in 1977 and are now about 40 per cent.

Moreover, transfers for health were exempted from the federal Government's six and five restraint program. The record, Mr. Speaker, contrary to the words of the Hon. Member, reveals a strong commitment to medicare on the part of the Government. I would again suggest to him that if he would stop playing politics, we could reach the stage when the Minister would be able to find time in the House to introduce the Canada Health Act.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted.

Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock.

At 6.28 p.m., the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 21, 1983

The House met a 11 a.m.

• (1105)

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*Translation*]

SHIPBUILDING

ASSISTANCE SOUGHT FOR DAVIE SHIPBUILDING LTD. IN QUEBEC

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Madam Speaker, the situation at Davie Shipbuilding in Lauzon is a very difficult one at the present time. This major employer in the Quebec City region, ranking second behind the Quebec Civil Service, may be facing a very serious situation by the end of 1984, when construction on the CN Marine ferry will be terminated, because the shipyard does not seem to have any new projects on its order books.

When the contract for the frigates was awarded on June 29 of this year, the plan was that as a compensatory measure, Davie would be asked to proceed with refitting of the Tribal destroyers, for a project that was then estimated at $650 million.

I therefore urge the Government to proceed as soon as possible with the studies and preparations required to carry out this major contract. I also urge the Government of Quebec to show some favouritism towards Davie Shipyards and to stop playing games. It is a fact that P.Q. politicians in the Quebec City area have criticized the federal Government's measures with respect to Davie Shipyards, while they are not as eager to admit that the Government of Quebec, which, through the Société générale de financement, owns Marine Industries Ltd. in Sorel, is supporting this shipyard on the outskirts of Montreal.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I urge the owners, the unions, the federal Government and the Government of Quebec to take action to save Davie Shipyards.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PITFIELD

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, now hear this! Senator Michael Pitfield has opened "Pandora's Liberal Box" and told the nation the secret he held so closely with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for 25 years—the Liberals have been "throwing money" at their problems.

Thousands of Canadians have wondered why our deficit was increasing year by year. The Liberals have been throwing money at every problem that confronted them. With their own money? Of course not; with the people's money. Listen to what Senator Pitfield said in Toronto the other day, and I quote:

We have been solving governmental problems by throwing money at them.

The Liberals have been buying their way into office. When a Liberal MP became a problem, the Prime Minister and Michael Pitfield "threw money" at him and sent him on a trip with all expenses paid.

Was there a problem with the Prime Minister's secretary in his office? The Prime Minister and Michael Pitfield "threw money" at her and she studied French for a year at public expense in the Riveria.

Did Senator Pitfield himself become a problem to the Prime Minister? I guess so, because the Prime Minister "threw money" at him and sent him to the Senate with a pension for life.

Millions of people exist on UIC and welfare. Businesses have been forced into bankruptcy through National Energy Program taxes. No matter, the Liberals had to get the money somewhere to "throw money" at their problems. What a pity!

* * *

THE UKRAINE

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET INDUCED FAMINE

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, this weekend marks the fiftieth anniversary of the great famine in the Soviet Ukraine. The forced famine, as it was known, resulted in between six million and ten million Ukranian peasants dying of starvation, starvation brought about by the inhuman policies of Joseph Stalin's regime. In spite of many offerings of assistance, the aid was rejected. Malcolm Muggeridge, who was there at the time, wrote the following:

—the fields are covered with weeds and the people, swollen from hunger, are awaiting inevitable death. In talking to these miserable people you will find out how many have died from hunger and how many were executed by the Soviet

government or deported because they have hidden a little wheat in order to satisfy their hunger.

In the name of humanity we remember the victims, and vow that an ongoing vigilance will never allow this to recur in a world which is undoubtedly a world of some considerable danger.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

RESTRUCTURING OF PÊCHEURS-UNIS DU QUÉBEC— ADVANTAGES TO PROVINCE OF PARTNERSHIP IN NEW CORPORATION

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Madam Speaker, the fishing industry plays a major part in the economy of the Gaspé peninsula, since 55 per cent of fish landings are made up of catches by fishermen in the riding of Gaspé and most fish processing plants are also in that riding. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) has submitted a restructuration plan for Pêcheurs-Unis du Québec, with the three following objectives: to ensure that Pêcheurs-Unis du Québec or its successor will continue to be economically viable; to develop a fair restructuration process, bearing in mind both the economic and social impact; to promote the development of Quebec's marine fisheries in co-operation with the Atlantic fisheries. The directors of Pêcheurs-Unis have agreed with the plan to set up a new company to administer the fishing industry in Quebec. Members of fishermen's co-operatives in Rivière-au-Renard, Newport and Saint-Maurice de l'Echouerie have expressed their agreement with the decision to accept the offer made by the Government of Canada, and the co-operative in Cloridorme will be doing so within a few hours.

On behalf of Quebec fishermen and processing plant workers, I urge the Government of Quebec to co-operate with the Government of Canada, in order to save Quebec's fishing industry from disaster, by setting up a new company administered by the people concerned and the financial institutions.

* * *

[*English*]

VIA RAIL

CALL FOR REINSTATEMENT OF ATLANTIC LIMITED TRAIN SERVICE

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy-Royal): Madam Speaker, passenger rail service in Atlantic Canada has been less than satisfactory since two well-utilized lines were abruptly abandoned 23 months ago. Since then neither New Brunswickers nor other Maritimers have experienced the improved, cost-efficient service, or seen the new equipment the former Minister of Transport, the current Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin), advised us the sacrifices were being made for at that time.

● (1110)

Instead, many communities are left without public transportation, schedules are chaotic, trains are overbooked, obliging passengers to stand cheek-to-cheek and cheek-to-cheek, and the LRCs, promised to be in operation by the summer of 1983, proved to be another promise shattered.

I urge the Minister to use every resource available to him to reinstate the popular, time and economically efficient and respected Atlantic Limited in an effort to reverse the tawdry and disgraceful service New Brunswickers have endured for the past two years. Forcing passengers to travel backwards before travelling forward, at greater expense and less convenience, does not forge a dynamic rail service.

The decision to terminate one of Canada's most popular lines is indicative of the irresponsibility of the Government in making this decision, and shows a general lack of compassion for and appreciation of the basic needs of Atlantic Canadians. Sadly, it is compatible with many other of its decisions adversely affecting the region.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

EXPENDITURES ON OFFICIAL RESIDENCE OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on the same topic as the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). Canadians are tired of the ever-growing examples of how Government officials have been both negligent and extravagant when it comes to spending somebody else's money.

In the case of Stornoway, the rent-free accommodation of the Leader of the Official Opposition, in the last seven years the residents of that house spent $25,000 in 1976, $25,000 in 1979, $35,000 in 1980, and the latest tenant, the new Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Mulroney), has found it necessary to spend $50,000 of taxpayers' dollars on a splash or two of paint.

This latest example of living high at the public trough raises a number of questions. First, to justify the expenditure of $50,000, did the Leader of the Conservative Party sign a long-term lease for Stornoway? Second, what political party does a leader belong to when he acts like a Liberal, lives like a Liberal, and spends other people's money like a Liberal?

Finally, with the Prime Minister's power as the custodian of the national treasury, can Canadians afford to move this free spender from Stornoway to 24 Sussex?

Some Hon. Members: No way.

Mr. Nielsen: It would save money.

PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

MANITOBA—JOB-CREATION RECORD OF NDP GOVERNMENT

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine): Madam Speaker, the *Winnipeg Free Press* and Statistics Canada have confirmed that Manitoba has the lowest rate of job creation in Canada. Because of the NDP job fund, in actuality the number of jobs created is 8,000 less than reported, meaning a percentage increase of a near worthless .88 per cent. John Bulloch, the President of the Canadian Federation of Independent Business, has reported that the Manitoba NDP Government is the most anti-business regime in Canada, and it clings to the lame philosophy that only it can solve all the problems and that only it can breathe new life into its sick economy. Bulloch states the NDP seems blind to the fact that its policies are doing just the opposite.

Unemployment is up 50 per cent, with 46,000 people out of work. Inflation has soared. Taxes have increased over $225 million. The annual projected deficit is $435 million. The NDP deficit this year is greater than the combined four-year deficits of the previous Conservative Government. To top it off, the *Winnipeg Free Press* reports that, under the NDP Government, Manitoba has the worst record of job creation in Canada. Manitoba under the NDP Government has become the "Dogpatch" of Canada.

* * *

BROADCASTING

COVERAGE OF DEBATE ON WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Madam Speaker, the House of Commons is gripped in the vise of an historical debate over changes to the Crow rate. That debate is of enormous economic and historical importance. This is an issue of deep-rooted differences, but one that impacts on industrial central Canada just as much as on western farmers. It is a major national issue, yet our national media have failed miserably at understanding and explaining the issue.

Last night CTV news won the award for gross incompetence. After a difficult day in the House of Commons in which the Crow rate legislation was the central issue, the news coverage was inadequate in time and content, and bland in delivery.

● (1115)

While our nation is struggling with an issue that contributes $6 billion annually to our balance of payments, more than any other single commodity, the issue tends to be viewed as a western one rather than as a national one, largely because the national media and central Canada are synonymous. We should not be surprised by this. The head office for CBC radio is in Ottawa; the head office for CBC TV is in Ottawa; the head office for Global TV is in Toronto; the head office for CTV is in Toronto; the head office for *Maclean's* magazine is

in Toronto, and the head office for CP wire service is in Toronto. The media are in central Canada.

It is unfortunate and dangerous that our national media are centralized to the extent that they are incapable of understanding and explaining national issues whose origins are in the regions apart from central Canada. Unfortunately, the disadvantages must be shared by all Canadians.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—RECOGNITION OF NEW GOVERNMENT

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Would the Acting Prime Minister indicate if he was quoted correctly and, if so, if he was speaking for the Government when he was reported to have stated yesterday that the Canadian Government, after a reasonable, decent period of time, would likely recognize the new Government in Grenada? I ask this, Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that the Government of Jamaica, the Government of Barbados and the Governments of other Commonwealth Caribbean nations have already indicated that they do not intend to follow that course.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, I remember teaching this subject to my students 20 years ago. There are two approaches to the phenomenon of recognizing de facto governments. One is referred to as the objective approach and the other is referred to as the subjective approach. Generally speaking, Canada has taken the objective approach to recognition of government, that is, we of course wait over a period of time and try to find out answers to a number of questions.

We need to find out what the relations will be between the government in question and neighbouring governments, and what the reality of the administration exercised by that government will be. We have to look at the attitude of the government to its own citizens. After a decent period of time, which is to be qualified in each case, the phenomenon of objective recognition takes place. It is a rather complex issue. Such recognition took place just a few days ago in the case of one of the African governments.

POSSIBLE ASSISTANCE TO CARIBBEAN REVOLUTIONS

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is again directed to the Acting Prime Minister who, frankly, rather startles me with that type of a reply. Would the Acting Prime Minister indicate if he is aware of the fact that the National Mobilization Minister in Grenada, Selwyn Strachan, has stated that he believes there is room for comradely

assistance to revolutions in the Caribbean? Mr. Strachan is presumably to be one of the new cabinet Ministers in Grenada. In that context, would the Minister at least indicate to the House whether he has consulted with the United Kingdom or with other Caribbean Commonwealth countries to determine what steps should now be taken, in view of the brutal and violent seizure of power in Grenada?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, I try to be a bit constructive when answering these questions. I was asked by the press yesterday about what would happen, and I did my very best to try to describe the phenomenon as it would take place. Indeed, we will consult with the Governments of different West Indies islands. There is a meeting of West Indian Commonwealth Governments during the coming weekend, I undestand. We will be listening to their views on the subject. However, I cannot but describe it the way it is, and I cannot but repeat what I have already said.

When a government, a group of people, a junta or whatever, takes over power in a country by force, we must look at all of the factors that I have indicated. Those factors include the reality of the exercise of power, and the reaction of the neighbouring countries to that exercise of power. A sort of consensus builds up in the world and, after a period of time, the facts of life are accepted and recognition is given. By using the standards that the Hon. Member seems to imply, he would probably have refused to recognize the previous Government of Grenada in any event.

● (1120)

CANADIAN AID PROGRAMS

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, again my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister, and perhaps it could be answered better if I were more specific.

There has been some $10 million worth of Canadian aid going into Grenada. Various programs are now under way, including improvements for port facilities, the improvement of a central garage facility, and other aid projects. In view of the fact that in other countries when there is a serious question about the safety of our aid personnel, the aid programs are suspended, would the Minister indicate if that is now under consideration with respect to the continuing programs for Grenada?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, I think you have to start with the proposition that foreign aid, development aid, is not for the sake of recipient governments; it is for the sake of the people in the less developed countries. Consequently, we keep that in mind all the time—what is the interests of the people? In this particular instance $8.7 million has already been spent in the past in Grenada, and there is $1.6 million in current programs. With respect to the existing program, the purpose is to try to do as much as possible, which may not be much, because of the circumstances. The objective is to try to continue with the existing program.

With respect to future programs, obviously they are not in the making now. Again, it is reality that we try to cope with in this particular instance, and the interests of the people of Grenada.

POSSIBLE CONSULTATIONS ON SITUATION

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, my question is likewise addressed to the Minister who is Acting Prime Minister today but who, on Wednesday, was junior Minister of External Affairs. I wonder if he could tell the House whether the Prime Minister, who never fails to remind us of the great role he plays in the North-South dialogue, has had any discussion with the heads of the Caribbean Governments or with the President of the United States, on this brutal take-over in Grenada, with a view to concerting action, whether it be recognition, or other action in the hemisphere against the vicious Government now in place in Grenada?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, I have already referred to the forthcoming Commonwealth Caribbean countries' meeting. Obviously we will be in consultation with them on the result of their meeting during the weekend.

COMMONWEALTH CARIBBEAN MEETING—REQUEST THAT CANADIAN OBSERVER ATTEND

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, as was mentioned the other day, there are some 85 Canadians in Grenada at the present time, some as travellers and some as "coopérants" in the CIDA projects. I wonder if the Acting Prime Minister could tell the House whether any approach has been made to the Commonwealth Caribbean Ministers who are meeting today about whether Canada, as a member of the Commonwealth, could send an observer to that meeting so that we can know what actions are being concerted, and could fall in line with them?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend does not seem to realize how confused the situation is. There are three or four versions of what took place, so every government in the world, including the Canadian Government is simply trying to find out what is happening.

With respect to the Canadians there, the number has already been referred to, and the information we have is that they are in contact with each other. As you know, there is one diplomat from our High Commission in Barbados now in Grenada. They are in contact with each other, and the information of the Department of External Affairs is that, generally, they are in a reasonably good mood. They have been told not to move because there is a curfew, and it is considered by the Department that if they start getting out of their hotels and homes at this time they would be more in danger than if they stayed put. That is the advice that has been given to them.

● (1125)

FUTURE RECOGNITION OF NEW REGIME

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, the Acting Prime Minister will know that the Commonwealth Ministers are meeting today. They have all said they will not recognize that regime. Is the Acting Prime Minister suggesting that Canada is going to be out of step with the other Commonwealth members in this hemisphere, in recognizing that regime after a decent delay? After this atrocious occurrence in Grenada will Canada recognize that regime, after a decent delay?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): No, Madam Speaker, I specifically said the opposite. I mentioned that among the factors which are borne in mind in the process of deciding whether or not recognition of a government should be given, is the conduct of that de facto in its relationships with neighbouring countries. Of course, one way in which we come to our decision is by looking to and consulting with neighbouring countries on what they will do. If, for a number of reasons, all the neighbouring countries of Grenada should decide not to grant recognition for a period of time—for a long period of time—I am sure this would be a major consideration in the decision Canada would have to make.

* * *

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILES

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister I would like to direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. The Prime Minister himself is reported to have set up a task force concerned with ways to ease East-West tensions. And the Government is reported to be going to spend some $500,000 this coming year on a verification program having to do with the arms race. Can the Acting Prime Minister tell this House, and the many Canadians who will be expressing their support of nuclear disarmament this weekend, how the Government reconciles this concern for verification procedures, on the one hand, with the decision of the very same Government to test the Cruise missile, a missile whose most distinctive and most frightening feature is its very unverifiability?

Mr. Stevens: Just like the SS-20s.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, in Canada we will find that easy to reconcile because we have decided, in conjunction with our NATO allies, to take a two-track approach—to defend ourselves properly and adequately and, at the same time, to do everything we can to bring about peace, disarmament, and so on. Those two things are easy to reconcile. I am sure that 99 per cent of the people of Canada have already reconciled them.

With respect to the task force, indeed there is such a task force, and one would be expected to have such a task force. At the Williamsburg Summit the leaders pledged themselves, and promised they would do everything—and more colourful words were used at that time—to bring about peace and, particularly, to bring about forms of disarmament. Therefore, the task force is really in line with that pledge. The Prime Minister is collecting views from our own diplomats around the world as to what, when, where and how could East-West tensions be reduced. That is the purpose of the task force, and the Prime Minister, when he is at Guelph in a few days, will have a chance to give us his thinking on that particular subject.

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, how often do we have to listen to the line that this is in keeping with our NATO commitments? Expert after expert has said that this has nothing to do with NATO. If the Government is concerned about NATO, there are other ways in which it could beef up its commitment to NATO.

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT RECONSIDER MISSILE TESTING DECISION

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Madam Speaker, we hear the Acting Prime Minister, like the Prime Minister, putting a lot of faith in arms control talks, talks which many experts, including Elva Myrdal, the Nobel Peace Prize winner of last year, has said are worth nil as far as real nuclear disarmament is concerned. Is the Government now prepared to admit, on the eve of this weekend when we hope the Prime Minister will make a half decent speech in Guelph, that these talks are not enough, that they are no substitute for courageous action to break the hold of the nuclear whirlpool on this planet?

Will the Acting Prime Minister now, in the name of the Government, indicate a willingness on the part of the Government to reconsider the testing of the Cruise missile? And would he also indicate at the same time the Government's position on other proposals, such as the call for a freeze on the testing, deployment, and development of new nuclear weapons? This is called "suffociation" in case the Acting Prime Minister and the Prime Minister do not know what that word means.

● (1130)

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member was obviously more interested in preparing his second question than in listening to the answer I gave to his first question. I referred to the two-track approach. Most people who think about these problems, and many, many many do, are sort of reconciled with the fact that it makes sense that you try to protect yourself in the best possible way. That is a prudent decision to make. Yet at the same time you do your utmost to develop a spirit of co-operation in the field to bring about peace through disarmament. That is what the Secretary of State for External Affairs declared the other day.

Canada has always been very conscious of the importance of verification as an ingredient of disarmament. What the Secretary of State declared the other day was not new, it was a continuation, with more money being assigned to it. But Canada is active, and the rest of the world thinks so, in all fora, employing all means or devices which can be used to bring about disarmament. We are active in the field of control of chemical weapons, outer space, and what not. So, to quote what was said at the time of the Williamsburg Conference, we really do our utmost to bring about better conditions for peace.

Mr. Blaikie: Madam Speaker, when will the blind see, and when will this Government see, that there is no protection to be had in the kind of arms race towards which it is contributing as the Canadian Government?

REQUEST FOR FREE VOTE ON ISSUE OF CRUISE TESTING

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Bird's Hill): Madam Speaker, the Acting Prime Minister will know that many Canadians would like Parliament to be able to express an independent judgment on Cruise testing. So far a free vote has not been possible as a result of, in part, procedural language in our Standing Orders which results in many motions being motions of confidence although they need not be. Can the Acting Prime Minister tell us whether the Government intends to follow the recommendations of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure, or parliamentary reform as it is more popularly known, and allow for changes which would make such votes more possible? Perhaps if Parliament could express itself freely and independently on an issue such as this, the Government would not be in court today over Cruise testing and the role of Parliament—

Madam Speaker: Order. I think we have had the question.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, this is a matter of parliamentary reform, and enough was said about the subject last Friday for the House to know where the parties stand on the matter. In the circumstances, I would refer the Hon. Member to last Friday's debate, which took place instead of the debate on Bill C-155, which, as the House is aware, is being delayed because of filibustering by the Progressive Conservatives and the New Democratic Party.

* * *

[*English*]

THE ADMINISTRATION

MINISTER'S USE OF CHALLENGER JET ON MIDDLE EAST TOUR

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Prime Minister who is well known for his candor. Will he tell the House whether a published report today is correct in stating that the Secretary of State for External Affairs has ordered that a Challenger Jet, owned by the federal Government, be sent to Europe to ferry him about the Middle East, and that the Jet was sent with empty seats while the Minister flew commercially? If that is so, what is the Minister's reason for doing that? Is it that he is uncertain about the airworthiness of the Challenger Jet, or is it, as the press reports, that the Challenger Jet would be forced to put down at Iceland to refuel and the Minister does not like the weather in Iceland this time of year?

Mr. Pinard: It is too slow by boat.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, the answer is, as usual, quite simple. It is to save time. The Secretary of State is rather a busy man. He is in Halifax for meetings with the U.S. Secretary of State on a certain day, and then he has to go to the Middle East. So the plane was sent to Europe because it takes longer to get there than a commercial jet. The Minister hitched on a commercial flight to wherever it is the plane was waiting for him, and in doing that he managed to save quite an amount of time.

COST OF TRAVEL ARRANGEMENTS

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Madam Speaker, in that case would the Minister undertake to tell the House exactly how much time was saved between Canada and Amsterdam by the Minister going commercially, and how much money it cost, so we can figure out how much the Minister's time is worth per hour? Secondly, can he confirm that in fact the Minister's office has been putting out the story that the reason for doing this separately was that the Challenger was leaving from Ottawa and the Minister was leaving from Halifax? Will he inquire as to whether there are maps and compasses in the Department of External Affairs, and whether they recognize the fact that Halifax is en route from Ottawa to Amsterdam?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, I will gladly ask the Secretary of State to give his agenda to the Hon. Member if he feels that way. But the easy answer is that the Minister, like other Ministers, and some other people presumably—

Mr. Chrétien: We will send Beatty to Iceland, too.

Mr. Pepin: —has a pass on CP Air, so it did not cost the Government anything. Presumably there was quite a number of empty seats on the CP Air plane. I am quite sure that CP Air was delighted to have the Secretary of State on board.

* * *

TRUST COMPANIES

PENALTIES IMPOSED FOR RENEGOTIATION OF MORTGAGES—IMPACT ON HOME OWNERS

Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate

Affairs, who is aware that some trust companies have placed clauses in their mortgage renewal contracts which remove a right given to a home owner under Section 10 of the Interest Act. Will the Minister deal with this matter in the report she will be releasing as a result of an investigation or inquiry undertaken by her officials?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Madam Speaker, I would like to inform the Hon. Member that a contract is a contract. I find it very difficult to accept that someone would sign such a waiver without examining very carefully what he or she had done. As to whether this particular type of incident has been detected or reported, I am not aware because I have not seen the full report. I expect it to be out shortly.

BRITISH COLUMBIA SUPREME COURT DECISION

Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington): Madam Speaker, the Minister has stated she may seek a remedy to aid home owners through the Interest Act, and I am sure she will have been briefed on the decision rendered by the Supreme Court of British Columbia last summer dealing with Section 10 of that Act. Will the Minister, in her report on this matter, deal with the wording now being placed in mortgage renewal agreements which deems that the date of the mortgage will be the date of the renewal agreement and thus set aside the decision by the Supreme Court of British Columbia?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Madam Speaker, we are looking at a number of options and we will disclose those to the Hon. Member at the appropriate time. But certainly full disclosure is one of those options which I feel must be examined very, very closely.

* * *

INDUSTRY

WHITE FARM EQUIPMENT LTD.—BIDS FOR COMPANY

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Madam Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce on behalf of grain producers who have millions of dollars invested in White Farm equipment, and on behalf of the 150 plus dealers of White Canada. In view of the fact that the receiver is meeting today to review bids for White Canada, could the Minister inform the House how many realistic, firm bids have been made for the White assets, and if any of those bidders are Canadian?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Madam Speaker, this week for the first time since the process started the receiver has received three bona fide bids. I understand the creditors have recommended that the receiver proceed to the bankruptcy court with a recommendation for the Borg-Warner proposal. The Borg-Warner board is meeting today with respect to adopting the conditions the receiver has put forward on behalf of the creditors in determining the commercial terms. If the Borg-Warner proposal is accepted, I understand that they are going to try to find a Canadian company to enter into a joint venture with them and that proposal will obviously have to come before the Foreign Investment Review Agency.

With respect to the federal Government, Madam Speaker, the conditions for our support have been the same as I have told the Hon. Member on several occasions in this House. Our first priority was to ensure that parts and supplies be made available, in keeping with provincial law, to the farmers right across the country; secondly, that the axial-flow technology will be kept here, exploited here, and manufactured here in Canada; thirdly, to try to preserve the dealer network across the country. The fourth, of course, was the same as the commercial lenders in trying to get a proposal. We are hopeful that the conditions we have set down will be accepted and that we will have a satisfactory conclusion to this lengthy negotiation.

TERMS OF BORG-WARNER PROPOSAL

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Madam Speaker, I take from the Minister's answer that the proposal was made by Borg-Warner Corporation, not Borg-Warner Acceptance. I presume that is who made the proposal. Would that proposal allow White Farm Canada to continue to operate as a viable company with the manufacturing of the conventional combines, the axial-flow new technology being manufacturing in Canada, and parts supply being continued by the Canadian White firm regardless of whether it is a joint venture or completely controlled by a Canadian?

• (1140)

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Madam Speaker, if I recall, the proposal that the receiver has been recommended to accept is that of the Borg-Warner Acceptance Corporation which will in turn financially back another Canadian company that would, in essence, take over White Farm as a going concern. Of course the conditions that we have set down for the proposal, which I do not see any reason to change with respect to the FIRA application, are that parts supply will be made available to the Canadian farmers, that the dealer network will be maintained, and the technology will be developed right here in Canada. I do not see those conditions changing, but I believe it will be Borg-Warner Acceptance Corporation rather than the Borg-Warner Corporation.

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

RESTRUCTURING OF PÊCHEURS-UNIS DU QUÉBEC—ADVANTAGES TO PROVINCE OF PARTNERSHIP IN NEW CORPORATION

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

The Minister has submitted a plan for restructuring Pêcheurs-Unis du Québec by setting up a new company in which both fishermen and creditors would be represented, and I believe this is the way to save the Quebec fishing industry from disaster. Has the Minister explained to the Government of Quebec the advantages of being a partner in the new company, and what reply did he receive from his provincial counterpart, Mr. Jean Garon?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Madam Speaker, I think the Hon. Member has described very well the importance of the project submitted by the Canadian Government in the same spirit as the project submitted to and accepted by, all intervenors in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. The House is aware that the Government of Canada has allowed Pêcheurs-Unis to continue its operations in the past two years, since Pêcheurs-Unis covers nearly half of the fish processing plant workers in Quebec, and especially in the riding of Gaspé, as well as 30 to 40 per cent of fish landings. Two years ago the Government of Quebec asked for a long term restructuration plan for Pêcheurs-Unis through which it could provide assistance. That plan now exists and is supported by all concerned, and I hope the Government of Quebec will support it as well, since Pêcheurs-Unis were to disappear tomorrow, the biggest losers would not be the financial institutions, such as the Mouvement Desjardins or the Banque Nationale, but the Quebec Government, which, either directly or through the Société de développement coopératif, where 90 per cent of the funding is the Government's, has the biggest share in this concern. I therefore urge the Quebec Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food to join in a partnership with all parties concerned so that we can restructure this industry in a way that has already found acceptance with the Government of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland.

* * *

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

APPLICATION OF CRIMINAL LAW IN NORTHERN REGIONS

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice, who is undoubtedly aware that people in the two northern Territories are three to four times as likely to go to jail as people anywhere else in Canada, although we have no reason to believe that they are any more criminal or immoral. Will the Minister agree that this is a deplorable and unacceptable state of affairs, and would he tell the House what responsibility he believes he has to see that there is some reduction in what seems to be the excessively vigorous application of the criminal law in the North?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Madam Speaker, I think that the Hon. Member is indicating that there are several factors which could lead to this situation which exists. I am attempting to find out which of those factors are the causes, if we could determine that, in this particular case.

I would also draw to her attention that I hope that I will shortly be introducing new legislation, if the Opposition allows us to proceed to the new Session of Parliament when we could introduce new legislation, concerning sentencing, which I am sure will at least in some part relieve the situation which exists there, as well as some other situations in Canada.

Ms. McDonald: Certainly this new legislation would be welcomed, but I would like the Minister to try to answer the question more fully. He is responsible for prosecutions in the North and for the court system in the North. Of course, his colleague, the Solicitor General, is responsible for policing in the North. Altogether, it is a federal responsibility.

POSSIBILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Madam Speaker, it seems to me that it will take more than just new legislation. Would the Minister comment on what kind of administrative changes might be needed? What are the alternatives, and how will they be developed? What kind of inquiries will he undertake? What input could we have from people such as the native people, who particularly suffer from the extensive use of the criminal justice system? Could he be more precise about what steps might be taken and what the responsibility is at the federal level?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member asks some good questions. I have this area under study at the present time. I will take her question as notice of issues that she will want to raise with me when I next appear before the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

I also understand that the Committee has before it for its consideration the possibility of some further study itself into these questions. Therefore, I hope that in at least the next several months we will get better answers to those questions than are now available.

* * *

AIRPORTS

PICKERING AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. In July of this year there was a report in *The Globe and Mail* of an initial phase

development of the Pickering Airport that would be announced on September 23. Could the Minister advise us what happened after that initial announcement?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, it is still being examined.

Mr. Fennell: I hope better consideration is given to the Pickering Airport development than was given to the Mirabel Airport development.

USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Madam Speaker, will the Minister agree to allow young farmers to develop the surplus land at Pickering and give them a chance to develop and begin using that land for a productive purpose?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I have already explained that all of the issues relating to that matter are now being examined.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PACIFIC PETREL SAILING VESSEL PROJECT

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Has he been briefed on the Pacific Petrel project which has been proceeding for some time without Treasury Board approval? If he has been briefed, could he tell us if he has decided to give post facto approval for those expenditures?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his question. I also thank him for having brought that matter to my attention initially. After he spoke to me privately about the issue, I asked for a complete briefing from my officials. I have received a preliminary briefing and I have asked for additional details which would permit me to make a decision. Whether that decision will be in the line that is suggested by the Hon. gentleman I am not in a position to say today.

Mr. McKinnon: It is always rather startling to find a million dollar project going on in the Minister's Department about which he or Treasury Board has known nothing.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Madam Speaker, is the Minister in favour in principle of the construction of that sailing vessel on the West Coast, as a means of giving sail training to sea cadets, or is he not?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, that is the question I am addressing. I am not in a position today to advise the House as to what that decision will be. I, like the hon. gentleman before me, wish to make decisions with the full knowledge of the facts.

* * *

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

USE OF GAMMA RADIATION AS FOOD PRESERVATIVE

Mrs. Jennifer Cossitt (Leeds-Grenville): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It concerns the use of gamma radiation as a preservative of food. In keeping with the Government's desire to keep the public totally informed, would the Minister tell the House what decision, if any, she has made with respect to the type of logo that will be used to identify the foods that are treated with gamma rays?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Madam Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for her question, although it would be more properly directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare since it is directly under her ambit. However, I would like to inform the Hon. Member that discussions are taking place between the two Departments and as soon as a decision is made it will be made public, of course.

IDENTIFICATION BY LOGO DESIGN

Mrs. Jennifer Cossitt (Leeds-Grenville): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is still directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who, I understand, has the jurisdiction over labelling. This is the purpose of my question. I think it is very important that consumers have all the information available to them with which to make an informed decision on their purchases of such treated foods. Will the Minister assure the House that the logo designed and approved by her Department will not hide or cloud the fact that foods are treated with gamma rays?

• (1150)

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Madam Speaker, I would like to reassure the Hon. Member and the general public that that is exactly what will take place. In the meantime, there is, as far as we can measure, no danger to the public.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

WORK PERMITS ISSUED TO AMERICAN AUCTIONEERS

Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. American auctioneers are coming into Canada to work, using work permits that go for an extended period of time, and yet Canadian auctioneers are not allowed the same benefit. Will the Minister look into this matter and determine whether

we should stop the American auctioneers coming in or, in the alternative, reach some reciprocal arrangement or agreement?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Yes, Madam Speaker.

* * *

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

CANADIAN CONTENT—STATEMENT BY JAPANESE AUTHORITIES

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Japan is apparently threatening Canada with retaliation if we adopt the recommendations of the automotive task force and establish a Canadian content requirement for imported vehicles. First, does the Minister recognize this threat for what it is? It is blackmail. Second, does he recognize that Japan virtually built its industry using a system in fact, that did not allow free entry into their market without there being Japanese content? Will he tell Japan that we will do what is in our best interests and take the steps necessary to implement the recommendations of the task force?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Madam Speaker, I have never known the Government of Canada to be intimidated by any country in the world.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lumley: Threats of retaliation is not the way to conduct negotiations which are now being undertaken with the Japanese automobile manufacturers. We find it rather strange that Japan will build an automotive manufacturing facility in Italy when Italy will allow only 2,000 Japanese cars into its market, whereas Canada allows about 150,000 cars into our market. We think we have a pretty good investment climate and we are hopeful the Japanese automobile manufacturers will see their way clear to invest in this country.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, can I take it from that answer that the automotive task force report, which represents the best work of both the industry and the unions involved, is not going to be implemented by the Government?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Madam Speaker, we have already implemented some of the recommendations of the automotive task force, and we have three or four other recommendations to which we are giving serious consideration. As for the major proposal, the content proposal, I have said many times in this House that I think it would be irresponsible for the Government to act unilaterally in this regard.

Japan is a very valued trading partner of Canada. Also, 30 per cent of our Gross National Product is generated by exports. In addition, the Canadian way is the negotiation route, Madam Speaker. We will continue in this direction, but if we are not successful then we might have to take other action.

* * *

PENSIONS

PLIGHT OF BRITISH PENSIONERS

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Madam Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. On January 1, 1984, the agreement between Canada and Jamaica on social security arrangements will come into effect. That is the fifth agreement signed by Canada with other countries. There have been a number of requests to the Minister by former resident citizens of the United Kingdom, now citizens of Canada, for the same kind of reciprocal arrangement in order that they might not suffer the penalties they now have because they do not receive full funding of pension plans earned. What is the Minister's time line in order that an agreement between the United Kingdom and Canada can be reached on the same kind of reciprocal agreement?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I am aware of and I must say I am quite sympathetic to the 40,000 or so British Canadian pensioners living in our country. I started on that dossier exactly six years ago. It is almost as old as medicare, by the way. Unfortunately, this matter does not depend on Canada, and I appreciate the chance the official critic gives me in being able to give an update on it. The problem is really with the other partner, namely, Great Britain, and I guess it is fair to say it is a money problem.

The parameters could be full indexation of British pensions for which people paid through general taxes all their lives with a certain amount which will have to cover retroactivity. It is fair to say that we would like something. This matter was on the agenda of the two Prime Ministers and I understand Mrs. Thatcher did not close the door.

Beyond that, I met with some of our pensioners in Canada recently and we are exploring what else can be done to try to press upon the British people that these British pensions have already been paid for, if I may way, as deferred wages through taxes.

REQUEST FOR MINISTERIAL ATTENTION

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Minister for that answer. Will she continue pursuing this dossier in light of the present discussion on pensions, and can she assure us that this matter will not in any way be put aside because we are also having a discussion on pensions on a larger question in Canada?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Madam Speaker, I can assure all my colleagues in the House that I have a mind of a critical path diagram and I follow activities in parallel form. Each activity gets its chance. Matters are not put aside because one major dossier is being discussed. The dossier of the reciprocal agreement for pensions and other social programs between Great Britain and Canada is an active one, totally separate from any other pension reform. I take this opportunity to do something unusual and ask the help of all Members on all sides of the House, and I am sure I will have it.

* * *

FINANCE

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TAX CREDITS

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. On April 19 when the Minister's budget was tabled, he also presented a paper called "Research and Development Tax Policies." A key phrase in that paper indicates research and development has become a critical growth factor as a result of accelerating technological change. When will the Minister introduce in this House the draft legislation which will lead to a considerable increase in the generosity of tax credits and benefits available to small businesses embarking on research and development projects?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): I thank the Hon. Member for raising this particular question. As he knows, we issued a paper with the budget which is the subject of extensive consultations with people in Canada interested in research and development. Through those consultations we have been able to make a number of adjustments and improvements. I can report to the Hon. Member that the general thrust of the recommendations has been supported by all those consulted. I would expect to be able to introduce draft legislation very, very shortly. As a matter of fact I have approved, as recently as a few days ago, the latest changes in that regard. I hope we can do this very shortly.

REQUEST FOR EARLY INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Madam Speaker, I think the Minister would realize that the date of the introduction of that draft legislation has a great bearing on the retroactivity of certain of those measures. If he checks with his departmental officials, he will find that they are saying there is no point in introducing this legislation at this time because the House will soon prorogue. I do not see what that has to do with draft legislation, Madam Speaker, nor do I understand the concern being expressed by his officials that an additional $100 million in tax credits is far too rich for the business Sector, the small business sector in particular. How does that square with the billions of dollars the Government is handing out to the Canadairs, the Maislins, and the Dome Petroleums of this country?

Why can we not get on with introducing this legislation and give a break to the small and medium-sized business sector which needs generous increases in tax credits?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member also forgot to mention the billions of dollars we are already giving in terms of tax advantages to small businesses in this country—

Mr. Siddon: Two hundred million dollars.

Mr. Lalonde: —and the money we have given to support Massey-Ferguson, de Havilland in Toronto, White Farm Implements, and hundreds and hundreds, indeed, thousands of business organizations in this country which have been supported by the tax and the grant system which the Government has in place to create jobs for Canadians.

As far as the Hon. Member's question is concerned, he seems to have an argument with my officials. I will check whether he is right or they are right, and who I should endorse. When I have reached a conclusion, I will let him know.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon.

* * *

• (1200)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MOTION TO PROCEED TO ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I presume the Question Period has terminated, and therefore I rise to facilitate the orderly transaction of the business of the House today. I would like to move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer):

That the House do now proceed to Orders of the Day.

If there is any doubt about the acceptability or the propriety of the motion, before the Chair makes any ruling I have submissions to make with respect thereto.

Madam Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Madam Speaker: I cannot entertain a point of order when I am putting the question.

Motion agreed to.

Supply

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—AGRICULTURAL POLICIES

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette) moved:

That this House condemns the Government for its failure to recognize the economic hardship affecting all farmers in Canada, and its failure to help alleviate that hardship by implementing sound agricultural policies.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone will give me the same kind of reception after I finish speaking! This is certainly a great opportunity to talk about a very basic part of any country. If we are to be a sovereign country, we first have to assure an adequate food supply. When we speak to that, we speak to what goes on in Canadian agriculture.

In the past Canadian agriculture has served the country extremely well. It is the reason Canada was settled in the first place. There were vast amounts of land available. People came from literally all over the world to take advantage of the land and the opportunity to develop it and to plan for the future. Unfortunately, in the last 15 years or so this Government in particular has been extremely derelict in ensuring the same kind of opportunity for farmers now as was the case when the country was originally settled some 50 or 75 years ago, in the case of western Canada, or in many cases as many as 200 years ago and more in other parts of the country.

Agriculture is extremely important to any society. We can almost define any developed country in terms of the amount of disposable income its people have to spend to feed themselves. Recently figures were made available which showed that the average consumer in Canada spent something like 16 per cent of his or her disposable income or take-home pay on food. This means that there is 84 per cent left to do other things. Also it means that we can have shorter work weeks, holidays with pay and many of the amenities which have come to be taken for granted but are basically luxuries in other parts of the world. These are the types of things an efficient agricultural system provides and are necessary for a developed society.

Other parts of the world are unfortunately not as well off as we are. People spend as much as 50 per cent or 60 per cent of their income or time on feeding themselves. This means they do not have time for shorter work weeks and that basically they have to work long hours in the fields.

We are very fortunate. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) has said many times—and I agree with him—that we have a very efficient system of agriculture. I would argue that it has become efficient in many cases despite government policy. This speaks to the ingenuity of individual farmers. That same ingenuity is what attracted people to settle the country in the first place; that same ingenuity made agriculture more productive.

When I say "16 per cent", that only tells part of the story. The 16 per cent of disposable income spent on food also includes many meals eaten away from the home. They are increasing. In the neighbourhood of 30 per cent to 40 per cent of all meals consumed in Canada are prepared outside the home. In addition, they include various fruits and vegetables which are out of season. This means they have to be transported into the country, which speaks to our balance of payments. In many cases this involves prepackaged and prepared food. It has been said that a potato does not go into a modern kitchen unless it is peeled. In many cases that is true. That is the kind of thing we take for granted today, in many ways at the peril of agriculture.

In the last two or three decades farming has changed. In many ways farmers were previously looked at as second-class citizens. For example, if a person was a poor driver, he was a farmer; he did not know how to drive because he had never been in a city. Now farmers are very sophisticated. We cannot tell the city kids any longer from the country kids. We all wear the same kind of clothes. We work with computers. We are a very modern, productive, forward-looking and energetic group of people. Unfortunately, the present Government has not kept pace with what Canadian agriculture is doing.

This motion is a very broad one and it is easy to condemn people out of hand, but I would like to be more specific by talking about it in terms of money, the basic problem of most of the country today. Certainly agriculture is no different, but in many ways its situation is a unique one. One of the ways agriculture has become more productive is that it has mainly become more capital-intensive. It now takes as many dollars to create a job in Canadian agriculture as it does in Canadian manufacturing. Farmers now need money to farm. They also need seed, fertilizer and modern machinery. They need access to capital. Certainly that speaks to government policy. As we all know, Government has become a very large factor in anybody's life today. That is what is going on in Canadian agriculture.

Many things could be done in the area of agricultural finance which do not require the spending of a lot of money. I would like to refer to some of the questions I am asked for which I do not have answers because the Government does not have any policies directed at answering such questions. When farmers see that there are term deposits in banks in the neighbourhood of 6 per cent, 7 per cent or 8 per cent, when they see the Farm Credit Corporation offering money at over 13 per cent, and when they see chartered banks offering money at the same rate, they wonder why they cannot have access to funds at lower rates. This makes sense because it means Canadians would be given a chance to invest in the most basic industry in any modern society. This would not involve a lot of subsidy.

We saw the attitude of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) in Question Period today. The Government is giving things to people. It has given money to various sectors of

industry. Farmers are not asking to be given anything; they want to pay their own way. They want to be able to hold up their heads. This is what has made them very productive in the past. They are asking for an opportunity to pay their own way.

There are many things in the area of financing which could be done that would not require large Government expenditures. They are not big ticket items as far as Government moneys are concerned; in many ways they are just common sense. It makes no sense that we should raise fuel taxes. It is extremely expensive to fill a tractor before going to the field in the morning. If one fills up a 100-gallon fuel tank on a tractor—and there are many farm tractors with fuel tanks that size—as much as $100 in taxes goes into it. That is the kind of commitment a farmer has to meet when putting in spring crops. That money is not circulated back into the private sector, it goes to the Government. If we are having financial trouble, it does not make any sense to tax farmers to the brink of financial disaster on one hand, and on the other hand bring in programs that cost them money to assist them. That is a much simpler way of seeing that farmers stay in business and stay productive.

● (1210)

There are other things that could be done and some of my colleagues will outline them later in this debate. We are talking not only about western grain but the advance payments program. In many cases that has served us well. It puts money into the hands of the producers when they harvest their crops. If the crop is marketed over a period of time, it serves the Government and it serves the farm community very well.

In the case of the advance payments Act for western grain, it does not make sense that the Government does not increase the amount. Looking at the history of that program, it has served very well. The losses have been minimal. The Government pays the interest on it. The Canadian Wheat Board borrows the money at prime minus one-quarter per cent, which is better than any farmer can get. The more money that can be borrowed by the Canadian Wheat Board at prime minus one-quarter per cent to be put into circulation in the farm economy is better for the whole system, yet this Government refuses to increase cash advances to western farmers.

I have had an opportunity to question the Minister on the agri-bond concept. It is still a concept, something that can be worked out. It is designed to allow the money generated in agriculture to stay in agriculture. It makes no sense, when a farmer sells out and wants to use that money as his retirement plan, to put it into the economy through trust funds, term deposits and so on in order to minimize the tax that he will have to pay on that money. What is wrong about developing incentives to have that money which was generated in agriculture remain in agriculture? It would alleviate some of the requirements for funds of the FCC and alleviate some of the requirements of the Minister of Agriculture on the banking institutions. However, we see no innovative proposals in terms of finance coming from this Government or this Minister.

A year ago last June 1 heard the Minister of Agriculture state over the radio that very shortly the Farm Credit Corporation would have a billion dollars available to loan to farmers at preferred rates of interest. However, we find that the FCC cannot even go to the domestic market to raise funds. That makes absolutely no sense. It further propagates the Minister's reputation as being somebody who likes to talk a lot and do very little. That is very unfortunate for the farmers of this country.

In many ways there is excessive regulation of the farming industry in this country. There is concern in western Canada about what is going on with producer cars. There are not enough available. That is one way the farmers can market their grain and save handling costs. There are problems in the British Columbia orchard industry. I am told that if the producers gave their product to the canneries, the canneries could not be competitive in their marketing with the products coming from offshore. There are problems on the east coast with the potato industry.

This Government has failed to negotiate on a square basis with the Americans. The Americans are our best neighbour and best trading partner. That does not mean that we have to roll over and play dead when it comes to negotiating with them. This Government has not maintained the proper connections with the Americans with whom we want to trade. They have to trade with us. They send us a lot of fruit and vegetables when they are not in season in Canada, as well as those we cannot produce. We certainly hold an ace as far as our trade with the United States is concerned. The Minister has not used that to the best advantage of our producers.

Let me touch briefly on what I believe is the real tragedy, and that is the attitude that seems to pervade the present Government. Agriculture is not asking for handouts, only an opportunity to be productive. Agriculture does not need a lot of subsidies and concessions, only a chance to be productive. If we can be competitive in world markets, we do not need a lot of the assistance and support that comes from time to time. What is needed is a proper economic climate.

The tragedy of this Government's agriculture policy is that it staggers from pillar to post. It reacts to situations once they are in place rather than looking at research and development. Some very exciting things are happening in research and development. There is the possibility of developing legume cereals which would very much reduce the cost of production and assist our producers in being competitive. What does this Government do? It cuts back on the amount of basic research. Our research is down the line once the product has been produced. Our producers should be armed with the best varieties and the best research in terms of pesticides, insecticides, fertilizer and so on. They would then be more than competitive.

This Government has failed to maintain a good climate for negotiations with the Provinces. We see a good example of that now in the stabilization program for red meats. I understand the federal Government took no meaningful part in the discussions and that is a tragedy. We had a debate in this

House a couple of years ago when we talked about the Constitution and all kinds of other things which the federal Government needed in order to have some clout. There is much that could be done with a simple change of attitude.

It would have been a lot more helpful to the livestock industry if the federal Government had participated fully in that program. It should have been at the table encouraging the negotiations and the development of a program. It could have said how much money it was willing to put on the table. It knows from the past that all the Provinces got into the act simply because the federal Government refused to get into the stabilizaton field as far as red meats are concerned.

The Minister has been derelict and negligent in this area. Because of that the four Provinces which represent 80 per cent of cattle production in this country have had to sit down together. The four Provinces recently reached an agreement in principle on how to proceed on the basis of a three-party program involving the Provinces, producers and the federal Government. We still do not know whether the federal Government will get involved and, if so, how much money it will put up. It is my information that all the federal Government contingency plans have been made on the basis that the Provinces would not arrive at an agreement. That is ridiculous as far as the federal Government and Minister are concerned. They are not in a position at the meetings to negotiate or show any leadership. They will not say how much money they will put on the table to see that this comes about.

I also recommend that the Agricultural Stabilization Act be used. In British Columbia there is a stabilization payment that has been due since 1982. It is not yet made. The Agricultural Stabilization Act needs to be overhauled in terms of the time period. It was moved from ten years to five years, and you can make the argument that it should be moved to a three-year average. The point is that whatever program is used, surely it should be incumbent upon the Government and the present Minister to see that it is administered in such a way that the payments are made at a time when they mean something. Producers in British Columbia have managed to survive for a whole year without payments being made. That calls into question the seriousness with which the Minister takes his responsibility.

● (1220)

I have almost run out of time and I would like to conclude, if I may, by making two or three suggestions that will not solve all of the problems but will at least show the producers that the Government is at least aware of the serious situation that exists with agriculture and recognizes how important agriculture is to a country like Canada. I have not mentioned how important agriculture is in terms of the balance of payments and that agricultural exports amount to some $9 billion. I have not mentioned the problems that the Minister seems to be ignoring in many of the other segments of agriculture, like the sheep industry or the Western Grain Stabilization Act. I have not mentioned any of those things. If I could take another 20 minutes, Mr. Speaker, I could outline the areas of responsibility that the Government and the Minister have not addressed.

Let me first suggest that the Minister take seriously the Agricultural Stabilization Act and that he see that there are enough people in his Department to administer it properly so that the payments are made on time and as quickly as possible after a crop has been harvested and the information is available as to whether or not there should be a payout. That is the very least the Minister can do. That would affect agricultural producers right across the country.

Let me also suggest to the Minister that he should move as quickly as he can to increase the level of cash advances. That is something that has been called for by all segments of the industry. It is something that would cost the Government a very, very minimal amount of money because, as I have already said, the history of that program in the past has shown that the losses have been minimal. When the Government does pick up the interest costs, as everyone appreciates, the interest costs are based on borrowing money at prime rate minus one-quarter of a per cent.

These are actions that are not earth shattering, but to take these actions would at least show the agriculture industry that the Government and the Minister have some interest in agriculture and are interested in seeing that efficiency continues to be improved and that the Canadian public continues to be served. The main thing is that agriculture continue to provide opportunities for young farmers to have the jobs that are so desperately needed.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I note that the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) spent a good part of his time outlining three topics. Two of those topics were more cash advances and easier credit which, while I refer to them as two different topics, are probably addressing the same problem of lack of cash. The third topic was the stabilization programs and I would focus my question on that topic for the moment.

The Hon. Member seems to think that the current base for the stabilization programs that now exist is fine and that the only real shortcoming is that too many years are thrown into the average. He has suggested that we move from the current five years to a three-year period. Does the Hon. Member not think that there is something inherently wrong with the base of the historical market price which those five or ten or three years give to the formula? Would he not think that we would be better off with a system that is based on costs rather than on market price, that would follow the actual costs from year to year and provide a much better form of stability to producers? Why did he ignore the possibility of moving to a cost base rather than simply trying to extend and make the old historically based data work?

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not say that at all. If the Hon. Member wants to deal with the whole question of stabilization, it would take a long time because it is a very, very involved topic. All I suggested was that the Government at least be serious about the programs it has in place and administer them the way they were legislated.

There are many, many areas in the whole concept of stabilization that can be looked at and changed to improve the situation. In the meantime, the only thing we should ask the Government to do is to have the courtesy, the decency and the guts to administer properly what it already has in place so that at least we would know there is someone here doing something to take an interest in the farming community in the country.

Mr. Gurbin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Hon. Member because I did not hear part of his speech very well. I know the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) touched upon the subject of financing but I did not hear him express whether or not he in fact knew that the Farm Credit Corporation was so low on funds that in some areas only 20 per cent of the people are being served by the Farm Credit Corporation and that 1,000 farmers are now stuck with an interest rate of 16¾ per cent. Of those 1,000 farmers, one-third are under the subsidization program and have had their interest rates lowered by 4 per cent. They will face an interest rate of 16¾ per cent again in the coming year. Even now they are not able to afford a rate of 12¾ per cent. I did not hear the Hon. Member mention that and I wondered if he could comment on that.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, that is a very, very sad situation which is occurring among a lot of farmers in the country. In many ways, those farmers were forced into the 16¾ per cent interest rate in the first place because it was either accept that kind of an interest rate or simply not be able to survive for another year. Certainly the attitude of the present Minister is that what he says and what he does are two entirely different things. He has gone on record as saying that he does not want to see the Farm Credit Corporation become a lender of last resort. I will agree with him. Yet the actions of the Government force the Farm Credit Corporation into becoming a lender of last resort so it is not able to address the problems that the Hon. member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Gurbin) mentioned.

Certainly there should be room in the new Farm Credit Corporation Act, Bill C-88, that we in the House passed some 18 months ago to provide specifically for the Farm Credit Corporation to have authorization, with the concurrence of the Minister of Finance, to raise funds by any means it sees fit. These means would include some of the agri-bond concepts or access to domestic markets if the Minister of Agriculture could convince the Minister of Finance to let the Farm Credit Corporation go ahead with that. If some of those things could be done, then the Farm Credit Corporation would be in a position to borrow funds at a cheaper interest rate and look after some of the problems that it will have once these farmers are again forced to pay an interest rate of 16¾ per cent.

Mr. Gurbin: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette. When discussing the situation of the Farm Credit Corporation and the financing that is available through it, does the Hon. Member know of any specific proposal brought forward by the Government or discussed privately that would in fact indicate that the Minister of Agriculture has done anything at all in the past four years since he has again become Minister of Agriculture to help the long-term financing situation in agriculture?

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I guess it is with a great deal of sadness and a lot of lament that I must simply answer no.

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who is the agriculture critic for the Official Opposition has spoken and I am sure the record will show how good the first part of his speech was. He talked about efficiency in the agriculture industry and how it had developed over a period of years. He then tried to say that things had changed in the last 10 or 15 years. Things have changed. We are very proud of the vast majority of those changes because they have been for the better. There never have been such advances in agriculture as have taken place since November, 1972 when I was appointed Minister of Agriculture. These advances are the envy of the world. The huge superpowers that send people into space, send others to this country to see how we farm. For instance, 55 per cent of our farming takes place further north than in any other nation. People cannot understand how we do what we do, thanks to the Department of Agriculture and our research.

● (1230)

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whelan: I can tell the Hon. Member from away down on the East Coast that even in his Province where agriculture is successful, it is because of the Department of Agriculture and its research. Research was established in Canada practically when agriculture started. We had experimental farms in western Canada before we had provinces. When settlers first moved into that area they realized the importance of having information available. Other nations that have been settled for 300 years are doing what we did at the beginning. Some say that research should be isolated and not mobile. The main research station is located in this city at the present time, although it was not in the city when it was first established over 100 years ago; but now it is in the centre of the capital of Canada, and is our largest research station.

Marquis wheat was developed in eastern Canada at our Ottawa station, and it has made Canada a power in the production of wheat. Some people said that that area of western Canada would never be farmed. Marquis wheat has made us a super food power through the research developed at the station in this city.

We have recently developed a new variety of wheat. The researchers told me to wait for another couple of years and they would put out a new variety called Columbus for the far northern regions. It has a husk that will allow the grain to withstand excessive moisture and other conditions. In two years it can mean up to a 4 per cent increase in wheat production in western Canada. That one variety of wheat took 14 years for researchers to develop. And there is a new program for a new variety of Columbus that will even be superior to the original.

It is for these reasons that other countries send people to visit our research stations and exchange scientists with us. We have readily signed such agreements with other countries, because no matter what we do by ourselves, if it is in isolation we can never feed the world. In 1980, the population of the world was 4.2 billion people. By the year 2000 it will be nearly six billion and in 20 years we will see the largest increase in population ever in history. The greatest challenge of all, therefore, is to produce food and to assist people in producing it.

Some Members have mentioned travelling. Perhaps they should see the travel vouchers I sign for our officials to go all over the world in order to assist other people in the control of disease and better plant production. My budget from the federal Government is not great, only 1.4 per cent of total federal expenditures, but a good portion of it goes for assistance to other countries. We have one of the healthiest agricultural industries in the world.

The Hon. Member's motion mentions "all farmers" but, Mr. Speaker, 50 per cent of farmers in Canada have no debts whatsoever; 35 per cent have still about an 85 per cent equity in their holdings, so only between 5 per cent and 15 per cent of our farmers are in some kind of financial difficulty.

It has been suggested that financing or stabilization would assist farmers in need. Mr. Speaker, we financed special loans at 12 per cent interest when the interest rate was 16 per cent or 18 per cent. We subsidized that interest rate by four points. We have seen what the Provinces did for producers who depend on the great free market to give them a proper return.

Our agricultural bill is ASA—it is a kind of aspirin for a very sick market. And that is what it is, Mr. Speaker, a sick market. It does not give the efficient producer a sufficient return for him to pay his bills. The producers say they do not want any handouts. The Hon. Member who presented the motion complained that I am not going ahead with stabilization as quickly as I should. He said that the Provinces have offered a plan. Mr. Speaker, it is a plan similar to the one I offered to them in 1977, so that is tremendous progress! I do not know if you want to call that progressive conservatism, but it certainly is not liberalism.

I offered that plan to them in Yorkton, Saskatchewan, at a federal-provincial ministers' meeting. It was a 100 per cent guaranteed income assurance. The Provinces said no and the producers said no. They said this wild man Whelan was offering concessions to producers that would cause overproduction and all kinds of things that they did not want. What do you think they are suggesting now, Mr. Speaker? They go so far as to say that I should pay a producer on as high as 12,000 head of swine or 16,000 head of cattle. They say that is how the Agricultural Stabilization Act should be. That means that the lawyers on the fifteenth, sixteenth and twentieth floors could be producers—vertical integration in a massive form, is what they are suggesting. I can tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, that I am not going for that massive figure they have suggested.

We have taken part in every meeting since June. Last fall they told me that if I did not have anything for them, they would have something for me by July 1. I told them to go ahead and present me with something. The Provinces were going to work in harmony, in a peaceful, constructive attitude and I thought that was fine. I had offered them something and only one Province thought it could support me. The Minister from Ontario said he would support me but he never got the official support of his Government. Then a new Minister of Agriculture in Ontario said that if we were not going to do it he would do it. I told him to go ahead. The Provinces worked together for pretty nearly a year but only four of them said they were in favour of some kind of plan. I thought that was pretty good because I did not expect ten of them to agree on anything at any time.

The Canadian Pork Council, which represents every Province, said it wanted the same thing for pork, but the provincial Ministers do not say that they will come in. How can we have a national plan if only four Provinces support one commodity? It has been suggested that this is a voluntary program, a dollar from the producers, a dollar from the Provinces and a dollar from the federal Government in order to build up a fund. But some producers do not have a dollar. We would have to sign a contract with them to the effect that when they sell their product, whether it be a lamb, a pig, a calf, a finished animal or whatever, we would deduct the first premium from the cost. That is the only way they would be able to participate in the plan at the present time. We used that principle in the crop insurance program. Some of the farmers could never get a dollar from the banks.

The Hon. Member who proposed the motion condemned the Farm Credit Corporation but, Mr. Speaker, his Party condemns Crown corporations right and left. Does he not realize that there are other lending institutions in the country that have a responsibility to lend in rural Canada also? In 1976 we asked the lending institutions if they would lend money to farmers. They said they would and that they would participate in long-term mortgages. I can show you records, Mr. Speaker, of farmers who thought they had long-term records but really had nothing but a piece of paper which, at the will and fancy of the manager of the bank, could be turned into a floating note. That is what happened in many cases. When farmers thought they had a loan at 11 per cent it jumped to 24 per cent.

The Hon. Member for Bruce-Grey (Mr. Gurbin) knows very well that when we were lending money at 16 per cent, those farmers were being taken off the hook because banks were charging them 22 per cent or 23 per cent. We were lending at 16 per cent. Hon. Members opposite forget that we subsidized those farmers for two years, down to 12 per cent which no lending institution, other than the Farm Credit Corporation, would give for any kind of long-term money. I challenge any Hon. Members to come forward and show me a lending institution today which would give a farmer a 20-year mortgage. That is what the Farm Credit Corporation is doing. We are giving a 20-year mortgage with a fixed interest rate for

the first ten years. If any Hon. Members can get a fixed interest rate for longer than three years from any bank or lending institution, I ask him to bring it forward and present it in this House.

● (1240)

Are Hon. Members opposite suggesting to me that the Farm Credit Corporation should be the total lender for the whole agriculture industry? It seems to be that way, because this year we have put up the largest amount of money we have ever loaned in Canada under the Farm Credit Corporation, a corporation which Members opposite have spent days in this House condemning—a terrible thing, they say, which is going to swallow up the whole nation.

We are told we are not aiding agriculture in Saskatchewan—which has that good Conservative Government—yet they sold 500 Hereford heifers to a terrible system, Bulgaria, a Communist system, and we assembled the cattle for them free. We did all the testing for them free. We made sure the cattle got to Sherbrooke, Quebec. Our Canadian veterinarians went to Bulgaria on the boat. And how did they sell them out of Saskatchewan? Through ADCO, a Crown corporation which is used for export in Saskatchewan. According to the newspapers, the Premier of Saskatchewan is going to enter into a contract with Communist China. It will be a partner with good old Conservative Saskatchewan for $500 million in a joint potash operation. I find it funny. I find it hypocritical also. At election time these countries are condemned. The feds are condemned for even talking trade with these countries.

Not too many days ago an Hon. Member in this House condemned us for being friendly with Cuba, saying that Cuba was the Prime Minister's friend. We sell to Cuba a lot of agriculture products, and they have paid for every one of them on the barrelhead. Last year we did $340 million worth of trade with Cuba. It pays. We are not supposed to assist Cuba in agriculture and trade with it. Not only the Premier of Saskatchewan but the Premier of Alberta was in China. The Premier of Ontario was in Indonesia and all over South East Asia. The Minister of Agriculture of British Columbia is over in Europe. He is going to be visiting many of the same countries we trade with. He is going to improve trade. How are these governments doing it? They are doing it with Crown corporations because that is the only way they can trade with some of those countries.

Canagrex, which could have been in business two years ago had it been allowed to go through this House, could have improved trade because there is no other nation of agricultural producers which depends so much on trade as we do. Some 50 per cent of our income comes from trade. Last year our biggest sale ever of grain, over 29 million metric tonnes, moved out of this country into trade. Our exports of agricultural products last year went up 12 per cent. In the United States of America, which gives all kinds of concessions, exports of agricultural products went down 12 per cent. The U.S. had great interest-free concessions, charitable repayment plans, which we did not even involve ourselves in because Canada has the respect of the world, and these people understand that when they go trading. I am talking about the Farm Credit Corporation, the NEED Program and so on.

Let us not forget that under the Constitution agriculture is a joint responsibility. That should be made very plain and clear. The Official Opposition agriculture critic comes from the Province of Manitoba where we spend twice as much money assisting farmers with programs than the Province of Manitoba ever did under an NDP or Conservative government. That government never spent the proportion of money we do.

We spend more than twice as much on agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan than the provincial government does. Yet the Premier has funds to appoint a trade minister to run all over the world. We do not do it in Alberta because Alberta has the Heritage Fund, and it is saying it is cutting back on irrigation plans and so on. What the PFRA spends in the Province of Saskatchewan, for instance, does keep rural municipalities alive. In the last ten years we spent $33 million in small towns and villages for sewage systems and water reservoirs. We funded 50 per cent and we gave an outright grant for the other 50 per cent. The Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Association is one of the best organizations ever created in this country, and it should be there for all of Canada.

We have been told we are slow in British Columbia in the matter of stabilization and how much money we are spending. I met with the farmers in British Columbia. I went with an Hon. Member of the Opposition from that area and talked to farmers. The Minister of Agriculture in British Columbia did not suggest any tariffs, as some Hon. Member said. He said to me at a meeting: "We are not suggesting tariffs because they might reciprocate on lumber and we ship a lot of lumber into the great United States of America". So we are subject to this type of importation and all the different kinds of trade problems.

I am sure the Hon. Member knows what is going on in the United States now. There is a hearing being conducted. We hope the decision will be handed down in November. Potatoes going into the United States from the Maritimes have an extra 17-cent tariff tacked on because little New Brunswick and little Prince Edward Island are going to destroy the great potato industry in New England. The U.S. says this is because the federal Minister of Agriculture has such superior programs that it cannot compete with us.

I received a letter from a person representing the Canadian Horticultural Society. He comes from the Province of Manitoba. It did this Minister's heart good to hear him tell in glowing terms about the great job that was being done, and how the Secretary for Agriculture in the United States is not paying any attention. Right now in the United States of America a law has been passed through its Senate which will limit the importation of beef. It has not gone through its Congress. Because there is no control on dairy production, those farmers are scared to death that what the Secretary for Agriculture is going to do in dairy production will cause over a million dairy cows to be slaughtered. These cows are producing nutritious food which could be distributed all over the world. It is

suggested they be slaughtered because the U.S. has a straight subsidy program, a very high subsidy program, which does not have any control over production.

The efficient American dairy farmers just produced and produced and now there are nearly 700,000 metric tonnes of surplus skim milk powder. There are over 320,000 metric tonnes of surplus butter. They do not know what to do with it. They are taking some of our markets because the U.S. is a much bigger economic power than we are. It says it is not. Let us use Jamaica as an example. This is a country to which we supplied skim milk powder for years. It trades dairy products, mainly powder, for bauxite. We do not need that in Canada so it trades with the U.S. In Mexico, the U.S. sold 60,000 tonnes of skim milk powder and gave them 20,000 tonnes of food aid. They said that did not lower the price, but that is questionable as far as I am concerned.

I would like to speak about research for a moment. Poultry production owes its reputation for being so efficient in the world to Agriculture Canada research, which developed a serum so that instead of losing one-third of your poultry flock through a normal laying span, you lose less than half of one per cent. Never did our chickens lay so much and do so much for society. It used to take almost an hour's wages to buy one dozen eggs. In Canada today, because of efficiency and the longevity of the chicken, and because of productivity, one hour's average industrial wage will buy the average Canadian a year's supply of eggs. The average Canadian eats 12 dozen eggs per year. The average industrial wage is $12 per hour, and the average price for a dozen eggs in Canada today is one dollar. We are the envy of the whole world.

• (1250)

This will be our largest year for exporting pure-bred Holstein cattle. These exports have expanded and expanded. It will be our largest year for exporting semen, exporting grain.

I could go on and on telling you the things we have done in agriculture. The Hon. Member says I have not done anything. We put 14 new programs into effect since I have been in agriculture and we only added 26 man-years to Agriculture Canada. The Auditor General has commended the Agriculture Department for the tremendous job it has done.

I could go on and talk about interest-free advance payments. The Hon. Member says he does not want handouts, but there are these interest-free advance payments, and not only with the Wheat Board. Last year there was nearly $500 million in interest-free advance payments, yet they say we are not doing anything. I will just close by saying that nothing is so firmly believed but that which is least known.

Mr. Gustafson: Mr. Speaker, it almost sounds as thought the Minister was rereading one of the speeches of Mr. Gardiner in Saskatchewan 20 years ago. His figures do not add up today. If you look at the $6 billion of profit the farmers have added to this country and compare that with 1.25 per cent of the budget attributed to agriculture, it is a pretty sick figure. That is all I have to say about that speech.

Mr. Whelan: I could comment a little bit about that. I am really glad that the Hon. Member mentioned the late Jimmy Gardiner, who was the Minister of Agriculture in Canada for 22 years. He was from Saskatchewan and he did more for agriculture than probably anyone else. He understood agriculture, which is something the Hon. Member does not understand.

The Hon. Member is contracting his colleague because his colleague said it is not money that makes for a healthy agriculture. He is saying we should spend more money. Some of the countries spending more money than us do not have as healthy an agricultural industry as we do.

We have programs in this country which will allow farmers to receive a decent price in the marketplace if they want to organize themselves. I think he is suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we pour millions and millions more dollars into agriculture and that is going to be its salvation. I am sure he does not mean that at all because I am told his own operation does not depend on Government handouts. I am sure that if he wanted to give you his account books, he would be in that 50 per cent bracket I talked about—the people who do not owe a penny.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, in his comments the Minister said that all that the farmers want is a decent profit. That being the case, they must be able to meet their expenses and I agree with that. I would like to ask the Minister why he was not able to get through Cabinet a formula agreed to by his Government and the egg producers, namely that their input costs would be met? Why was he not able to get through Cabinet that the input costs farmers face be subject to six and five?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member does not know what went through Cabinet. I do not think he does. We are just dealing with it this week and I am sure he would be very surprised at what went through Cabinet. But I am not at liberty to tell him at this time.

I am really happy that the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) is so supportive of marketing boards. I hope you have that from your Party caucus and your Leader. I continually get people saying "Wait until we change the Government and we will get rid of all of them".

Mr. McCain: No, you never heard that from this side of the House.

Mr. Whelan: I get letters on this. You do not know what impression you have planted in people's minds. Yet the Hon. Member is supporting the marketing boards, which I have supported. I say as humbly as I can that probably the Hon. Member would not even be asking questions if I had not supported the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency when it was so controversial. Most Prime Ministers would have said that is too controversial and would get it out of here. But the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said to me: "Mr. Minister, as long as they are doing things honestly and so on and you say that you are doing it properly, I will back you". I am now glad I have the backing of the Hon. Member for Provencher.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I would want to recognize the Hon. Member to give him an opportunity to enter into questions, answers and comments but I have to recognize him on a point of order.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, the Conservative policy has been misstated. This is not debate, it is merely a statement of fact. The Conservative policy has been that marketing boards, when it is the wish of the farmer, shall be organized, respected and assisted. But there shall be no compulsion from an arrogant Minister to force any group of farmers at any point in time to form themselves into a marketing board.

Mr. Whelan: The Hon. Member could not find any time that I forced anyone into a marketing board. I have suggested this to them. If the Hon. Member wanted to do some good, he could go down to his own Province. They are asking me now to spend millions of dollars because the marketplace has not returned a decent profit to potato producers in his own Province. We have spent millions and millions on stabilization and he knows it. I would like to see that Party's policy, and I hope the Hon. Member will send it to me, the official Party policy which supports marketing boards.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Minister when he says things humbly. I agree that he has a lot to be humble about and I am glad he recognizes that.

Just to support and elaborate a little on what the Hon. Member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) said, he is precisely right in stating our position on marketing boards. Let me go further and say there are ways other than compulsion to form marketing boards. I sat in a room with this Minister some seven or eight years ago when he used coercion and other things to—

Mr. Cullen: Friendly persuasion.

Mr. Mayer: It is one thing to use friendly persuasion; it is another thing to take an industry when it is down and say: "You are not going to have anything from me unless you agree with me on supply management". That is where we on this side disagree. The Minister may want to use coercion and compulsion, although it may not be compulsion in his mind, but when you find a producer in a very bad financial situation, it in fact becomes compulsion. We do not agree with kicking people when they are down. We like to help people so they do not find themselves in a bad financial position.

Very specifically, is the Minister in favour of reducing the tax on farm fuels in order ot keep producers' cost of production down? There is another way of getting returns from the marketplace which satisfy your expenses and that is by reducing the expenses. Is this Minister in favour of reducing—I did not say eliminating—the federal Government tax on farm fuel?

Mr. Whelan: The Hon. Member has talked about coercion. I challenge him on what he said. I may use moral suasion on people, tell them the benefits of marketing boards and their participation, but I have never suggested to anyone that there would be any action taken which would be coercion. Not this Minister of Agriculture. I have been elected to office since I was 21 years of age and I know about democracy.

The Hon. Member talks about fuel taxes. Earlier he said that he did not want handouts. The marketplace is the place to get the return for farmers. For instance, canola seed has gone up, what, 40 per cent since July? That is the seed. Meal has gone up 42 per cent and the oil has gone up 92 per cent. He never mentioned in his speech about how rapidly the market can change. That has more effect on farmers. But what he is saying is: "Whelan, you must have programs that guarantee that when the free market system gets sick, you must be the doctor who comes in with the proper medicine to make sure it gets healthy again".

● (1300)

We know there are marketing people in this country to whom I have not given a penny of aid since 1972, and when there was another government here for a short term, it did not give them a penny of aid either. That is the poultry industry all the way through. We have not changed our aid to the dairy industry for over seven years. If you find me one of those efficient producers in that bracket who are going broke, I would be very surprised.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I have a very short intervention. It seems to me that there is perhaps some logic to the Minister saying that he has not implemented changes to the stabilization program because it requires the consent of the Provinces and he does not have a program along the East Coast for potato producers to form a marketing board because he must rely on the assistance of the Provinces.

However, there is one area which is strictly within his own jurisdiction but in which he has not been acting very quickly. I refer to putting the personnel in place for Canagrex. He had plenty of time when the Canagrex legislation was in its various stages of debate to hold the interviews and make the preparations. How long must we wait for the people who will be appointed to Canagrex?

Mr. Whelan: First, Mr. Speaker, I was not that optimistic that Canagrex would ever be passed. I think it would have been very wrong for me to interview people and say: "You are going to be hired for Canagrex". I did not do anything until after Parliament finally passed it into law. We hired Peat Marwick to do headhunting for us and put ads in the papers, and I made my recommendations to the Government about three weeks ago.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Hon. Members will recognize that I have allowed the debate to continue slightly past one o'clock in order to provide for the entire ten-minute period of questions and answers to expire before coming back at two o'clock.

However, there remain a number of Hon. Members who have not had an opportunity to exchange comments or ques-

tions with the Minister. I do not know whether it is their intention to seek an extension of that period.

Mr. Epp: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): There is not. In that case, it being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1.03 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak on this motion put forward today because of the serious situation in which farmers find themselves with regard to present cash flow problems.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) who finished his remarks just before lunch made the point that agriculture and farmers had been very progressive throughout the years and I agree with that. They have been very productive in terms of their input into Canada's economy, being $8 billion to $9 billion; but I do not agree when the Minister said it was because of what the Government did. Basically, that is what I heard him say, that producers were so productive. In fact, the opposite is true. It is in spite of the lack of policy and direction with regard to agriculture that farmers have produced and have been productive.

I want to talk about some matters today, hopefully in a positive sense so that we can have an adjustment of some very serious problems that exist for the producers. First is one which has been mentioned by other Members, the Western Grain Stabilization Program. That Program came into existence in 1976. There was a small payout. When the Hon. Otto Lang introduced that program, it was on the basis that it was not to be crop insurance but a program that would deal with the cash flow problems of farmers.

Let us face the situation as it exists. This Program has not dealt with this problem of the farmers. However, the Government has $860 million of farmers' money in the treasury somewhere. By the middle of January it is projected that the Government will have over $1 billion of farmers' money. I see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) in the House this afternoon. I contend that the Government is playing politics with farmers' money.

● (1410)

We remember that farmers first paid in $500, which was deducted at the elevator at the time they delivered their grain. Then it was increased to $900, and last year there was a further increase to $1,200. If a farmer got into the plan in 1979 and made no payment since, he would have paid in $4,800, that is, if he paid the maximum. Had he invested that amount of money in a bank at prime interest rates, he would have accumulated $7,124. Just by depositing that money in the bank, the farmer would have had some $7,124 to be used in his cash flow. Yet the Minister rises in the House and tells Canadians what a great job the Government has done. I want to set the record straight. It has done great job of hanging on to the farmers' money, every cent of which the primary producer deposited at his own cost into a program to enhance and benefit the farmer when he had major cash flow problems.

I am glad the Minister is present. He must deal with this situation and take some positive steps toward helping farmers. Let us deal with the problem. I contend that the Government and the Minister of Agriculture are playing politics here.

Mr. Whelan: Can you imagine?

Mr. Gustafson: I hear the Minister. About two months before the election there is nothing more they would like to do than to write out a nice little cheque. What I am trying to do—

Mr. Whelan: What are you doing?

Mr. Gustafson: I am trying to bring about some responsible action. The way this can be done is simple. The program has to be adjusted. It is not working on a five-year, retroactive basis. The formula does not add up.

Mr. Whelan: Why isn't it working?

Mr. Gustafson: The Minister of Agriculture is heckling me because I have hit a very sensitive spot.

It is most important that the Government deal with this issue. I meet with my farmers weekly. They are saying that the program should either be cleaned up or they should be let out of it. They cannot afford to pay $1,200. They have to pay their fuel and grocery bills. They have to pay machine costs, and they are faced with a major cash flow problem at this time.

I ask the Minister to carry this representation concerning the very serious problem in grain stabilization to Cabinet and to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). The Prime Minister suggested to the House that because there was no representation in western Canada, basically speaking in agricultural areas, he would make a special effort to deal with the problems, the presentations and the representations that were made. The Minister of Agriculture owes it to western producers to look into the Western Grain Stabilization Program.

Another area of cash flow problems about which the Government could do something very positive is the initial price of grain. What is its history? On almost a daily basis I have contacted the Canadian Wheat Board to discover that the asking price of wheat, going back to January of this year, has been 99 cents to $1 per bushel higher than what farmers are receiving as an initial price delivered at the grain elevator. In the case of Durum, I obtained figures from the Wheat Board yesterday indicating that the asking price was $2.10 per bushel higher. Farmers were pleased to see an increase in the initial price of barley. Today it is selling at $140 per tonne in Thunder Bay.

Mr. Schellenberger: And higher in Vancouver.

Mr. Gustafson: Yes, it is even higher in Vancouver. The Government should take some positive steps to increase the cash flow position of farmers. All it has to do is give them their money and increase the initial price of wheat, as well as the initial price of Durum. Most responsible people in the grain trade will say that 50 cents per bushel is adequate leeway or an adequate holdback within the Canadian Wheat Board to deal with problems that may arise. Certainly the Minister could recommend to Cabinet that the initial price of wheat and of Durum be increased by 50 cents per bushel.

As I indicated earlier, this is the farmers' money. They are not asking for handouts. The Minister said today that he was handing out money for this and that to farmers. In comparison with the contribution that agriculture makes to the country, farmers are being short-changed in terms of the budget which goes through this place. I pointed this out to the Minister earlier, and he walked all the way around it. In fact, farmers are being considered only in about 1.25 per cent of the entire budget of the country. He knows that those figures are accurate. The Government could take some positive direction in the area of western grain stabilization. There could be improvement in the initial price of grain which would in turn improve the cash flow of farmers.

Instead of giving, the Government is taking. It has placed an excessive farm fuel tax on diesel fuel and other fuels used for the production of food. The Government has a direct federal tax of 77 cents per gallon on farm fuels. That is very excessive. On December 13, 1979 when we were defeated, it was a bad day—

An Hon. Member: A bad day for Canada.

Mr. Gustafson: Yes, it was a bad day for Canada. At that time the price of fuel in the little village of Macoun—is Mr. Speaker, indicating that my time is up?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Gustafson: Perhaps you could seek unanimous consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue his remarks?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There appears to be unanimous consent.

Mr. Gustafson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will make my comments short. As I was saying, on December 13, 1979 in the little village of Macoun the price of fuel was 98 cents per gallon. I recall that day. It was a rather dark day for a new Member who had been defeated. Today the price of fuel is close to $2 per gallon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would like to inform the Hon. Member that the Chair was in error. He had 20 minutes in total, of which he has ten remaining.

Mr. Gustafson: It is important to have this heavy-handed farm fuel tax removed. The Minister has said that the Government has made contributions to farmers, but farmers have been paying heavy-handed taxes to the Government on farm fuel. This is counterproductive for farmers. Many of them are not working. Many of them are not involved in summer fallow because they simply cannot afford it. It costs $150 to fill the fuel tank of a tractor. This will reflect in the cost of production. Have the Minister and the Government considered removing some of this tax on the farmers in order that they can be as productive as they have been in the past and even improve upon that?

• (1420)

I wish to deal with another area where this Government has long promised to move but has failed to do so. I refer to the capital gains tax on farmers. Members may ask what that has to do with cash flow. It has a lot to do with it. Let me give an example.

A father may ask his son for a reasonable sum of money for his land in order that he may retire with some dignity in a small town after years of hard work. The young farmer will do it so that his father may live with respectability. At that point the father is expected to pay capital gains tax to the Government of Canada. It becomes restrictive. Again and again in this House, as recently as two weeks ago, we have called upon the Government to remove the capital gains tax on farms, but nothing has been done to this point.

In the last three elections the Government promised to make moves in this direction, but it has failed to do so. It is my hope that the Minister of Agriculture will ask Cabinet to look into the capital gains tax on farms, which is very restrictive and counterproductive to agriculture.

The Minister had something to say about farm credit, as he does from time to time. There are some solutions to the farm credit problem. There is not enough money in the fund. More important, the rate is far too high. Young farmers cannot afford to borrow at those high rates. Our Party has proposed a way to get around this. There are farmers who would invest their money in an agri-bond. Young farmers would receive the benefit of that investment. They would be able to borrow from that fund to finance their farm. We made this suggestion some time ago and the Minister is well aware of it. The Government has failed to act in a positive way in regard to financing for farmers. This would facilitate the situation as at present the needs of young farmers are not being met.

The Minister talked about how much money the federal Government was paying to the Provinces. However, he failed to mention the great contribution by agriculture through taxation to central Canada, particularly the bureaucracy. The farmers are not happy with the way the Government spends their hard-earned money. They make that clear to us.

I now want to deal with another important point. I have contended for some time that there seem to be different standards for different areas of production. That is not right. The farmer has many expenses, such as machinery and fuel

bills. After meeting his expenses, he should be able to have a good standard of living for himself and his family. However, according to the Tax Department and other sources, the average net income of a farmer is approximately $4,000. Compare this to the fact that a consumer spends about 15 per cent of his earnings on food. That is a rather dynamic result from the production of our primary producers. It is most important that this continue.

Our farmers are proud that they can produce cheap food for Canadians. In return, it is only fair that this Government not penalize our producers. Farmers should not be discouraged from contributing in such a positive way.

The latest move by this Government with regard to the statutory Crow rate will result in very high freight rates. This will cause major problems. I was aghast when the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) rose to impose closure on Bill C-155, the statutory Crow rate. He is inflicting upon the farmers freight rate increases at a time when they cannot afford it. No consideration is being given to the cash flow problems of the farmer.

I see you rising, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for the opportunity to put forward briefly some of our concerns regarding agriculture. I hope that the Government, and the Minister of Agriculture in particular, will lend an ear to some of the recommendations we have made which will result in a positive effect on agriculture in the future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are Hon. Members rising to ask questions? If not, the Chair will recognize the Hon. Member for Lambton-Middlesex (Mr. Ferguson).

Mr. Ralph Ferguson (Lambton-Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to take part in this debate. I commend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) for the firm direction he has given to this vital renewable resource as he enters into his eleventh year, except for a brief sabbatical, as Minister of Agriculture for Canada. He has given us the direction and legislation we have needed to make the Canadian farmer one of the most efficient and productive in any country of the world.

I have to take issue with some of the comments made by previous speakers who have suggested that the tri-party stabilization programs are the answer to all our problems. For a few years I belonged to a program. In the Province of Ontario there was a joint program between the producers and the provincial Government. The producers paid in an equal amount to the Ontario Government for a cow-calf stabilization program that seemed at the beginning to be an excellent program. In fact, in the first three years of the program we received a payout because the price received was not comparable to that of the cost of production. However, in the fourth year of the program we all realized that there would be no payout, but many of us sent in our premiums regardless. However, that program was cancelled in the fourth year because less than half of the farmers involved had sent in their premiums. Consequently, the program collapsed.

• (1430)

I would hope that if we are to proceed with a stabilization program for the red meat sector, there will be guarantees built in to make it compulsory for the producer to sign up and to remain a part of that program for the required number of years. The producer should not simply sign up when prices are low and ride out the peak times when prices are good. I believe, however, that farm stabilization programs are not the answer.

When looking at methods used to establish a price discovery mechanism for many of the products produced in Canada which do not fall under the jurisdiction of the marketing agencies, we have to realize that there must be a counterbalance or a countervailing force in the marketplace. Last week, for example, the price of soybeans on the Chicago futures market had dropped by approximately 75 cents per bushel. Soybean futures dropped that much in spite of the fact that a week ago yesterday a United States Department of Agriculture report pointed out that supplies of soybeans needed to carry us through to the next crop year would perhaps be inadequate to meet the demand. If that was the case, why did the price drop last week? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the system has broken down and that it is only through a system of establishing a price at the farm gate that reflects the cost of production to the efficient producer that we can overcome this problem.

Since we have such large requirements for capital in the farming sector at the present time, I submit to you, Sir, that the solution could be found if the national marketing agencies which are in existence at the present time, whether through dairy, poultry or another commodity, were to have price setting mechanisms that reflected the cost of production of the efficient producer and if they were to be under the jurisdiction of a supervisory body so that the interests of the consumer are also protected. No company can operate without a return on investment, management and risk. Consequently, farming is no longer a way of life; rather, it is big business and we must have these guarantees built in if it is to be successful.

No amount of funding, whether from the Farm Credit Corporation or any other body, will relieve the situation if we do not first cure the problem of the price at the farm gate to the farmer. I suggest that to increase the amount of funding available through the Farm Credit Corporation would perhaps be a short-term solution, but the producer cannot borrow himself out of trouble. There must be a return from the marketplace that reflects that cost to the producer and then there must be a reasonable markup to the packer or processor and to the retailer. Finally, most important of all, there must be a fair price to the consumer.

My colleagues have been speaking about the need for agri-bonds and I do not quarrel with that need. I believe there is a place for agri-bonds but I do not think they go far enough. For example, what if a father wanted to turn the family farm over to his son? Many of us began farming with the assistance of our fathers who loaned us machinery for those first crucial years of farming so that we did not have to make huge cash

outlays. Many of us received an interest rate on mortgages well below the current rate from our fathers. Under the agri-bond system, this is not possible.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we must come up with a different provision to maintain the family farm, which is recognized as the most efficient production unit in the world today. I submit we must come up with a different proposal to guarantee a mortgage, if the farmer in fact took one back on his fixed capital assets, on the sale of his enterprise to a member of his family. I maintain that this is essential if the family farm is to continue to be the backbone of the Canadian agriculture sector. We need provisions to allow the farmer the flexibility to give a member of his family a reduced rate of interest in order to give him a start, so that he can build up an operation, achieve a level of equity that puts him on a secure footing and which allows him to proceed to contribute to the industry that is so important to the economy of the country.

The lending of the Farm Credit Corporation in itself tells a story about what is required in the agricultural sector. We should look at the number of farmers who are in arrears to the Farm Credit Corporation and look back to see in which sector of the agricultural industry they are involved. We would recognize immediately that those farmers involved in the red meat sector form the largest percentage of those in arrears. Grain farmers come next. The reason for this is that these are the producers who do not have the power to set their prices at the farm gate. They have to rely on the vagaries of the marketplace as well as the vagaries of mother nature. This creates the type of speculation that is taking place today on the commodity futures market. There certainly is no security there for any of the farmers who need this money so badly.

Another situation that has occurred over the last several years is that the number of retail food outlets has dropped dramatically. The fact is that five retail food chains control 75 per cent of the retail food outlets in Canada. Those five chains have in turn banded together to form buying groups to exert even more pressure on the marketplace. Consequently, there is the need for an even greater countervailing force in the marketplace than the national marketing agencies can provide. It is in this context that I hope the producers of Canada will take advantage of the legislation available to them not only at the provincial level but also at the federal level to give them the type of income that is commensurate with that of the rest of society and to protect their investments. This is essential if we are to have a healthy agricultural industry in Canada.

As I look further at the type of federal assistance that exists for the farmers in Canada, I see that there is assistance not only through the Farm Credit Corporation but assistance is also provided to the vegetable producers and the fruit growers to ensure that there are adequate supplies of fresh Canadian fruits and vegetables available to Canadians. The vegetable cold storage program has been utilized across Canada to a great extent. We have a large number of programs that are not recognized by many Members of Parliament. There is the grain storage program under which money can be borrowed from the Government interest-free on grain held in storage to allow it to go to the marketplace in an orderly fashion. They are all very positive programs. The fact remains, however, that there is a provincial responsibility that must be used in co-ordination with the federal programs.

• (1440)

The Minister of Agriculture has had a great deal of involvement in research and ours is among the best in the world. We have the highest quality food of any country and we have the highest standards of any country. Consequently, even though the budget of the Department of Agriculture is lower than some of us would like it to be, it reflects the lean, hard image portrayed by the Minister himself.

Mr. Murta: Even the Minister is smiling at that!

Mr. Ferguson: There is no fat in the Department.

Mr. Bosley: Lean, mean Gene.

Mr. Ferguson: It has a lean, hard image which reflects the position we have taken over the years that we have to trim off the fat. We must make sure that we recognize the latest methods of production so that we can keep abreast or ahead of the rest of the world in the marketplace.

When we compare yields of the various crops, we see that in Canada, and particularly in Ontario, our average production per acre is higher than that of the United States, whether it be in soybeans or corn. I think it is interesting that we have this potential productivity.

I want to reflect now on the increased productivity that has taken place through research and development and marketing agencies. Many people say that our system of planned production through marketing boards leads to inefficiencies. The figures show otherwise, Mr. Speaker. A few years ago a laying hen would produce approximately 20 dozen eggs in any one-year laying cycle; now the production is 24 dozen per bird. The number of pounds of feed necessary to produce a dozen eggs has decreased as well. As the Minister said this morning, the mortality rate has decreased. This is an example of the efficiencies that have come about. Although the price is set according to the cost of production, if the farmer can be more efficient than average, he can increase his margin of profit. This has happened and he has become more efficient in the process.

A number of buyers from other countries come to my constituency. Recently a buyer came from Russia to buy dairy cattle. Some of the best productivity records in the world are held by Canadian producers. Some of these cattle are used to increase the number of offspring of one select animal by way of embryo transplant. One mother can mother six or eight offspring in one year and the embryo can be transplanted into a host cow.

When you have a man as busy and who does such a good job as the Minister of Agriculture, it would be nice if we could clone him and have two of him.

Whether Canadians are farmers or are engaged in the agri-food industry as a veterinarian, say, they have been leaders in research in spite of the fact that the budget is not as great as that of many other countries. This just shows the ingenuity and imagination of the people involved in this sector. We can look at its accomplishments with pride. Well within the span of my lifetime one farmer fed eight people; now one farmer feeds 70 people. Of course, I am talking about south-western Ontario. That part of Ontario that lies west of a line drawn between Georgian Bay and Toronto produces about 20 per cent of all agricultural production in Canada on a dollar basis. Through the greenhouse industry and intensified farming practices it has a higher rate of productivity than other areas of the country. Climatic conditions contribute to production as well, because in that area it is unusual to have a crop failure or to suffer the drought that sometimes happens in other parts of Canada.

The federal Government has met its responsibilities not only in the area of food production but also in research, plant health programs and inspection programs. I recently received a call from a show in Cologne, Germany, asking us to supply 600 tonnes of turkey. The largest turkey hatchery in the world is in my riding and it has branches in the United States. It supplies 22 per cent of the North American market and 11 per cent of the world market. It is a very sophisticated Canadian operation and is a family business. Through research and assistance from the Department of Agriculture they have been able to raise their production to the standards required to break into the world market. This is a credit to the Canadian Department of Agriculture and to Canadian farmers.

Through the PIK program in the United States this year they tried to take land out of production and a drought followed. This has not happened in Canada with our programs. There has been drought and adverse weather conditions in some areas of the country but we do not have a PIK program. One has to question the morality of such a program for Canada when there are so many hungry nations in the world. Our programs are tailored to meet the demand of the domestic and export markets. The crop year in grain production is tailored so that none of the product is actually sold prior to leaving the farm. When it leaves the farm we know that it is on the way to market.

During the hearings on the Crow rate I could not help but think that ours has to be one of the most efficient systems in the world. The cost to the producer is well within his means and he can afford to get his crop to market, especially with assistance from the Government.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Lambton-Middlesex (Mr. Ferguson). I made a note of the enormous efficiencies he has claimed that have taken place in the farming community in recent years. I should like to ask him how it is that a farmer today can feed 70 people and yet he himself starves.

• (1450)

Mr. Ferguson: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Hon. Member has missed the point I was making. Those farmers who have orderly marketing systems are making a reasonable return on their investment and a reasonable return for management and risk. If the other parts of our agricultural sector would take advantage of the programs which are available to them—the meat sector and some of the grain sectors—to establish the price at the farm gate, then they could also enjoy the same level of prosperity as those who have their marketing agencies operative and in place.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, just so I have that question on the record, could we take it, then, that the position of the Liberal Members is that there should be marketing boards for the beef industry? Is that the position of the Government?

Mr. Ferguson: Mr. Speaker, regarding the beef industry I should point out, being a beef producer myself—and I have been for a lot more years than I care to remember, well over 35 years—that is one part of our operation which is certainly not showing a profit. I started out as a beef producer when I was 14 years old. I was a 4H Club member. I bought a heifer calf and built up a herd. I am very proud of that herd, but in an economic sense I should have sold it quite a few years ago. However, I do have scrub land across part of my home farm and if I am going to scavenge the pasture off that land, I have to keep some cattle. It is not a profitable venture.

I am suggesting there is a way that we can bring a reasonable return to the beef producers of Canada. I would like to suggest to the Hon. Member that we allow our feedlot operators to fill up to capacity, and base this on cost of production. However, rather than feeding those steers out to 1,250 pounds to 1,300 pounds, what is wrong with selling them 50 pounds lighter than that if the demand is not there? By so doing we would tailor our production to the marketplace to reflect the demand, whether domestic or export.

These are my own ideas and thoughts on the matter. I am not sure what the Minister of Agriculture thinks about it. I believe he would agree with me that it is a great idea. I feel it would solve a lot of problems in the red meat sector if we had a system like this, where a person could set their price at the farm gate rather than have the existing conditions continue. The spread between the wholesaler and consumer in Montreal a year ago last August was 41 cents a pound greater than a similar spread in the United States. Someone is ripping off the marketplace, and I suggest to you it is not the farmer but someone further up the ladder. If the farmer was even getting half of that spread, he would be making a profit.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, it quite amazes me that the Hon. Member can claim to be associated with 4H Clubs and, after that number of years of pledging his head to clearer thinking, would still join the Liberal Party.

I still ask him whether it is or is not the policy of the Government of Canada today to have beef marketing boards for the sale of beef. I believe that was the answer he applied to

my first question. If that was the answer, I want him to say definitively whether or not he and his Party are trying to have a system of marketing boards for the beef industry. I want a yes or no answer for the record.

Mr. Ferguson: Mr. Speaker, there is no way I can speak on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture. However, as a person who has spent so many years in the beef industry, I know what the needs of that industry are, and my personal opinion is, after losing money for several years, that there has to be a better way. Being a Liberal and a pragmatist as well, I am willing to try something new. If that is the only way left, then I am willing to give it a try. However, I am not going to be hamstrung by some old fashioned thinking that there is a free enterprise system left in the marketplace today where we have various types of monopolies in existence.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Lambton-Middlesex (Mr. Ferguson) used the word "tailored" several times during his address. I would suggest that he meant to say "Whelaned". Had the agricultural policy of this country been "Taylored", agriculture would not be in the mess it is in today!

I would like to ask the Hon. Member a question in connection with egg production. The egg producers of Alberta are now having a very difficult time. They have co-operated 100 per cent with the Government in the six and five program. They are now up to the six and five ceiling, but the production costs have kept on increasing. Production costs are now between 4 per cent and 5 per cent above what the producers are able to charge, because they have reached their limit under the six and five program. These egg producers are unable to carry that burden, which simply means that if something is not done to provide the egg producers with the opportunity of increasing their price, they are going to go into bankruptcy. Has the Hon. Member for Lambton-Middlesex any comment as to what the Government might be able to do to keep these producers viable?

Mr. Ferguson: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to that question because I have been following the problem very closely. I am glad to see the Hon. Member has tailored his thinking along the lines of the marketing boards. I am also very much aware that the marketing board people were the first to endorse the six and five program. During my address I spoke about the vagaries of the marketplace and what is happening on the Chicago futures exchange. In fact, the price of feed has increased by 23 per cent since last June. That is well beyond the capability of the egg producer to cope with, I quite agree with the Hon. Member.

I have been in discussion with many of the egg producers on this particular problem. I have suggested to the Minister of Agriculture that perhaps the feed component should be isolated as one of the variables which cannot be adhered to under the six and five program. However, the rest of the components of the cost of production formula, such as pullet cost, labour and so on, could be adhered to very easily. With that one exception, I believe the egg producer could continue under the six and five program and show the same responsible pricing methods as they have in past years.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, when he has reached the end of his income and the bills are still not paid, the producer is in a pretty tough spot. There is no easy way out for him. There is no use saying he wants to co-operate. He does want to co-operate. It simply means he is going to go into bankruptcy. When he loses 4 cents or 5 cents on every dozen eggs he sells, it just means he is going to go that much deeper into debt until he just cannot continue to operate.

I have forwarded letters to both the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) in connection with this problem. If the policy of this Government is to keep agriculture viable, it has to take a realistic look at these things. If these egg producers go down the drain, what it will mean is that the larger corporations will take over and prices will go up for the consumers. There are no two ways about it: the consumer will have to pay more. I am trying to keep the price viable for the consumer by being reasonable with the egg producers today. I believe this is a responsibility which the Government should undertake, look at and resolve, not become part of the problem, but become, for a change, part of the solution.

● (1500)

This is a simple problem, it cannot be that hard to solve. If we do not, it means that the people of this country are going to pay more for their eggs or else go without them. The egg producer cannot continue to lose money on every dozen eggs he sells and stay in business. It is just that simple.

Mr. Ferguson: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to that. I am well aware of the margin of profit the egg producer has. The average for Canada is, I believe, 2.7 cents a dozen. I am confident that if the Minister of Agriculture follows the advice I gave him, and he indicated this morning that Cabinet was considering it and maybe even has made a decision, I think the problems of the egg producer will be resolved. I only hope the cattle producers would follow through with a similar plan so they could have the same level of stability.

Given all the problems I had as a Member of Parliament concerning farmers in financial difficulty in the last three and one half years, I have not had one egg producer, one dairy producer, one chicken broiler or turkey producer among them. So I think we have to recognize the importance of the cost of production formulas, that they have stood up to the challenge, and consequently I am confident that the Minister of Agriculture will use his persuasive powers to clear up any misunderstanding and that in the very near future we will have something to announce that will be acceptable to everyone.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, today's debate has centered on condemning the Government for its failure to recognize the economic hardship affecting all farmers in Canada, and its failure to alleviate that hardship by implementing good agricultural policies. The Minister said it was not really that much of a problem. According to his

Department's figures, 50 per cent of farmers have no debt. He said 35 per cent of the farmers in Canada own more than 85 per cent of their assets, so less than 15 per cent of their assets are in the form of debt. But he did admit that 5 per cent to 15 per cent are in financial difficulty, to use his term.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the hardship is more deeply ingrained than that and goes much beyond what the Minister has told to us today. I would like to spend a few moments outlining the situation as I see it. It seems to me the place to start is first to consider the realized net farm income, the costs farmers are subject to, and then to determine whether they are as a group able to move forward under that regime. I would then look at the debt statistics and the rate of debt increase, which I think will substantiate the allegations made by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) when he said there is extreme hardship out there on the farms and in agriculture.

Realized net income has been relatively stable. In 1974 it was $3.5 billion or $3.6 billion. In 1983 it was $3.7 billion. For over a decade farmers have had virtually the same net income, the one exception being in 1981 when they broke the $4 billion mark at $4.1 billion. But in 1980 it was down to $3.3 billion. However, it has been running along at $3.6 billion, or $3.5 billion. This in spite of the fact that costs in that period of time for all Canadians, and we are talking only about net farm incomes so we are talking about the take-home pay of the farm community, rose by well over 200 per cent, to be exact, 240 per cent. Just to bring us up to date, in the last four or five years we find the farm input price index has increased 29 per cent. That is between 1979 and 1983. At the same time farm commodity prices have increased only 11 per cent, with a resulting net income increase over those four years of 5 per cent. If you were to translate that into real dollars, it means a net decline in income of 25 per cent. So there has been in effect 25 per cent less spending power in the hands of Canadian farmers between 1979 and 1983. That leads us to conclude there is a very real possibility that hardship will occur.

Let us look at another set of data, that of the Farm Credit Corporation. Let us look at how many accounts are in arrears with the FCC as of September 30, 1983. Of beef producers with outstanding loans, 24 per cent are in arrears. Of crop producers with outstanding loans, 21 per cent are in arrears. That compares with a couple of years ago when only 14 per cent of the beef producers were in arrears, and only 14 per cent of crop producers were in arrears in 1981. If these people are not having financial difficulty, why are they so far in arrears? Why is the number of people in arrears going up? We have heard an argument, which seems to make some sense, that if farmers had marketing programs, they would not have those financial difficulties. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the figures show that is no longer the case. Of farmers who were in fluid dairy production in 1981, only 6 per cent were in arrears with the FCC. However, as of September of this year 9.1 per cent were in arrears. That is the cream of the crop. That is the sector of the agriculture industry which is the best organized in terms of controlling production and also the most subsidized of any segment of agriculture. The amount of money in arrears has increased 50 per cent in just two years. Producers are beginning to feel the pinch as well.

What about people in the poultry business? They are operating under supply management boards, and you would not think there would be many people in arrears with the FCC in that sector of agriculture. Yet we find that while in 1981 some 9.4 per cent were in arrears, today 14 per cent of them are in arrears on their FCC loans. In 1981, almost 21 per cent of hog producers were in arrears with their Farm Credit Corporation loans, and the same situation exists today.

• (1510)

Therefore, I believe that the allegation that there is hardship on the farms is correct. I am not sure that the immediate answer is simply to increase the amount of credit available. These people to whom I have been referring have had credit offered to them and they have had difficulty making their payments even on a 20-year or 30-year repayment schedule. The problem is not just one of needing more credit. The outstanding credit in Canadian agriculture was approximately $19 billion at the end of 1981. That figure is presently estimated to be $6 billion to $10 billion higher. The interest charges are now at the point where they are almost equivalent to the net farm income that farmers receive.

When I was attempting to begin farming about 25 years ago, there was a rule of thumb that one's sales from farming should be at least equivalent to one-fifth of the money invested in the farm. Much of the invested money would be borrowed, but that is beside the point. The theory was that one should be able to turn over the value of the farm once every five years so that the five-year sales should be at least equivalent to what was invested in the farm.

That is virtually impossible to achieve today in a cropping program, whether in western Canada or central Canada. In fact, a farmer who can turn over his assets in sales by ten years is doing extremely well. This means that the proportion of money that remains to the farmer to spend on his family, on reinvestment and improvements to his farm is shrinking all the time.

When I was deciding to become a farmer in the 1950s, farm economists and Government people were saying that there were obviously too many people involved in farming. They arrived at that conclusion then by taking the amount of income that is left, deciding what a good average wage would be and dividing that into the amount of income. In this way they concluded that there should be half as many farmers. With today's agricultural technology, I submit that it is quite difficult to argue that there are too many farmers. Today's farmers are very well equipped. They are using the latest technology and the latest information. They are working very long and hard hours. Even the academics are not making a case that there are too many farmers. They are not making the same arguments about under employment as were made in the 1950s and 1960s.

In fact, today's farmers face great financial hardship. I believe it is time to begin looking at some of the sources of that

hardship. We know that the most logical solution, one which many industrialized countries are in fact following, is to attempt to become as self-sufficient as possible in the production of food so that we do not have to rely on offshore producers for our livelihood. We discovered that in our country as a result of our experiments in dairy policy some 12 to 15 years ago. We decided to import some butter, cut back production and rely on those imports because it was much cheaper than it could be produced in our northern climate. When we finally arrived at an import position, our extra demand forced the world price of butter up so high that we could not afford to import it. We then moved to the program of subsidies and controlled production that is in place now. I suggest that is a reasonable policy for a country like ours, as it is for virtually any country.

However, we have not used that type of analysis in determining our needs for other products such as fruits and vegetables. If we were to extract our exports of grains from the import-export figures, there would actually be a net import requirement of approximately $2 billion in food products. These products are primarily fruits and vegetables. Even during the last 15 years our country has been processing fewer fruits and vegetables and has not been taking advantage of the very seasonal nature of our northern climate to keep them for the other eight to ten months that we are incapable of production because of the weather. We have given up those techniques to a large extent, with the result that farmers have had to ease out of producing some fruits and vegetables.

Let me point out some areas of the country where this is occurring. British Columbia is a traditional area of apple production in our country. The cost of production is estimated to be 14 cents per pound. Farmers receive approximately 4.5 cents at the farm, and there is a stabilization program in B.C. which adds another 2.5 cents. This means a seven-cent return to the farmer for a 14-cent outlay.

This situation does not only apply to British Columbia. With respect to the beef industry on the Prairies, the market yields approximately two-thirds of the actual cost of producing a pound of beef or pork.

In regard to potato production in the Maritimes, 50 per cent to 60 per cent of the costs are realized from the market while the rest adds to the debt of those particular farmers and increases the overburdening debt load that many of them face. This is causing a tremendous hardship.

The only solution is to do two and possibly three things. In the short term we have to devise better ways of providing short-term credit. More important, we must take action to solve the problem on a longer term basis. We must recognize that there should be some stabilization programs that are addressed at maintaining incomes by using costs rather than traditional market prices as the base. It makes no sense at all to have the historic market price as the base for stabilization programs.

In the British Columbia apple situation, the market is yielding only about a third of the costs. This has been the situation over the last three years. Even when the data base is shortened to three years, it still means that the farmer will be stabilized at approximately 35 per cent to 50 per cent of his real production costs. Therefore that kind of stabilization program does not provide any stability to the farming sector or solve the problem of ever increasing debt.

Some Provinces have begun to develop programs based on costs, but this is done to a very limited extent since their financing capability is limited. They are also limited by the fact that much of the production goes beyond the Province, which means that any subsidy is essentially a subsidy to people who live outside the Province. We need a national stabilization program based on costs. Furthermore, we have to work hard at developing better marketing methods for those products, because there is no sense to having a stabilization program for a product that is not properly marketed. The buyers could take the attitude that they will pay a lower price because the farmer will take a very poor price for his product. The stabilization plan will simply go up to cover that price since it is cost based anyway. There should be a system of marketing the product linked to that stabilization program so that maximum returns can be gained from the market. We are seeing some experiments in that field in some Provinces. I note the beef programs in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and the hog programs in Ontario, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Prince Edward Island. They have been experimenting with that concept and it is one that is working relatively well.

● (1520)

I think it is generally agreed that a tripartite program involving the producer, his provincial Government and the federal level could provide an even better kind of program. Hopefully, the Government would be able to move very quickly on that kind of program, provided that some proposed legislation is introduced in the session, which, we are told, is imminent.

Finally, on the very short term, improved ways of permitting the turnover of land from one generation to the next is vital. We should be looking at reductions in the requirements for capital gains. We had that argument advanced several weeks ago in this House. Some new methods of transferring land from one generation to the other have been experimented with in some parts of the country with relatively good results.

The land bank in Saskatchewan allowed families who did not have a great deal of money to trade the land from one generation to the next and permitted them to roll it over to the following generation. This allows for relatively low cost production because the land does not have to be refinanced with each new generation and ultimately allows our country to compete effectively with those countries where land stays within the same family and is simply transferred from one generation to the next, free of charge. That is the system they have in certain parts of Europe. It is traditional. It allows us to compete effectively with producers whose land costs them practically nothing.

I close by urging the Government to reassess its agricultural program, to admit that hardship is being effected on producers

and that we move as quickly as possible to better marketing programs, stabilization programs and refinancing programs to overcome these problems.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Hon. Member. He talks about the terrible plight farmers are in. He gives the impression that it is the case for all farmers. Is the Hon. Member aware that even in his Province land values have hardly decreased at all? Is he aware that the repayment ability of farmers in that province is the best in all of Canada? Is he aware that the Royal Bank is opening 12 or 14 new branches this year in Saskatchewan?

Mr. Althouse: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that lending institutions are still very interested in Saskatchewan. I think that if you analyse the situation you will find that Saskatchewan was one of the last provinces to respond to the current difficulties by reducing the value of land. There are two reasons that land prices have not gone down in Saskatchewan as quickly as in other areas.

Mr. Nickerson: Because a Conservative Government was elected.

Mr. Althouse: First, there was a fairly good crop for the last two years and the volumes moved have been fairly good. The Hon. Member beside me says it was a good Conservative Government that was elected. To some extent that has contributed. The Government has added not only to the 4 per cent reduction in the interest that is available for four years under the FCC, but it has extended that to any person looking for land who is under a certain age. That subsidy, though it is only short-term and will only apply for four years, has served to maintain the price of land. Therefore, rather than falling as dramatically as has been the case in some parts of Canada, the reduction in land prices is probably still to come in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify that land prices have hardly gone down. With the increase in price of commodities, will the Hon. Member not agree they will probably go back up again? Canola seed oil is up $90 a tonne; canola oil meal is up $42; canola seed is up $40 a tonne, all in the space of about six weeks. That is more than enough to pay amply the increasing Crow rates for ten years. This has an effect, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the price of land going down in Saskatchewan has some effect. Would he not consider the question that Saskatchewan is overgoverned by 31 Cabinet Ministers for a population of less than one million people? Does the Hon. Member not think it is costly to run the crop insurance to which federally we contribute $56 million and to which producers contribute the other $56 million, while the Province spends $3 million or $4 million administering the program and has a special Cabinet Minister for it? Is that not a costly thing for farmers?

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, there are a number of questions asked by the Minister. I will take the last one first. Yes, there has been a tremendous increase in the size of the Cabinet and the cost of governing the Province. That has been reflected in the very large deficit in the order of $500 million to $600 million, a deficit which had not existed before. To some extent, I suppose, putting residents of the Province in debt into the future is perhaps being used to hold up some of the jobs in that Province.

With regard to the sudden increase in the price of canola, I would simply remind the House that the sudden surge in prices is very similar to the surge in prices we had in 1973 or 1974. It was very short-lived then and it will probably be short-lived now. We have not seen quite the same price levels for canola as we saw in 1974. Costs are something like 2.4 times as high now as then. Even with the sudden surge in prices, I do not think you will see a huge rush by Saskatchewan farmers to go out and start purchasing things.

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse). Comparing the land bank program to the family farm purchase program, which is presently in place in Saskatchewan, up to the present time over 1600 individual family farm purchases have been assisted by the family farm purchase program. I would draw to the attention of the Chair that this is more than the whole land bank system had helped in the previous seven years. If the Hon. Member is serious, I would like to ask his opinion on the federal Government's refusal to accept some $200 million through the Province of Saskatchewan to the Farm Credit Corporation to be lent out to people in Saskatchewan to allow them to continue the family farm purchase program.

Mr. Whelan: It was discriminatory and the human rights people would have been after us.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that exists with these kinds of programs is that the federal Government will have to decide when it cuts people off and when it does not. We have not had any reasons, and I do not know the reasons, for the federal Government having refused to accept a loan of $200 million, if indeed that loan was offered. The increase in purchases is in very large part due to this sudden availability of the 4 per cent reduction in interest. With the size of loans these days, that is pretty well enough to keep a family operating for a year. That 4 per cent reduction supplies them with food, clothing and automobiles. It would, of course, bring about a great many potential customers.

The problem with the program is that it is dependent upon the borrower being eligible under the rules of the FCC, which means that they have to have a fair amount of assets to begin with. People who would have qualified for the land bank program to get land do not often have those kinds of assets and therefore are not part of this program. There is some inequity as a result.

• (1530)

Mr. Whelan: Does the Hon. Member know that the $200 million offered by the Province of Saskatchewan was more costly than what we could borrow any other place? Does he know that it had to be re-lent in Saskatchewan? It was discriminatory. We could not lend it in any other Province.

Mr. Althouse: I will take that as an answer to the previous question rather than another question.

Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise to participate in this debate. There has been much misconception by Hon. Members opposite, which is evident in the motion itself. The entire state of the agricultural industry in Canada is not as the hon. proposer of the motion indicated.

I would like to cite a few statistics. Net farm income in Canada in 1983 will be up about 5 per cent above 1982 levels. The total cost of production to farmers at the same time will decline by about 3 per cent. Wheat is another example. Exports totalled 21.4 million tonnes, or three million tonnes more than in 1981-82. Grains and oilseed exports are up to 29.7 million tonnes. Barley is up approximately seven million tonnes, despite the fact that there have been tremendous surpluses of coarse grains in the United States. The price of canola to producers and western farmers is up about 20 per cent. If we look at pork, one of the difficult industries and one of the areas on which we should focus attention, in 1982-83 exports were 25 per cent to 30 per cent above 1981 levels. In the area of milk, through a system of supply management in Canada we have been able to keep our surpluses at a reasonable and manageable level. The contrary has occurred in the United States. It has incredible surpluses, about 12 per cent above requirements. The problems the Americans are facing in dealing with these surpluses are mindboggling.

The problem is not right across the board in agriculture. We must be responsible in pinpointing areas of concern and targeting on farmers who need help. As we all know, this is in the red meat area. Contrary to what is implicit in the motion before the House, our farmers are the most efficient of agricultural producers in all countries of the world, not only in terms of productivity but in terms of the quality of the products produced for consumption here and outside Canada. This enviable record is achieved despite the fact that 55 per cent of our agricultural lands are the most northerly of those of all other countries. Despite these hostile environmental factors, Canadian farmers are the most efficient producers of any in the world.

This has brought tremendous benefits, particularly for consumers. The cost of food to Canadian consumers is less than 16 per cent of their income. If this is not the best, it is the next to best record of any country. In addition, the efficiency and productivity of the farming community have led to reduced inflation in Canada. Our agricultural producers have to take a tremendous amount of the credit for the fact that our inflation rates are at a low level. In the statistics presented last week, the inflation rate was down to 5 per cent. Let us not forget the tremendous contribution to the Consumer Price Index and the lowering of the rate of inflation by our agricultural community.

In focusing on what we might do to help farmers, let us recall that it is an area of divided jurisdiction. Under the Constitution, agricultural production is part federal and part provincial. Let us concentrate on some of the things the federal Government has undertaken. One problem mentioned has been the high cost of carrying credit or raising money to certain farmers. The federal Government has in place six programs designed to aid this situation—the Farm Credit Act, the Farm Credit Corporation Special Farm Assistance Program, the Farm Syndicates Credit Act, the Farm Improvement Loans Act, the Fruit and Vegetable Storage Construction Financial Assistance Program and the Small Business Bond Program.

By contrast I turn to the programs of the Province of Ontario, its four small, paltry programs. If the Ontario Minister of Agriculture thinks he can pass the buck to us for the farmers of my Province, he has another guess coming. He has not fulfilled his responsibilities to farmers in the area of credit assistance.

Turning to the red meat area, admittedly that is where there are the most problems. Almost all farm insolvencies relate to areas where there has not been some type of supply management program or marketing board program. The Ontario Minister of Agriculture proposed a stabilization program for red meat—producers, the Province and the federal Government each contributing a third. One would have to ask that Ontario Minister what happened to the program which was in effect in Ontario in the 1970s. It was a stabilization program that was similar in nature. It lasted a total of three years and fell flat on its face in the fourth year when only 10 per cent of farmers would contribute their third of the stabilization because prices went up and they would not need it that year. Is that any way to run the stabilization program? Is that the type of program that will provide security to producers who need it most in the circumstances?

This issue is fraught with politics. I realize the agricultural community is divided on the issue, but this does not mean that we should not attempt to follow the directions our experiences have indicated will work and have worked in the past. I welcome the leadership shown in this very vital area by our outstanding, knowledgeable and competent Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan).

Having looked at the present problem and having commented upon it, I feel we should also be looking forward and looking at what we as a federal Government might do on behalf of all Canadians to try to bring about greater equity and greater possibility for stable production and to try to help our farmers and ourselves.

I have five points upon which I would like to touch briefly. The first is the transportation system. In fact, the efficiency of production of western farmers or grain producers and their incredible productivity has been a mixed blessing. We can no longer envisage our present rail system being able to carry their grain to market under the present rate structure, if they continue producing at increased levels. The farmer's produc-

tivity has in fact brought upon us the need to rebuild our rail system to ensure that we have the capacity to export those products to market.

● (1540)

What are we doing today in this area? We have a House which is not prepared to deal with that issue and debate it firmly. The best thing we can do for our western farmers is to ensure for them a rail capacity which will guarantee them exports. As a country and a nation we will be able to enter into export contracts with foreign purchasers, never having to fear the possibility that that grain cannot be taken to market.

With a new transportation system in the West, new port facilities, double-tracking, upgraded facilities and more cars, we will be able to assure our foreign buyers that our product can be delivered to them on time. This is critical to the prairie farmer as well. He would not have to worry about the export logjam. He can go ahead producing his product, his wheat, with the assurance that we can do the job of exporting it. It will cost him less to store the crops on his land. He will have better cash flow.

The single one thing that will do more for the western farmer than anything else, apart from higher world prices, is the ability of Canadians to compete more effectively in the export markets through an increased rail capacity. That is why essential to what we are doing in our transportation program today is to increase the capacity of our rail system to carry the western farmers' product to market.

The second area I would like to touch upon briefly is the whole field of research and development. Why are we among the most efficient producers of agricultural products in the world? It is because we have undertaken tremendous research and development in order to produce new crops, plants and types of cattle and beef that stand up to Canadian climate and conditions and which can be exported. Marquis wheat is one example, canola is another. We have 72 different nations sending their agricultural representatives to Canada to find out how we are doing some of these things.

Look at the entrepreneurial flare of many Canadians and what they have been able to do. E. P. Taylor has put Canada on the international map in terms of the types of bloodstock he has been able to produce. There are many Canadians who have followed in his footsteps. One of them I know very well. Anderson Farms, which started out ten years ago near St. Thomas, is now a leading exporter of stock to the United States and elsewhere. We have seen what the Holstein cow, developed in Canada, has done for milk production in many other countries. We are now advancing our technology of open transplants and exporting semen. We are able to bring these technologies, these new ways of doing things, to many other nations of the world. This is critical to what we are doing.

Agriculture Canada spends more than $200 million a year on this type of research and development. It goes into soils, plants, water, energy, equipment, animals, food processing, all these types of areas. We have produced 30 to 40 new plant varieties for the benefit of Canadian farmers in the grains, fruits and vegetables areas. After Agriculture Canada was able to find these products, rather than keeping them to itself, it has put them out through the SeCan Association for immediate distribution to the farmers so that the benefits of these new technologies become immediately available. SeCan is presently handling 77 new varieties of plants.

I am very proud of the research and development record in Canada. However, this record does not mean we can sit pat. Our competitors abroad are getting more deeply into these areas as well. It is our obligation to devote more and more effort to high-level research and development in Canada.

A short while ago I had the pleasure of visiting Red Williams in Saskatoon and seeing his tremendous research facilities, of which he is very proud. That Canadian has achieved an international reputation. We need more of this type of individual in our agricultural research in Canada.

The third area we should be looking at in terms of agricultural policy is the whole concept of foreign aid. Except in emergency-like situations such as floods or extreme drought, I do not believe that exporting surplus Canadian food to developing countries is the answer to either their problem or our need for foreign markets. It is critical that they have this food when people are starving. I am not denigrating that role for food aid at all. Even more important than food aid over the longer term is bringing these new agricultural technologies to the developing countries. Our role as a leader in research and development, biotechnologies and the new techniques, as a nation that has developed many new types of animals, plants and trees which can stand up to the harsh vigours of the Canadian environment, gives us a tremendous role to play in exporting those agricultural technologies to the Third World countries. The greatest thing we can do for those nations is to make them self-sufficient in food. They would not have to spend their very scarce foreign exchange reserves on importing produce from other nations. They would be able to feed their people through cycles of drought, heat or pestilence with new products that we with our expertise can help them develop. I believe this would be the greatest contribution we could make in the name of humanity.

A fourth area to look at where we should explore further possibilities to assist the agriculture community and all Canadians is in the area of taxation. I welcome the provisions of the April 19 budget in which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) extended loss carryovers so that those farmers who have experienced difficulty over the past couple of years will be able to spread those losses backwards and forwards to a far greater extent so that income taxes payable before or in the future can be offset by those losses. The farmers will have the cash.

Very important, and some Members have mentioned it today, is the issue of capital gains. In many instances, the farm is the retirement security for the farmer. If the children do not want to take it over and benefit from the capital gains rollover, if they do not have children who can take it over, if they are forced or want to leave the farm because of age or illness, we have to look very seriously at whether we should be taking the

slice of taxes that we are out of that retirement security, namely the farm, which they worked so hard to build up and into which they have put so much. I am very partial to recommendations to take a second look at changing the valuation day to 1974 and offering farmers the option of either choosing 1972 or 1974 as a valuation year for valuing their farms and disposition. I think we should also look very carefully at the impact that inflation might have had upon the value of their farms, and I think we should ask ourselves if it is right, if it is proper and if it is the most efficient use of resources to tax farmers on inflationary gains from that valuation year of 1972 or 1974.

• (1550)

The fifth area I would like to touch upon very briefly in the one minute left to me is the whole concept of self-sufficiency. We have within our means the ability to produce more foodstuffs in Canada. The consumers of Canada will benefit and they can help us by buying Canadian goods, even if they are buying Canadian fruits that are canned. Why do we always need to have fresh fruit throughout the winter? Why do we have to import fruit? Why could we not be growing more of our own foodstuffs in greenhouses, which would take advantage of the tremendous energy surpluses, particularly of western gas? There are tremendously imaginative new methods from which, if implemented, we can all benefit.

The agriculture industry is not the disaster that the Hon. Members opposite have indicated. It is one of the most dynamic, forward looking, entrepreneurial industries in the country. It is one of the best. We should all be proud of what the agriculture industry and the farmers have been able to achieve.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions, comments, answers? Debate.

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, since I come from eastern Ontario and represent what is primarily a rural constituency, I welcome the opportunity to discuss agriculture and its importance to Canada. I have always admired the forthrightness, foresight and determination of Canadian farmers. They have had the ability to lead by example, to thrive on challenge and to increase the efficiency which has built the country. Agriculture helped to build the country with roots which are deep and strong. Determination, sharing and hard work have helped to overcome adversaries in all shapes and forms. Our tradition is strong and we are slow to change from the known to the unknown simply for the sake of change alone.

The federal Government should follow the lead of the farmers with the many attributes which have been ascribed to them, which include those of leadership, self-sufficiency, unity and hard work. These qualities will help in bringing about solutions to the very real problems facing Canadian farmers today.

One problem facing Canadians is that of energy. We all use various forms of energy, and farmers are no exception. Rising fuel costs and security of supply are important matters that must be faced in the near future.

We are fortunate here in Canada to have the potential for energy self-sufficiency. The Government's energy policy proclaims self-sufficiency by the year 1990. However, what we see as a result of its policies are uncertainty, increased costs and indecisiveness all across the country.

Farmers have not only been plagued by high energy costs, but because of the federal Government's interests rate policy, they have also been hit with high financing costs. As a result of high financing costs, many independent farmers have been forced into bankruptcy. Economic hardship in the agricultural sector can have a far-reaching impact affecting the welfare of many people other than farmers and their families.

We have observed the extension of such problems into the farm machinery industry and other farm supply industries as farmers have been forced to curtail expenditures and new capital investment. The need for new capital investment in the farming community continues even though many farmers cannot afford to borrow. Machinery continues to wear out and must be replaced, but it is expensive. If money is put into machinery, it is not used to put food on the table of the farmer. Every day the need for adequate funding for the Farm Credit Corporation grows. Daily financial pressures are forcing farmers to go to the Farm Credit Corporation and farmers are increasingly being told: "Sorry, there is no money".

The Farm Credit Corporation recently requested permission to borrow $600 million from foreign money markets in order to finance the corporation until March, 1984. Finance Department officials turned a deaf ear to this request. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), when questioned in the House of Commons, stated that $250 million was adequate. The Minister's response only goes to show his lack of understanding of the problems facing Canada's farming community.

Another problem facing the farming community is that of retirement. The nature of the agricultural industry and the present tax system create many problems that other industries do not face. Incomes tend to be very erratic, fluctuating with the extremes of weather, the changes in domestic and foreign commodity markets and general economic conditions as a whole. A large percentage of any profit made by a farmer goes directly back into the farm in order to finance the purchase of additional land, cattle, fertilizer, machinery and the like.

At present, farmers have no over-all pension fund other than the Canada Pension Plan. Because the farmer's income is so erratic, his ability to contribute to an RRSP is greatly reduced. There is an old saying that goes: "Farmers are cash poor but asset rich". However, that saying does not answer the question of where a farmer will get a pension when he or she becomes unable to farm in later life. Historically, the farmer's pension has been his farm.

The proceeds of the sale of a farm are eligible for capital gains tax. In the November 12, 1981, federal budget, the IAAC was replaced by forward averaging. This has caused a

great deal of concern because of the potential long-run divergence between interest and inflation rates.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Finance should re-examine his policy of levying capital gains taxes upon farmers and their farms and that he should also review his forward averaging policies in order to allay the fears expressed by the farming community.

Having heard that the Province of Ontario proposes to introduce agriculture as a compulsory part of the core science courses in grades seven through ten, I strongly urge the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) to support this provincial initiative and to urge other Provinces to follow suit. Such courses would make the job of Minister of Agriculture much easier.

To many people, and in particular the Minister of Finance, are unaware of the importance of agriculture to the Canadian economy. Agriculture accounts for one-sixth of all economic activity in Canada. The agricultural sector employs 18 per cent of the Canadian work force and generates nearly 12 per cent of Canada's exports. However, the recession has hit hard. Farm bankruptcies have soared to record numbers, and one agricultural economist has estimated that the recession has taken $5.5 billion worth of assets off the national farm balance sheet.

The Progressive Conservative Party has announced a ten-point program to help the producers survive this recession. We called for greater funding to the Farm Credit Corporation. The Minister of Agriculture agreed with us but his colleague, the Minister of Finance, ignored his advice and slashed the Farm Credit Corporation's request for more funds by over 55 per cent. We called for the establishment of an agri-bond program. The Minister of Agriculture agreed, but again the Minister of Finance has refused to implement such a program.

We called for an improved stabilization plan. Once again, the Minister of Agriculture agreed. However, the Minister of Finance did not agree and, as a result, Canadian producers will continue to suffer from a plan that does not fully take into account rising production costs and a plan that makes its payments after much of the economic damage has been done. We called for revisions to the capital gains tax and other taxation matters. Again, the Minister of Agriculture agreed with the need for such revisions, but again the Minister of Finance has refused to make any changes, although his predecessor did consider a study of the matter.

It is clear from this list that the Minister of Finance is not aware of the importance of and opportunities in Canadian agriculture, nor is he aware of the problems besetting this vital Canadian resource. With the establishment of compulsory agricultural courses at the secondary school level, hopefully future Ministers of Finance will not suffer from the same ignorance.

● (1600)

Recent figures on Farm Credit Corporation loan approvals point to a poor credit picture for financially troubled or beginning farmers seeking mortgages from the federal lending agency. In July, the FCC got approval to borrow $250 million more. It needed at least $600 million. This $250 million just will not cover the tremendous need and demand from farmers.

This is a real danger if we continue on our present course. In 1981, there were 318,361 census farms in Canada, a 12 per cent decline from 366,128 of 1971, and a 57 per cent decline from the 732,858 of 1941. We all know that farms are larger and more efficient but we also know there is a limit to efficiency, and now we see the numbers of farms going out of production at an alarming rate. In the 40 years between 1941 and 1981 the farm population in Canada decreased by nearly 66 per cent, a rate of decline averaging some 4,300 persons per month. Atlantic Canada has suffered the worst with farm population declines of approximately 93 per cent in both New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Farmers are our unsung heroes. In 1940 the average Canadian farm produced enough food to feed 11 people; today an average farm feeds over 60 people. This trend has reached a peak because of the lack of reward for the hard work which is associated with farming.

The net farm income as a proportion of gross farm income has slumped from 37 per cent in 1965 to 19.6 per cent in 1982. In 1965, gross farm income was $4 billion and net farm income was $1.5 billion. In 1970, gross farm income was $4.4 billion and net farm income was $1.3 billion, or 28.8 per cent. In 1982, gross farm income was $19.3 billion and farm income was $3.8 billion.

Agriculture Canada has estimated that production costs will increase by 11 per cent in 1981 and 1986. Farm operating expenses increased 115 per cent between 1976 and 1982. The Minister of Agriculture brags about cheap food and being able today to buy more eggs with a dollar than before. If this trend continues consumers will not be able to buy farm products at any price. What about costs of production and the prices of farm products which have not kept pace? Mr. Speaker, one factor alone which the Government has placed on the backs of our farmers is the costs which stem from the deficit and indirect costs of energy and the federal farm fuel tax which accounts for one quarter of farm operating expenses. In 1972, interest charges comprised 8.6 per cent of farm operating expenses. In 1982, this has grown to 13.9 per cent of farm operating expenses.

It is a crime that FCC does not have the funds available. Farmers in Ontario given conditional loan approvals last summer will have to wait until at least 1984 for any hope of getting these funds.

Settlement in Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington on June 16, 1784 by United Empire Loyalists was a situation of which we have little understanding today. These settlers, who faced starvation, planted turnips that summer and survived on rations of food until the first crop could be grown the next year. From this hearty stock of first farmers in Ontario came future generations of farmers who, to this very day, owe so much to their ancestors. 1984 will mark this bicentennial of agriculture in Ontario, and I hope the Minister of Agriculture will make every effort to recognize this significant contribution to the history of agriculture in Canada during 1984.

There is a vital role for Governments to play in agriculture such as the promotion of soil conservation, the safeguarding and managing of water resources, agricultural research and the conserving of genetic resources. However, Government intervention frequently goes far beyond such concerns since it is often motivated by political consideration and a very narrow view of economic gain.

In a recent report by the science and technology division of the Library of Parliament on world food security it was stated that not so many years ago, the promise of the green revolution seemed to have calmed down fears about society's ability to feed a burgeoning world population. Agricultural technology held the prospect of pushing the problem of food supply far into the future. Between 1950 and 1971, world grain production almost doubled, and despite a rate of population increase unmatched in human history, per capita grain production rose by more than 30 per cent. Today, agricultural systems in developed and developing countries alike are experiencing difficulties, although the causes vary.

The question that arises from this statement is whether or not central planning, uneconomic price ceilings, import restrictions, export taxes, and subsidies established by the Government of Canada have created the problem of supply and distribution, not only affecting the market in Canada but also the world. Increasingly, Canadian agricultural policies are being felt throughout the world because of our large exports of agricultural produce. Canada is one of the largest exporters of grain in the world. What would happen to the world if Canada's grain farmers found that they would no longer afford to supply cheap grain to the hungry masses of people? The result would be that many hundreds of people would die. In light of this fact, the Canadian Government and people have an added responsibility to ensure that our farmers can meet such demands, at home as well as abroad.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Nickerson): Are there any questions or comments? There being no questions or comments, we will proceed to debate. The Hon. Member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain).

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the occasions when I wish there were all kinds of time for a Member to speak. In this debate a lot of things should be answered. A great deal of dreaming is done by Members on your right. There is a facade of confidence over there. It has been pointed out unequivocally by Members on this side that the statistics offered by the Minister of Agriculture have not been authenticated. When you compare his daydreams with the statistics presented by Members on this side, his knowledge of the condition of agriculture today is found to be wanting.

I want to draw the attention of the House and the country as a whole to a situation that has arisen in trade between Canada and the United States. It was apparent from the very beginning that it was going to impact upon Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick particularly, and therefore it was judged not to have any significance, not only to the Government but also to the agricultural organizations in Canada.

Early last year, the State of Maine launched an appeal to the U.S. Department of Commerce to declare that potatoes, round whites in particular, had been dumped into the United States and that they had damaged the return of the industry in the State of Maine and the eastern seaboard. This is very alarming to eastern Canada because we do rely upon shipping a portion of our crop on a near annual basis to the eastern seaboard of the United States. If that market is eliminated or if the return from that market is reduced, it will very seriously affect the income of the Atlantic farmer in the potato industry. However, that is not where it stops, Mr. Speaker. This is where I criticize other areas of Canada. If the export market to the United States reduces the net return to the farmer of Atlantic Canada, at the same time it reduces the net return to every potato producer east of Thunder Bay. Every potato producer in Quebec and Ontario will suffer because of an oversupply of potatoes which would ordinarily have been exported but must now be marketed in eastern Canada, east of Thunder Bay at its extremity. That is the consequence. Unfortunately, the hearings ended in a successful result of the application of the State of Maine, and on July 26 it was found by the Department of Commerce that:

● (1610)

> We have preliminarily determined that there is a reasonable basis to believe or suspect that fall-harvested, round white potatoes from Canada are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than "fair value", as provided in Section 733 of the Tariff Act 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1673) (the Act).

In response to that there was a communique issued by the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan) in respect of the decision of July 26. After weeks and months of the presence of this problem to Canadian trade, the Minister said this:

> Minister Regan noted that officials have not yet had time to study the U.S. Commerce Department's preliminary determination in detail but would be doing so to ensure that the United States is acting in conformity with its international obligations.

I quote from the determination of the Department of Commerce in the United States as follows:

> The U.S. Government imposed am import penalty tax on potatoes from the Maritime Provinces today in an interim decision subject to review.
>
> It assessed an interim penalty of an average 17.9 per cent of the import value. That means importers must post a bonded promise to pay that levy on any imports pending a final ruling—and possible adjustment of the dumping duty—this fall.

Please note, Mr. Speaker, that not only is there a tax imposed, but that tax may be readjusted at a later date upward or downward. This imposes a virtual embargo on all except for those most gambling of individuals on this product imported into Canada. However, I think we should note the final line of the release from the Department of Commerce of the United States which reads:

> The ITC found in a split decision last March that there were preliminary indications of injury to U.S. producers.

The first question I want to raise is why is the Minister unprepared, after months of opportunity to study this situation, because a report of that commission says this:

On February 9, 1983, we received a petition filed by counsel on behalf of the Main Potato Council.

That means, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister had from February 9 until June 28 to study and become knowledgeable about the problem which was to hand. He stated, "We have not had time as yet to consider the consequences". As to who is damaging whom, I want to read into the record of this House the statistics which relate to the importation of potatoes by Canada and the export of potatoes by Canada to the United States in their relative quantities in relation to the quantity of potatoes we consume. In 1971, the U.S. exported to Canada 7.1 per cent of our total consumption. We exported .3 per cent of its consumption. Relatively speaking, then, we probably received 24 times as many potatoes as they received from us. In 1972, it was 7.8 per cent we imported. We exported to the United States .2 per cent. I will not read all the figures because they go up to 1982. However, let us take a look at 1977. We imported 17.2 per cent of our requirements and exported .3 per cent of American requirements. In 1981, we imported 11.8 per cent of our requirements and exported 1 per cent of the American requirements. This is roughly as low a ratio as there is available. It is roughly 12 to 1 on a consumption basis, which we imported versus what we exported for U.S. requirements.

I stated from day one that this was but the tip of the iceberg. I was ridiculed by federal authorities when I tried to contact them for some discussion on this matter. I was really ridiculed by many others in the trade when they said, "Oh, no, we can win this case. It does not really mean anything." There was to be a hearing on September 20, I believe, in Washington. When I called Government officials for advice as to what the potato industry of Canada should do in this case, I was told that this was merely a technical situation, that we really should not put much effort into defending or presenting the Canadian position. That is the answer I received from officials of the Government of Canada.

I went further, Mr. Speaker, and inquired of some highly placed U.S. people. While they did not want us to win, their response was—and I submit to you that every government official which had to do with the potato industry in Canada's trade should have known this—"If you lose the hearings of September 20, you have lost the biscuit." The Canadian Government advisers were saying to the industry, and to me, "This is just a technical thing. Forget it. Don't bother." That is the kind of service which agriculture has had from the Department of Agriculture.

To show you, Mr. Speaker, that this was but the tip of the iceberg, I have in my hand a Bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. Gilman. That Bill was to provide equitable treatment for certain fresh vegetables produced in the United States. It deals with the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to impose at his discretion and on the advice and petition from producers, surcharges on importations from Canada on vegetables. Those vegetables are cabbages, carrots, celery, lettuce, red onions, potatoes and radishes. However, please take note of this:

The Secretary, for the purpose of this Act, may add for the duration of a marketing season any classification of fresh vegetable provided for in such Schedules as a vegetable category if a United States producer of vegetables—

I repeat, "a United States producer of vegetables".

—of that kind petitions the Secretary for such addition and the Secretary concludes that economic injury is being caused or threatened to United States producers—

I have a flyleaf also of a Bill introduced in the Senate of the United States. It is an identical Bill. So now we have a Bill in the House and a Bill in the Senate of the United States. That is what I meant, Mr. Speaker, when I said it is the tip of the iceberg. What offends me is that the Minister of State for International Trade has not yet, after months, concluded what should be done. The industry in New Brunswick pleaded with the Minister of Agriculture to find ways and means of assisting the industry of Atlantic Canada in defending its case.

● (1620)

I say to you unequivocally that the industry is going to spend not less than $250,000 in co-operation with the Canadian Horticultural Council, which, thank Providence, has chosen to champion this cause. The Minister has received letters pleading for financial support for the council and the New Brunswick Potato Agency. Of the $147,000 plus incurred to date in legal fees, the New Brunswick industry alone has already remitted $37,000 to the Canadian Horticultural Council in part payment of its share of the cost of the defence to date. Another $27,000 is going to be needed, which makes for a total of over $75,000 in New Brunswick alone. This, of course, is an organization in an industry which has been downtrodden, ignored and condemned by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). This money has come from the New Brunswick Potato Association whose total promotional budget for 1983-84 is only $35,000, yet their Bill will be $75,000.

I tried to obtain from Government Departments, including the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, copies of the legislation introduced in the U.S. Congress and Senate. "Oh, we do not have them", they said. I went around to three Departments trying to get those Bills and was told that the Government did not have them, or I was denied copies. However, I obtained copies and, since the Minister does not have them, I am going to ask a messenger to deliver them to him when I conclude my remarks.

There is now a third Bill which has been introduced to give the U.S. Government blanket authority to subsidize or pay the cost of applications on behalf of a producer or association of producers who appeal to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture for surcharges on agricultural exports to the U.S. This Government apparently does not have that one either, but I shall have it early next week and I will present it to the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of State for International Trade. I am also going to send to the Minister the brief prepared for the hearing in September, along with a copy of all those documents issued by the U.S. Department of Commerce. If we are to allow this incursion, this breach of the moral principles of trade between Canada and the U.S. without a voice of

complaint, if we allow this proposal to become law without a formal protest, we may well look forward to its extention to the feed, grain and oil seed industries, and goodness only knows what other industries.

I appeal to this Government to heed what I am saying. The consequences of neglect and lack of financing, the consequences of a lack of professional input into opposing this matter, will range from coast to coast in not only the fruit and vegetable industry, but other industries in this nation as well.

Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo-Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, at this time last week I was in my riding and I had the pleasure of attending the sale ring of the local livestock co-op. They ran through about 1,500 hundred head that day, mostly of calves. Good steer calves were going for about 75 cents a pound. The last time I sold calves in that same sale ring was in 1973 and I got 73 cents a pound. I can remember at that time paying about 38 cents to 40 cents a gallon for gasoline, and you know what a gallon of gasoline is worth now.

Mr. Huntington: What is it worth?

Mr. Greenaway: It is about $2.40, something like that. In any event, cattle receipts today are low, costs have probably tripled and people are in real trouble. Many farmers and ranchers have had to take jobs off the farm to try to meet their mortgage and operating expenses. This seems like a very normal thing to do because you are trying to save your business and stay afloat. All was well in my riding until about January this year when the Department of National Revenue sent in teams of auditors who decided that these ranchers, because they were making an off farm income, had to be recategorized from full-time farmers to part-time or even hobby farmers. What is worse, they went back as far as four years and are now sending out reassessments as high as $75,000 and literally bankrupting many of these people.

If you do not think this is a problem, Mr. Speaker, I can lay out the evidence to show you it really is. It is a problem right across the country. In 1981, Statistics Canada claimed that over 39 per cent of all farmers and over 50 per cent of beef farmers are working off the farms to the extent of 171 days a year. I know that in 1982, approximately 125,000 had off farm income. Yesterday I received a zerox copy of an advertisement for a herd dispersal sale involving 100 head of cattle. This is Kelso Angus in Georgetown, Ontario, and what is interesting about this is that at the bottom it says, "A victim of Section 31 of the Income Tax Act". Kelso Angus had been designated as a hobby farm under an interpretation of this Act and as a result of subsequent assessment they were left with no alternative but totally to disperse this major herd which was just attaining the peak of its young productive life. I say that is a disgrace and it should not be happening in this country, Mr. Speaker. I have literally a couple of hundred cases as bad as that. I am going to read from a few letters I have received because they set out the problem so succinctly that I think it will drive home to you how very serious the problem is.

The first letter is from a lady at 150 Mile House, British Columbia, who was audited in January and received a reassessment in April. In May she received a call from the auditor, a Mr. Wilson, stating that they would only be reassessed for 1981, not 1979 and 1980 as previously indicated. He did not give any reason. These people merely went about their business and purchased an old bailer and a pick-up truck thinking that they would have only one year's income tax bill to pay at the worst. Then, all of a sudden, the same auditor phoned back to say he made a mistake and these people would be reassessed for all three years. That just goes to show the incompetence of these auditors, Mr. Speaker. None of them have any agriculture expertise, and we have proved that already in this House.

I have another letter from Quesnel, British Columbia. These people were audited on March 16 and were told they were now classified as a hobby farm because they had no reasonable expectation of a profit. They had three weeks in which to appeal, they went straight to their accountant, found they showed a profit this year and would be glad to show the auditor the books. So they met, and the auditor changed his mind a bit but said that he was still going to classify it as a hobby farm. They then sent their appeal letter, a copy of which came to me, on March 30, and on May 3 the auditor phoned and said he reviewed their case and they were now classified as part-time farmers. In other words, they could deduct up to $5,000, and was that okay with them? She said yes but that her husband was not home and she wanted to ask him before agreeing finally. She asked the auditor on the phone twice if this means they do not owe the Government anything and he said twice, "No, you don't. You don't owe us anything." The next day he phoned back and asked if she had talked to her husband and if he agreed with the decision. She said that he did. The auditor said that as long as he agrees, he did not have to send them a letter. She said no, that she would like the letter. He said that it would take a couple of weeks, and that was okay with her.

• (1630)

Two weeks went by without any letter. She phoned the auditor on May 30 and asked why she had not received her letter. He said that they had reviewed their appeal again and decided that they were back to being assessed as hobby farmers. She asked why she was not notified, and he replied that it had been in the works for "the last two weeks". That was the only reason he gave. She then asked again if they owed the Government anything, and he said yes, as far as his office was concerned.

How can people conduct their business when the tax department harasses them in that manner? Another fact which has come to light is that many young farmers are being hit under Section 31 of the Income Tax Act. I would like to read one case from the presentation that was put together by the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario. He composed a 22-page document called "Income Tax Treatment of Small and Part-Time Farmers" which he presented this summer to the Interprovincial and Federal Provincial Conference of Ministers and the Deputy Ministers of Agriculture in Prince Edward Island.

It is an indictment of the whole problem that I am bringing to the attention of the House in regard to Section 31 of the Income Tax Act.

In this report he points out particularly how absolutely wretched this situation is as far as farmers starting out are concerned. I will just read the one case which he uses as an example:

> In 1974, Mr. A bought a half-section of land for grain farming, the price of which was partially financed by a mortgage and partially by savings. He gradually added to the size of his farm, so that by 1979 he had 800 acres, and had also acquired a full line of farming machinery. Again, these additions were financed by savings and by outside borrowings. During this period, Mr. A had kept his job at a uranium mine, where he was employed on a seven-day-on-seven-days off shift basis.
>
> Mr. A found that with the help of his wife and his two teenage sons, the seven consecutive days off every second week were enough to enable him to carry on his grain farming operation. He also took one week's vacation in the spring and one week in the fall which, together with his regular time off, allowed he and his family to do the planting and harvesting of the crops.
>
> By 1980, Mr. A felt confident enough about the future of his farm that he gave up his job to devote his full time to the farming operation. Unfortunately, his timing was unlucky, and the combination of high interest rates, low grain prices, dry conditions, grasshopper infestation and higher general operating costs forced him to take another job in early 1981.
>
> While this would seem to be an example of an individual genuinely trying to get a start in the farming business, and committing practically all of his capital and most of his energies to the business, Revenue Canada invoked Section 31 and limited Mr. A's farm loss deduction to $5,000 annually. Mr. A's objection to the Appeals Division of Revenue Canada has been rejected, and if he wishes to carry his case further, he must now go to either the Tax Review Board or the Federal Court, either one of which will be a costly and time-consuming procedure.

There are three other examples given here which are all as bad, if not worse.

An interesting thing which is mentioned here and in the other cases is the fact that the wives and children in all of these cases generally work many long hours on these farms, and this labour is not recognized at all by the Department of Revenue. If a farmer employs someone the Department will recognize that. While that is in the farmer's favour, the Department will not credit any labour by the wife or children.

As well, the Department states that if someone has a full-time job, that person does not have the time to spend on the farm. Luckily, the wife of a rancher in my riding kept a diary in 1980. The rancher had a job in a mill where he worked 37.5 hours a week. He put in a total of 1,950 hours that year. In the same year he put in 2,260 hours on his farm. This does not count the hours put in by his wife and children. Of course, the auditors coming from the city figure that if one puts in a 7.5-hour day, that is all one is good for. It only proves that they do not understand farming or what makes a farm or ranch work.

Since I first brought up this issue in the House approximately a year ago, I have managed to get the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan). He writes different replies on the subject to almost anyone who writes him a letter, but at least he is beginning to realize that there might be a problem.

I have copies of letters that he has written to people all across the country. They are interesting and I will read a few key sentences. I have a letter dated May 31 which is a written to a Mr. Lyle Klein of Quesnel, British Columbia, in which he states: "I am in favour of a thoroughgoing review of Section 31 because this provision means that farming is treated differently than other businesses and that the full losses from other businesses can be deducted from the taxpayers' income from other sources."

The Minister says, in a letter to David Kirk, Executive Secretary of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture dated June 17, "Now is the time to address the basic issue of why there should be any limitation on loss deductibility for farming businesses when there is no such limitation in respect of other businesses the taxpayer may pursue." In the final paragraph, he says, "I personally regard Section 31 as a priority issue in agriculture at the present time."

I submit that one surely would not know that it is a priority with him if one tried to do some of the things I have done to get his attention.

In an August 8 letter to Mr. Brian Griffith, President of the Ontario Aberdeen-Angus Association, the Minister of Agriculture said, "My own view is similar to yours in that I am not comfortable with the $5,000 limitation under Section 31 on the deduction which can be made from other sources of income with respect to farming losses. If the person passes the test of having a genuine farming business, I would favour the unlimited loss deductibility which applies to non-agricultural businesses." The Minister is finally realizing that there is a problem.

It did not take the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) as long. I received a reply from him to letters I had written to him on June 6. He said, "I am disturbed by the number of letters and press clippings that I have received illustrating that a rigid application of the restrictive farm loss rules can result in an unfair taxation of bona fide farmers." While he does not go on to say that he will do anything about it, he realizes that there is a problem.

The assessments in my riding are now pouring in. There are approximately 150 people who are getting their reassessment notices, and most of them are anywhere from $5,000 to $75,000. It is interesting to see what happens. The minute one receives that notice, the collection division of Revenue Canada immediately begins its attack. Generally, it phones to say that it demands the amount of money immediately, whether or not that person intends to appeal his case.

People should be aware of the fact that they do not have to pay cash. Some have been foolish enough to borrow money from the bank to pay, but it is possible to go to the bank and arrange for a letter of credit. It costs .5 per cent per year. That will keep the taxman away until the hearing is completed.

If that does not work, they can put a lien on the ranch or farm, and that is not advisable. What is interesting about the letter of credit is that if the case is lost, the bank has to forward that money immediately to the Department of Revenue. The bank then debits the account and makes it a demand loan. With a $100,000 operating loan, for example, the bank

would deduct that letter of credit from the total operating loan so that the person would be cut back during that interval.

When a person receives an assessment, there is an opportunity to file a notice of objection. Generally there is 90 days to file that objection. It will take approximately two to three months to hear from the Department of Revenue. It appears that the Department of Revenue is simply rubberstamping these objections and throwing them out without given them any consideration. I presume that the Department does not want to admit that anyone has made a mistake. When an objection is overruled, the next step is to go to the tax court of Canada. In order to do that, you have to write to Ottawa to the Court of Administration at 381 Kent Street, Ottawa and ask for an appointment. It might take up to two or three months or even longer to get an appointment with the tax court. You go before a judge. You do not need to have a lawyer. It does not cost you anything. It is probably a good idea though to have a lawyer. You go before the judge and, hopefully, if you win the case, you are all right. But if you do not, the only thing left is to go to the Supreme Court of Canada. You have to go through the court system, which is terribly expensive. I know of only one person with whom I have been in contact out of about 500 who is going that route.

● (1640)

There was an interesting case of a chap at 100 Mile House who has a horse farm. That throws taxation auditors into a tizzy. They do not understand horses at all. They do not understand cattle, goats or anything else as far as I am concerned, but horses really throw them for a loop. Tax people claim that horse breeding is not classed as a legitimate business in Canada. That is their stand on horse breeding. This particular chap was reassessed about $70,000. He went to the bank to try to get a letter of credit. Because he did not have a great line of operating credit, he did not get the amount needed. Revenue Canada is now forcing him to sell his horses. This will put him into receivership. At the same time he has launched an appeal. He wants to go to the tax court, but he will be broke long before he gets there.

This problem is damaging to agriculture. It removes the incentive for anyone wanting to get into farming. I had a person in my office last week. When he went through some of the stuff with me I found he had 500 acres of land, but he decided to let it sit there. As long as we have this kind of legislation and these kinds of over-zealous auditors and a Minister of Revenue who is as heartless as he appears to me to be, agriculture in Canada will go nowhere.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions? Comments? Debate?

Mr. Ian Watson (Châteauguay): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have this opportunity this afternoon to take part in a debate introduced by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer). The Government has been accused in this resolution of not responding to the financial needs of farmers. It provides us on this side with a very useful occasion to put a few facts on the record.

I come from an area that is no longer truly agricultural but I do have, in two or three of my municipalities, a substantial dairying industry. In another part of my constituency, the black earth area, I have a very fast growing industry in the production of vegetables, many of which are being exported to the United States in numbers and quantities that last year exceeded revenues of $16 million and this year will probably be in the order of at least $20 million. This is a small geographic area but it is an extremely rich agricultural area. Exports of vegetables are penetrating markets that have never been penetrated before by Canadian products. Markets are being penetrated largely because the federal Government has been helpful in many areas, either providing for refrigerated storage allowing, for example, carrots to be kept in perfect condition until late spring or early summer, even carried over from the previous year, or, in the case of some salad crops, providing assistance in fast chilling facilities.

The federal Government has been helpful and it is paying off for the Canadian economy. To accuse the present Minister of not doing his best for agriculture is really a travesty. I think every Canadian farmer knows that the present Minister has been a staunch defender of farmers' interests whenever he has had the opportunity in Cabinet to do that. I am sure in many, many a Cabinet meeting the present Minister has been an "enfant terrible" in favour of the interests of Canadian farmers, and his actions have paid off in a number of the new programs that we have seen.

[*Translation*]

I would especially like to mention a few items concerning the dairy industry, which is an important sector in an area like the federal riding of Châteauguay. Canada's dairy industry has had to face two major setbacks in recent years. A drop in domestic demand for dairy products was followed by a spectacular drop in prices as result of reduced demand and an unprecedented surplus of over two million tons in other countries producing dairy products. We are now overcoming these problems thanks to our supply management program and other federal policy measures. The dairy program has been in effect since 1975, with changes being made regularly following recommendations and meetings with members of the dairy industry.

As far as subsidies are concerned, in order to maintain the importance of our dairy industry, subsidies are granted directly to producers of industrial milk. At the present time, the subsidy is $6.03 per hectoliter on shipments meeting domestic requirements. It is expected that $280 million in subsidies will be paid during the present dairy campaign which started August 1.

Last year, Quebec producers received $132 million in subsidies. Within the framework of our national dairy policy, the Federal Government determines a target price for processed milk and cream to ensure that increases in production costs of

dairy producers are covered by market prices. The target price is calculated according to a formula established in 1975, which allows for variations in production costs and other factors. The price serves as a guide for provincial milk marketing boards and in setting prices for processed milk and cream in the provinces. The present target price is $42.80 per hectoliter.

In 1975, when the present national dairy policy was established, the target price was set at $25. This means there has been an increase of 72 per cent. According to Mr. Garon, the Quebec Minister responsible for Agriculture, the Federal Government is doing nothing for farmers. However, we have increased income from industrial milk by 72 per cent since 1975.

Since 1975, Federal Government expenditures with respect to dairy products have averaged $300 million per year. These funds are helping to ensure the continued development of the Canadian dairy industry.

[*English*]

I would like to mention one other area we tend to neglect when we talk about agriculture. A tremendous contribution has been made by our agricultural research. These policies have contributed not only to agriculture but to the Canadian economy by strengthening the quality of our agricultural products and thus our ability to compete in world markets.

We spend more than $200 million a year on agri-food research. This amounts to almost half of what is being spent by all organizations in the country, both private and public, on that kind of research. We have developed, as a result, one of the most successful and productive agricultural systems in the world. Plant breeding has gained for Canada a reputation second to none. A whole variety of new plants which are able to defeat diseases and increase yield have been developed. The Department produces 30 to 40 new plant varieties each year for the benefit of Canadian farmers. They cover a wide variety of crops, including grains, fruit and vegetables. Oilseeds have been a particular success story. Canola, rapeseed which was a Canadian research success story—

● (1650)

Mr. Fraser: It was a bad word, and you know it.

Mr. Watson: Canola is now giving Canada about $500 million a year in foreign exchange. This is what it is worth from an export point of view. It is an extremely important product, not only for Canadian farmers but for the rest of the economy because of the secondary effects of that money. There has been a succession of new varieties of wheat over the years.

Something which is of particular interest to my part of the world, about which I might as well be talking, is this new Leger barley variety. It is now available for the first time to Canadian farmers. It outyields all other barleys grown in eastern Canada by wide margins. Leger barley is so promising that it could supplant all other barleys grown in Ontario, Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces over the next few years. It could reduce the dependency of eastern farmers, particularly those in Quebec and the Maritimes, on grain for animal feed imported from outside their provincial borders. One day Leger barley could help make eastern Canada self-sufficient in grain grown for animal feed, along with new corn varieties which require an ever shorter growing season and which, combined, put a lie to the kind of propagandistic opposition of some farmers' organizations against changes to the Crow. In effect, this kind of argument was being made to stir up eastern farmers against the Crow arrangement. It was to the effect that they would be paying so much more for western grain that they would never be able to compete, etc. What nonsense! Within a few years eastern Canada will be self-sufficient in feed grain production. In my view that argument was totally false, as are many of the arguments used against the Crow in the West.

[*Translation*]

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention, but only briefly, because I would like to let others . . . I would like to mention the compensation plan for apple growers in Eastern Canada. In the winter of 1980-1981 and the following spring, severe frost caused very serious damage to orchards in Eastern Canada. In many cases, producers suffered losses of over 50 per cent. After a thorough analysis of the situation, the Federal Government, in consultation with apple growers in the areas concerned, developed a compensation and reestablishment plan. We want to help apple growers in Eastern Canada recover their full production capacity. The compensation provisions are as follows: between now and December 31, 1984, apple growers will receive compensation for trees damaged in 1980-1981. Forty dollars per standard tree will be paid to cover the cost of removal of dead trees and preparing the soil for new plantings. New plantings in the orchards concerned will be covered by the plan as follows: As soon as the orchards destroyed by frost have been replanted, $16 per standard tree will be paid to cover the cost of maintaining the new trees until they start producing.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this is a major contribution towards helping our apple growers, and an indication of the assistance the Government is giving to farmers across the country. I shall not comment any further, since I would like to give the Official Opposition a chance to finish the debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Any questions? Comments? Debate. The Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) has the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, in the dying minutes of Friday afternoon it gives me pleasure to rise and conclude the debate. I was very pleased to hear the comments of the Hon. Member for Châteauguay (Mr. Watson). He expressed some very progressive thoughts on the Crow rate. I see the former Minister of Transport is present today. He probably listened with a very open mind to those

comments. He should have acted when he was Minister, and we would have had a lot fewer problems and difficulties in the whole Crow debate. They were very progressive thoughts, and I was pleased to hear them being expressed by the Hon. Member for Châteauguay.

The motion of the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) is true in what it says. It condemns the Government "for its failure to recognize the economic hardship affecting all farmers in Canada". It has never been a more true statement than it is today. The Hon. Member for Cariboo-Chilcotin (Mr. Greenaway) gave one very clear example of it in his speech. Another example of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) not recognizing the difficulty in the vegetable and potato industry was put before the House by the Hon. Member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain). Also, the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson) put in very clear language the difficulties with the agricultural grain stabilization plan at a time when grain farmers in western Canada have been severely hurt by difficult economic times. Almost $1 billion of their own money is sitting in the federal Treasury, and the Government is not prepared to change the formula so that the money can get to those farmers in need at this time, not a year or two years from now.

These examples were put before the House. The Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette dealt with a group of plans which have been put in place for agriculture over the last 40 years. If we look at the record of the Minister and the number of Bills he has put before the House in the last ten years, we find that most of them were only improvements on legislation passed before he ever became Minister. The Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette suggested that the Minister should use the tools which are in place at this time if he has no new ideas to put before the House to assist farmers in difficult times.

If we look at the net incomes of farmers, as the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) pointed out, we see that in net constant dollars farmers in 1982 were making less than they were making in 1956. That is very eye-opening because there are fewer farmers today than there were at that time. If we look at farm expenses, we find that they have increased tremendously. It makes me wonder how they are capable of hanging on, given that statistical picture. Farm production costs are estimated to increase from 1981 to 1986 by 110 per cent. If we look at the prices of commodities, we find that there is no chance for that kind of increase in commodity prices to keep up with expenses.

Basically, the motion is saying that we need some policies to bring agriculture into the eighties and to carry it into the nineties. The Minister should not sit back and brag about the policies on which he has sat during the ten years he has been Minister of Agriculture. They are not sufficient to carry us into the next decade. That is why the motion condemns the Government for its failure to implement sound agricultural policies to carry us into these coming years. This is very evident to farmers throughout the country.

I know time is drawing to an end, but in conclusion I ask the Government to look at the agricultural adjustment fund to deal with western livestock affected in the Crow debate. It is most important if it intends to continue on the path in the Crow debate which it has followed to this point.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It seems I am in the habit of wishing Hon. Members a good weekend—

[*English*]

—and I would choose to do so, as I usually do. I see the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) present and I am reminded of certain procedural difficulties this afternoon relating to the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), whom I would not refuse in the circumstances. That Hon. Member reminded me of the difference, if I may say this as a good wish to Hon. Members for the weekend, between a lawyer and a rooster, that is, that a rooster clucks defiance. I wish Hon. Members a good weekend.

At 5.02 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Orders.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 24, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1110)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Thursday, October 20, 1983 consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motions Nos. 41, 42, 43 and 46 (Mr. Benjamin), Motion No. 44 (Mr. McKnight) and Motion No. 45 (Mr. Mayer).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) had the floor at the adjournment of the House. The Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo).

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this series of motions which to some extent give a pretty fair indication of the effect of 12 to 40 years of Liberal bureaucracy in that this Bill before the House is so badly drafted that a number of things must be changed to even make it palatable and understandable.

This series of motions deals with sanctions and awards which may be levied by the Administrator. As you mentioned, the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) was the last speaker and he gave a very interesting series of Bills which he thought should be presented to the House. I could go on, Mr. Speaker, because I would like to add to those Bills Conservative Bill C-112, which is a Bill that says that if a patient loses his hand the Conservatives would treat the heart because the darn thing is pumping out all the blood. That is the kind of inadequacy which we see in this whole series of amendments.

The intent of Motion No. 41 is to give to the Administrator the authority to make sanctions against the railways but not against the Wheat Board and other agencies of the Government. It, along with Motion No. 42, should be in the Bill to give authority to the Administrator to do his work properly and not be bothered with fighting with other agencies within the Government. For instance, Clause 21(1)(a) requires the Administrator to establish performance objectives. Motion No. 42, which stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), attempts to reduce the confusion which has been built into the Bill by bureaucrats who have become sloppy and did not bother to take a good look at the effect of the amendments. This particular amendment is an attempt to get rid of some of the confusion which is manifest in the Bill by allowing one agency of the Government—the Administrator, who is defined as an agent in the Bill—to levy sanctions against another agency, that being the Canadian Wheat Board or the Canadian Grain Commission. It also attempts to strengthen a portion of the Railway Act.

• (1115)

Sanctions against the railways have been in the Railway Act for a great number of years. Unfortunately, the Canadian Transport Commission or the Government of Canada, the Cabinet, which has the power within the Railway Act to apply sanctions to the railways and force them to carry grain or whatever railways are built to do, has never used that power.

Motion No. 42 strengthens the Railway Act by giving the Administrator, this one-man agency, more power. He probably has more than he should but if he uses it well in forcing the railways to do their duty, it could be of some value. This amendment would allow the Administrator to have the sole responsibility for imposing sanctions on the railways. We recommend the amendment to both the Official Opposition and the Government as one way of assuring that we have the kind of control over the railways which, along with Motion No. 41, would guarantee performance. Since the Railway Act has not guaranteed performance although it has had the authority for many years, if we are to have an Administrator let us use him to develop the transportation of grain in such a way that it will not be affected by the dilatory railway.

Motion No. 43 deals with awards to system participants. It would eliminate the Wheat Board from the structure of a group that could receive awards because that particular idea of paying awards to a Government agency—again, one agency paying awards to another agency—does not have a great deal of logic to it. I suppose it could be considered to be incompetence on the part of the people who drafted the Bill. We suggest a change by taking out the railways as receivers of awards. They do not need awards. We have been giving the railways awards for the last 100 years and it has not improved their ability to do a good job.

Railways do not really need awards and the awards we have given them in the past have not produced good performance. We have given them rehabilitation funding, money for the rehabilitation of cars and rail lines. That can only be considered an award. Monetary awards have been given in the case of branch lines particularly, but the Government has never checked to see if the money was used for rehabilitation

of rail lines. What they did was take what little of the money was spent on the rehabilitation of that line and just added that money to their income.

• (1120)

That is the kind of award which the railways have been receiving and it has not made any difference in the quality of their service. A lot of awards in the form of hopper cars have also been given to the railways. The responsibility for the movement of grains belongs to the railways, according to the Railway Act and according to our understanding of why the railways are there. If one was driving a truck, for instance, one would expect to own the truck. One would not expect the Government to supply the truck even if one were moving Government goods. However, for the last number of years we have been supplying hopper cars and the railways have not been charged for that: they have been able to use those hopper cars rent free, so to speak. That must also be considered an award to the railways because they do not have to provide railway cars to move grain, as they did before 1950.

Motion No. 43, Mr. Speaker, also establishes the principle which Hon. Members have been speaking about for a number of weeks. The Wheat Board should not be tampered with. The second part of this amendment deals with the possibility of sanctions. Again, we feel that if sanctions were put in place they should not be levied against the Wheat Board, because any levy against the Wheat Board is a levy against the producer, and if we levy against the producer we are going to affect the cash flow of the producers. That is not the intent of this Bill. Consequently, we feel that this particular amendment should be allowed.

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members of this House are hearing more and more about the plan of the Government to hustle this Bill through all stages of debate by the end of this month. I would like to say at the outset that this will come back to haunt the Liberals for many years to come. The dismantling of the Crow rate will long be remembered on the Prairies. The Government, of course, will make much about the unwillingness of Hon. Members on this side of the House to join with it in its plans to scrap the Crow. It will continue to accuse us of being reactionary on the issue of grain transportation. It will continue to hold up before Canadians the hope of job creation from railway operation—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. With all due respect to the Hon. Member, this is report stage of a Bill. There are specific amendments before us and debate should be strictly relevant to the amendment being considered.

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, I am just making introductory comments; I intend to debate the amendment before us. I would like it recorded again that we in this Party offered to deal with those parts of the Bill which were beneficial. All the Government had to do was divide it into the three parts. We agreed to public investment in railway upgrading.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, I invite him to speak to the amendments which are currently before the House.

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, we have been debating amendments to this Bill which we believe would make it more like a Bill which would come from this Party. It would be more reflective of what is needed for western Canada. Of course, we would begin by retaining the current statutory freight rates.

• (1125)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Hon. Member is not prepared to debate the amendments specifically before the House, the Chair will have no alternative but to recognize someone else.

Mr. Epp: Next.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I invite him to speak to Motions Nos. 41 to 46 inclusive, grouped for debate at this point.

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, if you would give me a chance I am coming to the amendments we are discussing.

This group of amendments, Mr. Speaker, deals with the authority of the Administrator of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee to set performance objectives and a system of sanctions and awards to enforce those objectives. We agree that performance objectives should be set by the committee, but what is missing in this legislation is a restriction of its authority to set those objectives only for the railways. As I pointed out the other day when I was commenting on Motions Nos. 36, 37 and 38, the problem with our grain delivery system is not that the producers cannot get the grain to the elevator in time or that the grain is held up unnecessarily in port; the problem is and has been for quite a while that the railways cannot seem to meet their obligations to move grain quickly and efficiently from the country elevators to port. They have been responsible for millions of dollars worth of prairie grain sitting in cars on sidings by country elevators when it should have been at the port terminals being loaded on to ships for export.

I have been told horror stories, Mr. Speaker, about railways leaving full cars sitting at country elevators for up to 90 days. No doubt about it, we need to set performance objectives for the railways and make sure they meet them. But why, Mr. Speaker, do we need to have the Senior Grain Transportation Committee set performance objectives for the Grain Commission or the Wheat Board? Why do we need another regulatory body overseeing the other regulatory bodies which are responsible to their own Ministers? I think the simple answer is that we do not. In fact, as I pointed out the other day, allowing the Administrator of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee to interfere in the operation of the Wheat Board will weaken the Board's ability to market western grain. The intent of Motion No. 41 is to limit that interference.

Motion No. 42, Mr. Speaker, recognizes the simple fact that the railways have been at the public trough for long enough

now. By all means, set performance objectives for them, and if they do not meet those objectives, impose sanctions. But why in heaven's name do we offer them rewards for meeting their performance objectives? They have been taking the Canadian public for a ride for too long now. Let's make this the end of the line for the railways' public gratuities. Already this Bill proposes to hand over to the railways some $650 million annually as a Crow subsidy. The Government will be investing billions in upgrading our grain delivery system, much to the delight, no doubt, of CN and CP. If that is not enough, add to that the billions of dollars provided over the years in subsidies, the provision of grain hopper cars and deferred income tax. No, Mr. Speaker, the railways are already being rewarded handsomely for a pretty poor record of meeting their commitment to move grain quickly and efficiently to port.

● (1130)

If this Bill is allowed to pass through the House as it is now written, the railways will be rewarded again by the elimination of the Crow rate. However, this time the reward will be coming out of the pockets of prairie farmers. As far as I am concerned, the railways have gotten enough. It is ludicrous even to consider establishing a system of awards to be applied to CN and CP simply for meeting their performance objectives and doing their job. As David Lewis said many, many years ago, it is time to stop. It is time we cracked down on these corporate welfare bums and on corporate welfare handouts.

I would like to close, Mr. Speaker, by dealing briefly with Motions Nos. 45 and 46. These motions are very similar. Both increase the maximum sanction for the railways to 20 per cent of the volume-related variable costs. However, our Motion No. 46 goes one step further. For that reason, I believe it is the motion that we should support.

In addition to the 20 per cent of volume-related variable costs, this motion would make the railways liable to sanctions equal to 100 per cent of the capital portion of line-related variable costs on grain dependent branch lines. This would simply take from the railways all of the reward money the Bill gives to them if they do not meet their performance objectives or, in other words, if they do not do their job and indeed obey the laws that they are currently required to obey under the Railway Act.

Taken together, I think these sanctions would present a sufficient incentive for the railways to live up to their obligation to transport grain which they have been so delinquent at living up to in the past. It is high time that the railways started doing their job.

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a few words on the record dealing with the motions that are lumped together here, Motions Nos. 41 through 46 inclusive. I would first like to say that I disagree with the fact that the motions are lumped together. Although they are similar in some respects, I would like to debate each of these motions separately because they do have separate intent and they are separate motions. It is very hard to say what we would like to say about all of these motions in the ten minutes allowed. There are six motions lumped together and we do not have adequate time to cover each and every one of them as we would like to.

I would say initially, Mr. Speaker, that under Bill C-155 the railways have been given a guaranteed annual income. They are guaranteed a return of 20 per cent on their investment and they will either drain that out of the pockets of the farmers of Canada or, if that amount is more than the farmers can bear, they will drain that guaranteed annual income from the pockets of the taxpayers of Canada through the Government of the country. I do not know of any farmer in my riding who would not be very happy to have a guaranteed annual return on his or her investment of 20 per cent. Things like that must be rectified.

The guaranteed annual income to the railways is not really tied to any performance indicators. If there are to be performance indicators, they should be set out in Bill C-155. In terms of the motions that are before us now, it would be very appropriate to have performance indicators spelled out within some sections of the Bill.

The entire system may be well managed, but if the railway companies do not perform and if performance indicators are not included and we cannot tell whether or not they have been performing, they should not have a guaranteed return on their investment of some 20 per cent. I will grant that it is not always the railway companies that are at fault. There are some situations in which the railway companies have performed very well. That usually happens on the main lines. The rail companies hardly ever seem to perform well on the branch lines.

The performance indicators, Mr. Speaker, should not only be tied in to the hauling of grain at a certain rate or with a certain turnaround time but should also take into account the fact that the rail companies have been responsible, or should have been responsible, for keeping the rail lines in an adequate condition so that they can be utilized to the fullest possible extent. This certainly is not the case. Performance indicators should be tied into the upgrading of the rail system.

I can think of situations where there is a need for hopper cars at delivery points with large grain storage capacities and yet there are only 85-pound steel tracks going into those places. The provincial Governments, the federal Government and the Canadian Wheat Board actually bought the grain hopper cars that the railway companies did not buy. Those cars should be able to go into delivery points where they are needed and be fully loaded and hauled back out. Of course, if there are only 85-pound steel tracks there, we all know that a box car can only be loaded one-third full and must be hauled out of that delivery point. That is a very inefficient kind of system.

I think that efficiency should be tied in to the performance indicators that the railway companies should be compelled to honour. Under the Act by which the railway companies operate, they are responsible for providing that service. They have received more than adequate compensation over the years for providing that service, either through land, cash grants, rolling stock or money to upgrade the rail systems. The railway

companies have not upgraded the system. They have let it waste away. Some of the tracks are in very poor condition. The railway companies have taken the money that should have been used for upgrading the rail system and spent it on numerous other things that have nothing to do with grain transportation.

That brings me to another point I wish to discuss, Mr. Speaker. Many things that are included in Bill C-155 should be debated separately. Bill C-155 has become known through the media to many farmers in western Canada as the Crow Bill. However, we know that the Bill deals with more than the statutory rate that is tied to the movement of grain. The Bill also deals with the upgrading of the rail transportation system and the leasing of the Dominion coal blocks. If the Bill were to be split into these three very separate issues as has been requested by Members of the New Democratic Party, Motions Nos. 41 through 46 would in fact fall under the section that would deal with the upgrading and improvements to the rail transportation system because the network that we presently have sometimes operates efficiently along main lines but very seldom operates with any degree of efficiency on branch lines.

● (1140)

As I have already said, while the cars may belong to the railway company and it can move them in, it is sometimes unable to move fully loaded cars out because of the condition of the tracks. Of course, track condition is a responsibility of the railway companies which should be taken into account in their performance. There is no way they should be allowed a guaranteed annual income of 20 per cent on their investment if they do not perform the movement of grain in the best interests of the producers. We have already heard about the Administrator's acting in the best interests of the producers for such things as trucking grain from certain delivery points. A conflict of interest may well arise if rail line maintenance is not tied into the performance indicators for the railways, because if they do not upgrade the rail lines and truck the grain instead, they would effectively kill that line and would have reason to go to the Canadian Transport Commission and ask for the abandonment of that rail line. Therefore I believe the branch lines are an integral part of the performance indicators of the railroads to justify their guaranteed annual income which is to be provided through this legislation.

Motions Nos. 41 through 46 deal with the power which is given to the Administrator, power which no individual should have. As I understand it, the Government wants to make the Administrator the sole person to solve all the problems of grain transportation. That person would be responsible to the Cabinet. These motions attempt to have the Government consider the fact that the Administrator should not have the power of sanctions and other means over the Canadian Wheat Board, which is a producer organization. The Wheat Board is a farmers' organization which performs in the best interests of producers in western Canada. Instead, the Administrator should be concerned with operating a more efficient grain transportation system in the best interests of the producers. We maintain that this should not be done by abandoning branch lines, trucking grain and having power over the Wheat Board.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair hesitates to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired. He needs the unanimous consent of the House to continue. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, there are presently six motions before the House. All of them seek to amend Clause 21 of Bill C-155. I consider those motions very important because Clause 21 of the Bill gives great discretionary power to the Governor in Council. In other words, that discretion is given to the Minister in charge of administering Bill C-155.

I would ask all Members of the Government to study Clause 21 of the Bill very closely. I say this because, having sat in this Parliament with my seatmate from Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) for some 15 years, we have seen Bills passed through the House of Commons, some of which we have supported and others which we have opposed. We have often seen the intent of legislation change quite drastically as a result of the regulations that are drafted by the Government itself or by the particular philosophy of the Minister in charge of a Bill. The reason for that is that a lot of discretionary power is given to the Minister in charge of a particular piece of legislation. He or she may interpret a Bill in any number of ways.

The six amendments in question today amend Clause 21 which gives the Minister tremendous discretionary powers regarding sanctions and awards to the participants in the grain handling system. Clause 21 states that the Governor in Council may, by regulation, at any time after the completion of the review that the Minister is required to carry out under Section 59, take a number of steps which are listed in that clause. This includes awards and sanctions as are detailed in Clause 21(b)(i) and Clause 21(b)(ii) to be applied to the system participants. It goes on to talk about more regulations. Clause 21(3) states that the Governor in Council may make regulations establishing a system of arbitration to resolve disputes concerning awards or sanctions that are to be applied according to this legislation.

This clause gives tremendous discretionary power to any Minister. I say to my Liberal friends across the aisle that the time will eventually come, perhaps very soon, when they are not in Government and another Minister will be sitting across the way. I say to the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) that the time may come when there will be a Minister other than one from his Government in charge of administering Bill C-155. That Member may then experience the same kind of frustration over the bureaucracy and lack of freedom of information one finds in the executive council in our country today. At that time he may wish that some amendments were passed to curtail the power of the Minister with respect to awards and sanctions on the grain handling system.

That is the thrust of the amendments that are before the House this morning. Our amendments and those moved by the Conservative Party attempt to limit the power that the Minister will be given through Orders in Council to draft regulations regarding sanctions in the grain handling system.

I repeat that I seriously recommend to Government Members that they take a very serious look at Clause 21. If they did so I am sure they would be very interested in supporting some of these amendments in the name of democracy and fairness.

Let me refer specifically to Motion No. 41 which was moved by the Hon. Member for Regina West. That motion points out once again that we are dealing with a transportation bill and it should be treated as such. Motion No. 41 refers to the power to impose sanctions and we say that this power over the Canadian Wheat Board and the grain companies should not exist in this Bill. The Canadian Wheat Board is responsible to the farmers of this country and we believe that the Administrator and the Minister in charge of the Bill should not have the power to impose sanctions on the Canadian Wheat Board.

In reality, the sales that are made by the Canadian Wheat Board will determine grain transportation objectives. Therefore the Canadian Wheat Board, as the farmers' agency, should be able to allocate the cars to where it knows how much and what kind of grain is needed. I maintain that the Wheat Board and not the Administrator of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee should have that power.

The Hon. Member for Regina West, who has done a very commendable job on this Bill before the House, also moved Motion No. 42. That motion seeks to limit the application of sanctions to the railways for failure to meet performance objectives. There are a number of reasons why I would like to recommend this motion to the House. This part of the legislation would give the Administrator power to impose sanctions on the Canadian Wheat Board. We find it very absurd for one agency of the federal Government to be able to impose sanctions on another agency of the federal Government. In other words, the Minister in charge of this legislation can be given the power to impose sanctions on the Wheat Board, which is under the authority of Senator Argue in the other place. I do not believe it should operate in this way and the farmers of western Canada believe it should not operate in this way.

In the past it is only the railways which have consistently failed to meet performance requirements. I believe the sanctions need only apply to the railroads. The farmers for whom the Canadian Wheat Board is working should not have sanctions imposed upon them.

● (1150)

Motion No. 43 is also in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West. Once again it talks about the possibility of sanctions and awards being removed when it comes to the Canadian Wheat Board. The appropriate place for that amendment, as indicated in Motion No. 43, is once again in Clause 21. I do not want to repeat the arguments. We have said many times that sanctions must not apply to the Canadian Wheat Board, to grain companies, to the Wheat Pool and the like; they should apply to the railways. There are many good reasons why that should occur.

In this collection of amendments there is co-operation between our Party and our friends in the Conservative Party. Indeed, Motion No. 44 is moved by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight). I believe the Hon. Member is on his way back from his riding. I am sure he would be interested in knowing that his amendment moves in a similar direction to the one about which we are speaking today.

Mr. McDermid: He is here.

Mr. Nystrom: I hear someone say he is here. I knew that if he was not he would certainly be back very soon. He made the best argument as to why his amendment should be carried.

[*Translation*]

On September 12, the Member from Saskatchewan said in Committee, and I quote:

I think the intent is similar to that of Mr. Benjamin. There is no way I can see any agency of the Crown, or any minister, applying a sanction through the Canadian Wheat Board or the Canadian Grain Commission that would basically affect producers, who are the main participants, or the sole participants, within the Canadian Wheat Board, or sanction the companies to which they belong and, through that, sanction producers, so the sanctions to be applied would be non-pecuniary. I do not know the definition of that, but I strongly suspect, Mr. Chairman, that most sanctions applied would have ramifications that would affect producers, either through depriving them of the ability to deliver their products or depriving them of the ability to have their products sold.

[*English*]

And this is the end of the quotation:

[*Translation*]

Therefore, my understanding of non-pecuniary would be that the sanctions would meet the intent that Mr. Benjamin meant by the inclusion of the words. We have seen fit to move it by not being specific but by using the word "non-pecuniary" and seeing how that would pass down.

[*English*]

I think he sums up the arguments for his motion in his own words. The other motion before the House—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Nystrom: May I have one or two minutes within which to wind up my speech?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue.

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) that in many ways this is an important group of

amendments. One of them happens to be in my name, and I would like to speak to it specifically.

An Hon. Member: That is why it is important.

Mr. Mayer: Perhaps it is important because it is in my name, but I do not want to pursue that very far. Our sole purpose throughout this whole discussion—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member but he moved Motion No. 45. According to the rules he is presumed to have spoken. I would like to confer with the Table.

The Hon. Member has the floor.

Mr. Mayer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very simply put, our sole purpose throughout the discussion of the amendments to the changes the Government is proposing to the Crow rate has been to protect the interests of producers. When we talk about protecting their interests, one of their interests is costs. In that regard we have advanced the notion or the proposal of a three-year freeze on the rate charged to producers. The other area is that of guaranteeing service by the railways when it comes time for producers to move grain. In that regard Section 262 of the Railway Act protects producers, in fact all shippers, so that the railways are obligated to provide certain kinds of service.

This particular piece of legislation allows for another way that producers can be guaranteed protection. According to the Bill as drafted, a large amount of money will go to the railways each year. One way to put pressure on the railways to provide service is to take some of that money and hold it back, not for foolish or capricious reasons, but for reasons related to the performance of railways in the movement of grain. Motion No. 45 would amend Clause 21(2), which reads:

> The sanctions referred to in subparagraph (1)(b)(ii) shall, in respect of any railway company, consist of a reduction in the government payment to the railway company under Part III, as prescribed by regulations made by the Governor in Council, not exceeding an amount that, in the opinion of the Commission, is equal to 10 per cent of the volume-related variable costs of the railway company.

To put that in perspective, about 80 per cent of the total amount of money the railways say they need to move grain is comprised of volume-related variable costs. If we take 10 per cent of 80 per cent, it means we are holding back 8 per cent of the Government money which will go to the railways. Let me emphasize that 8 per cent is not the amount which will be held back. It is a maximum, it is a variable. It is up to 8 per cent.

Motion No. 45 simply indicates that the Governor in Council should be in a position to hold back more. We are suggesting 20 per cent. Twenty per cent of 80 per cent is 16 per cent. That is not a large amount of money compared to the total. It is not an absolute, it is a maximum.

Just to give some figures, in 1983-84, if we use the 10 per cent figure, it would be $65 million out of total railway revenue of $790 million. In 1984-85, according to the figures provided by the Department, it would be $71 million out of $893 million. In 1985-86 it would be $75 million out of $987 million. Motion No. 45 simply suggests that that amount be doubled so that the railways know the Government is serious about seeing that they live up to their performance objectives.

In many ways it makes sense because producers do not have the option of receiving any of that Government money themselves. It all goes to the railways. If there was a provision in the Bill that some of the money would go to producers, they would then be in a position themselves to judge whether the railways were providing service. If the railways were not providing service and they had the option of using trucks to move some of their grain to a feed mill or crushing plant, they could do that. But when all the money the Government is to put up—and it is substantial, we give the Government credit for that—goes to the railways, surely there should be as many teeth in the Bill as possible to ensure that the railways perform. The amendment suggests that 8 per cent of the total amount of money is not enough and that 16 per cent would be more appropriate.

Let me put it further into perspective. As the Bill is written, volume-related variable costs will go down. There is a provision in the Bill that the railways be allowed a contribution to what is called their constant costs. As constant costs become a larger and larger proportion of the total amount of money that the railways will get from the Government, the actual percentage that is volume-related variable costs will decline. Over a period of time, the 8 per cent that the Government is suggesting in the Bill as it is written at report stage will decline. Over time the contribution to constant costs that the railways will be allowed to charge will amount to about 20 per cent. This becomes rather involved statistically and I am not sure it is worth elaborating. The point is that over time this 10 per cent figure will fall. It is now only 8 per cent and over time it will fall to less than 8 per cent.

● (1200)

If the Government is really serious about providing the producers of this country with some guarantees that the railways will in fact perform, there should be nothing wrong with doubling this holdback, which is all it can be termed, from 10 per cent to 20 per cent. Initially, the Bill at second reading was written to hold back 40 per cent of the volume-related costs. Forty per cent of 20 per cent would only amount to 8 per cent of the total costs. As it is written now, it is raised to 10 per cent. A more reasonable proposition would be that it be doubled.

I am making these arguments to try and convince Government Members, but I do not know whether many of them are listening. Let me emphasize that the 20 per cent holdback is not a maximum. We are not saying that if the railway does not perform anything that does not come up to standard as judged by the CTC or the Governor in Council, the total amount should be held back. We are saying that the maximum should be raised. This was referred to by the previous speaker, the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom). Subclause (3) reads:

Where a scheme that provides for awards or sanctions or both has been implemented under subsection (1), the Governor in Council may make regulations—

It does not say "shall penalize" for the full 10 per cent or, as I am suggesting in this amendment, 20 per cent. It states:

—may make regulations establishing a system of arbitration to resolve disputes concerning awards or sanctions or both applied under the scheme in accordance with any procedures prescribed by the regulations.

If there is any faltering as far as performance is concerned, it does not say that the railways shall be penalized a full 20 per cent. All we are doing is raising the maximum. It does not mean that if there is a holdback or penalty it should be taken away permanently. As I interpret it, it means that the Governor in Council should be in a position to hold back certain amounts of money for a period of time until the railways perform. If the Government is really serious about seeing that the railways perform, given the fact that they are going to get many many hundreds of millions of dollars from the Government, the Government should be willing to see that there are some teeth in this Act in order that the railways do perform.

Let me point out another area of concern. In press releases last spring, both railways pointed out that because of the decline in the economy and the falling volumes that they were shipping, they may or may not invest the kind of moneys that they had initially talked about in the spring. Here we have an indication from the railways, and it makes sense because volumes are down, that they may not invest.

I will say this again so that Government Members in fact understand what Motion 45 states. We are saying that the Government should have as many teeth as possible to look after producers. When the producers do not receive the money themselves, they have to rely on the railways and whatever pressure the Government can put on the railways to perform. We think that increasing the amount of the penalty or holdback would serve as an inducement.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on Motions Nos. 42, 43, 44, 45 and 46. It appears that these sections of the Bill are designed to protect the producers. That is certainly a worthy objective. These amendments deal with sanctions or penalties which may be imposed or enacted.

I have difficulty following the argument that one segment of all those concerned is fully responsible for many of our problems. Certainly the railways play an important part, but there are other segments which also play an important part in transportation, such as the Wheat Board, the pools, the labour unions, the Canadian Transport Commission and the Grain Commission. All of them have their place.

Under this Act, the Administrator will be given certain authority. Some people, such as the Members of the NDP, think that the Administrator is being given too much authority. Frankly, I do not think he is being given enough authority. I would like to see it increased rather than decreased.

My experience with the abandonment of rail lines, for example, has not been a happy one. I was very unhappy with the decisions of the Canadian Transport Commission. I tried to get information pertaining to the books of CPR and CNR. Not only was I thwarted by the railways, which did not want to reveal what was in their books, but by the CTC. In other words, the producers are being opposed by the very bodies that should be protecting them.

I want to give an illustration of that. It deals with penalties and sanctions. In the East Coulee coal mines, there are still more than a million tonnes of coal to be mined. A few years ago, the Canadian National Railway was persuaded to build a line from Rosedale to East Coulee, a distance of about eight miles. There were five coal mines there at the time. They paid for that rail line. When it reached the point where the coal mines could not compete with oil, the mines were closed. They stopped operating. The rail line and the elevator in East Coulee sat there. The CNR and CPR asked for the right to close the line. First, the Alberta Wheat Pool sold the elevator. The railways then said they did not need the line any longer. The railway companies produced a lot of figures at the hearings to indicate that the line was costing them money. Among other things, it showed depreciation on the line.

I knew that in fact the railways had put no money into that line for several years. However, they showed a large sum of money for depreciation. At the hearing, I asked the railways to show me the amounts of depreciation for each year since the railway was built. Counsel for the CPR said that I was not entitled to that information. I wanted to know why. After all, that was one of the factors upon which they were closing the line. CP said that it would not give me the information. One of the Commissioners of the CTC said that he believed I had the right to have the information. I almost fell over when he said that, but he did state that he believed I had the right to it. A very able lawyer in the City of Drumheller, Mr. Robert Ross, Q.C., supported me in the stand and stated: "Yes, he is entitled to that information. We are all entitled to it". The Commissioner then said to the railway representatives: "You supply the Member with that information".

• (1210)

I waited for weeks and for months and then I went back to the CTC and wanted to know why I was not getting the information that the CPR had been ordered to give to me. By that time the CTC had changed its mind and said: "We do not think you are entitled to that information".

I ask Hon. Members of this House, are the books of one of the segments going to be kept in such a way that the rest of us are not going to be permitted to see what is in the books? Why am I not entitled to see what the railway has been charging for depreciation on that line since its inception? I will warrant you, Mr. Speaker, that they have paid for that line time and time again through depreciation alone, but they will not reveal any figures.

I think we need an Administrator who is able to say: "We will look after the producer. We will look after the people. We want that information". If the railway is not giving the facts and refuses to give the facts, then there should be heavy

sanctions imposed against them. I would like to see a severe penalty imposed on both the CNR and the CPR when they "cook" their figures in their books. That is what they are doing; they are "cooking" the figures.

In navigation school where we were learning how to find the location of a plane, we would take a shot on the sun, we would take a shot on a station, and we would build a little triangle to find exactly where we were going to be in ten minutes. At night we would take a shot on a couple of stars and the moon, and we would get our little triangle to find out where we are so that we can tell the pilot, "This is where we are now. "Turn 180 degrees or 70 degrees" whatever way we wanted him to go. Some people at navigation school and those who trained as navigators will know that we had to shoot so many shots on the stars and the moon and the sun. But some "cooked" their books; they simply "cooked" their shots, and of course many of those were washed out. What good would they be to a crew up in the air when they did not know where they were or if they did not know how to take a shot on whatever is available.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The information being relayed by the Hon. Member is of particular interest to the occupant of the chair, but I am having a little difficulty relating it to the amendments before us.

Mr. Taylor: From now on you will not, Mr. Speaker. I am just suggesting that that is exactly what the railway is doing; they are "cooking" their books and they do not want to reveal it. They will not put it out to the light of day so we can see how much they have charged for depreciation. That is only one segment. There should be penalty imposed and it should be a heavy penalty.

I also agree that when we start enacting penalties we should make sure that the person who is responsible pays them. Too often it is passed on to the producer who pays it in the end. I do not agree with that at all. As the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) said the other day, when we impose penalties let the railways pay it out of their own profits and not charge it back to the producer. Let them not put a pecuniary penalty on the Wheat Board because that takes money out of the pockets of the producers. The motions made by this Party and the stand we are taking on these amendments is to protect and be fair to the producer. That will be a big change in this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) has already spoken.

Mr. Anguish: I know I have already spoken, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a question of the Hon. Member.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is not permitted under the rules. At this point the Hon. Member's time has expired and we would need the unanimous consent of the House to ask questions. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

According to the Chair, Motions Nos. 41 to 46 inclusive have been grouped for debate but at this stage they are to be voted upon separately.

The Question is on Motion No. 41. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79 (11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 42. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 43. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 44. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 45. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

● (1220)

The question is on Motion No. 46. All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

As indicated previously by Madam Speaker, Motions No. 47, No. 48 and 49 will be grouped for debate. Motion No. 47 will be voted upon separately. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 48 would dispose of Motion No. 49; a negative vote on Motion No. 48 would require the question to be put on Motion No. 49.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 22 by striking out line 2 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"fifteen Senators or fifteen Members of the".

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 48

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 25 by deleting lines 10 to 17 at page 13 and substituting the following therefor:

"debated for not more than three sitting days and at the expiration of the three sitting days the Speaker shall forthwith without further debate or amendment put every question necessary for the disposition of the motion."

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 49

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 25 by striking out lines 10 to 17 at page 13 and substituting the following therefor:

"debated and on the conclusion of the debate the Speaker shall forthwith put every question necessary for the disposition of the motion."

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, in committee the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) and some of my colleagues in the Conservative Party endeavored to have changes made in those parts of Clause 22 and Clause 25 which specified the number of Senators or Members of the House of Commons who would need to sign a statement in writing requesting referral of the regulations put forward by the Grain Transportation Administrator to the appropriate committee of the House and, further, that when the committee had reported back, the report could be debated for three sitting days as proposed by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) or, as I propose, until debate is concluded.

In Motion No. 47 we endeavored to provide equality with Senators in terms of the number of Members required to sign a request to the Speaker that a regulation be referred to the appropriate standing committee. I can understand why they did not want 30 Senators and 30 MPs as it would be tough enough to find even 15 Senators to sign a piece of paper. We do not object to 15 Senators but we think only the same number of Members of the House of Commons should be required to sign a submission in writing to the Chair that a regulation be referred to the appropriate standing committee of the House.

As was the case with the previous group of amendments and as was mentioned by the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), this legislation is another VIA Rail set-up. The Governor in Council, the Minister, or the Grain Transportation Administrator can do anything they want. When it comes to regulations regarding awards and sanctions, regulations regarding the allocation of railway cars, regulations that could affect the quota system or the block system or regulations that could discriminate against a system participant unfairly or discrminate in favour of a system participant unfairly, it surely requires some detailed attention by the House of Commons. The regulations will be contentious and they are to be submitted to the House by the Minister within five days. There will probably never be a request that those that are minor or somewhat innocuous be referred to the appropriate standing committee for debate.

It can be safely assumed, however, that there will be many regulations of a very serious and complex nature that cannot be grasped quickly and so will require the attention of Members both in the standing committee and in the House. We submit that it is only fair that an equivalent number of Members of Parliament as members of the other place can make a request in writing.

I will not go into any criticism of members of the other place except to say that it seems to me and to this Party that Members of the House of Commons have the greatest responsibility to go into these matters because every day they have to face the people who sent them here and give an accounting of what they are doing. Certainly Members from western Canada will be called upon to explain the regulations put forward by the Minister if this legislation should ever pass.

With regard to Motion No. 48, the Bill asks for a one-hour debate consisting of ten-minute speeches in the House. We can all see of course that some complicated, serious and important regulations will need more than one hour of debate. The limit of one hour of debate with ten-minute speeches is a sort of legislated closure—it legislates time allocation in advance. I

thought that the proper place for that was in the Standing Orders of the House of Commons and not in a piece of legislation. The three sitting days proposed by the Hon. Member for Vegreville is reasonable; it is not extreme and often three sitting days may not be required.

Motion No. 49 standing in my name leaves the matter open. It may require debate for a few hours, for a whole day, for two days, three days or even five days, although I cannot see it going beyond that. If there is a collection of regulations, some of which Members want an opportunity to debate, one hour on each is totally inadequate. As I submitted earlier, on a minor regulation there would probably be no request in writing that it be referred to committee. I believe that should be done automatically. Where there are contentious regulations, and when those committees report back to the House, the opportunity should be there for the House to debate those regulations fully. It will be debating a report of the committee, but that report will contain all the regulations which the committee dealt with. Some of the more complex regulations will require individual attention, certainly for more than an hour.

● (1230)

We believe this time allocation in advance with respect to an area such as this is totally inappropriate and we would urge that the Government reconsider and accept our Motion No. 47. It is not a motion which is going to do any violence to the legislation which the Government wants passed. It certainly would be more fair to Hon. Members of the House of Commons that we be treated equally in the matter of numbers with the other place.

Secondly, the Government must surely agree that limiting debate on such regulations to one hour is unfair. There might be the odd minor regulation for which an hour would be sufficient; indeed, an hour might not even be used up. However, there will be other regulations, Mr. Speaker, which will require lengthy debate, because when those regulations are being dealt with by a standing committee of the House, there will be representations from one or even all of the system participants affected under the legislation. There would be representations from governmental bodies which are not, strictly speaking, a system participant but are affected by the regulations. If a regulation allowing some kind of variable rate system in a specific area jeopardizes the existence of some branch lines, you can be certain, Mr. Speaker, that the municipalities in that area will want to be heard and the provincial Government will want to be heard. They can be heard before the committee if the committee will agree to call witnesses, if the committee is authorized to call witnesses, and the committee should be authorized to do so. However, once that stage has been completed, then the House requires more than an hour on those kinds of contentious regulations in order to debate their efficacy and whether or not they should be changed or amended. The House should be able to decide this and certainly it should have more than an hour to deal with a piece of legislation which is of major importance to western Canada.

I hope, Sir, that the Government will agree to accept these motions. It is agrees to accept Motions Nos. 47 and 48, for example, I am sure the debate can be relatively short. This would help. I hope that the Minister will carry through on his first meeting before the committee with his expressed desire to co-operate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired. The Hon. Member may continue with unanimous consent of the House.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) and to commend him on his foresight in proposing the adoption of this amendment to the House. I hope Government Members opposite will pay attention to this particular amendment because I believe it is crucial to the future of grain transportation and other product transportation in western Canada.

It is wise, I believe, to track through this entire piece of legislation to see what brings us to this particular amendment. What we have before us is a piece of legislation which is trying to help Canadians look into the future to see how best to regulate and encourage the railway system to become more effective and efficient, and to enable Canada as a nation to better our capacity to deliver our export products on time and at a reasonable price.

Mixed in with that, Mr. Speaker, is the notion that a Cabinet of this House of Commons shall decide regulatory matters. Built into the proposed law, Mr. Speaker, is a principle whereby 10 per cent of the Members of this House of Commons can petition the House to have a one-hour debate on a particular regulation. Is a one-hour debate reasonable, Mr. Speaker? I suggest that it is the firmly held view of Members of the Conservative Party of Canada and Hon. Members of this House that a one-hour debate is simply not reasonable. We are not dealing here with something which is simple to discuss, nor are we dealing with regulations which will have very little impact on the lives of Canadians. We are dealing with regulations which will have an enormous impact on the lives of Canadians, particularly those in western Canada.

If one looks at the current constitution of the federal Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, it is wise to note, I believe, that there is not a single elected Member west of the Manitoba border. There is only one elected Member from the Province of Manitoba. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is simply the one voice of one Member in the Cabinet of Canada who is accountable to the electors of western Canada. That Hon. Member is city born and, perhaps, more attuned to eastern Canada. With respect to his past performance over four years, it is hard for me to distinguish him from someone who was born and raised in the City of Toronto in terms of his attitude.

Is it reasonable, Mr. Speaker, for that very, very busy group of people who constitute the Cabinet of Canada, those 37 individuals of whom only one is accountable to the voters of western Canada, to make decisions which so profoundly affect the lives of western Canadians? Is it reasonable to provide in this piece of legislation the possibility for only one hour of debate in this Chamber on a regulation which might have the impact of bankrupting 100 per cent of the agricultural producers in western Canada, or 2 per cent, or 10 per cent, or 50 per cent? The only protection which those producers in western Canada would have through their elected representatives is the possibility of a one-hour debate in this Chamber. We know, Mr. Speaker, what happens to one-hour debates in this Chamber. The Government uses its majority to use up 30 minutes of the 60 minutes and we are left with the possibility of only 30 minutes worth of time for the elected representatives from western Canada to be heard about a regulation which has the potential to make life very difficult for producers.

I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the Cabinet of Canada would promulgate a regulation of that kind if it had knowledge of the potential impacts of that regulation. However, I do suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that given the busy nature of Cabinet Ministers and the fact that we will occasionally have Parliaments which are heavily weighted to other regions of the country, where there is only one elected voice from western Canada sitting in the Cabinet, the odds of that Cabinet inadvertently making a decision which would have a profound, long-term, negative impact on the economy of western Canada are very, very high.

• (1240)

It is a wise Government, Mr. Speaker, and it would be a wise group of Government backbenchers, which would look closely at Motion No. 48. It protects the Government against itself. It protects a busy group of Cabinet Ministers from making a tragic mistake in regulations which would cause them considerable grief over time because it would cause large numbers of Canadians considerable grief over time.

What we are saying to the Government, Mr. Speaker, is that when 10 per cent of the Members of this Chamber petition this House to debate a proposed regulation, then give the elected representatives an adequate amount of time to represent their constituents and inform the Government and Cabinet about the potential negative impact of any proposed regulation on the economy and the farmers of western Canada.

The only reason I can see for the Government insisting on the one-hour limit is stubbornness, a declaration to the Canadian people that the Government and Cabinet of Canada is not willing to learn about the potential impact of a proposed regulation. Why else would the Government insist on restricting Opposition voices to 30 minutes on an issue which might involve hundreds of millions of dollars and affect hundreds of thousands of Canadians? These regulations could affect Canadians' lifestyle today and their future retirement. Surely those kinds of very important considerations deserve up to three days of the time of this Chamber solely for the purpose of allowing elected representatives to bring to the attention of the Government that by supporting a particular regulation at a particular point in time the Government is in danger of making a tragic mistake.

Thirty minutes or even 60 minutes is not sufficient time to deal with the kinds of complex issues existing in Bill C-155 and the regulatory powers therein. Three days is not a great deal of time but in our view it would be sufficient. The Government would be free to make its mistake but it would do so with knowledge rather than with ignorance. I urge Members opposite to support the Hon. Member for Vegreville and vote yes for the adoption of the amendment under Motion No. 48.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly to Motion No. 48 and in so doing, since the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) talked about the prospects of several regulations being debated as a group, I thought it should be pointed out that Clause 24(1) of the Bill provides:

> A regulation made under subsection 21(1) shall be laid before each House of Parliament within fifteen sitting days after it is made.
>
> (2) Within five sitting days after a regulation referred to in Subsection (1) is laid before either House of Parliament, a motion to the effect that the regulation be confirmed, signed by a Minister of the Crown, shall be filed with the Speaker.

The word "shall" was incorporated in the committee hearings. Then we get into Clause 25(1) which provides:

> A motion filed under section 24 shall be taken up and considered by the Senate or House of Commons, as the case may be, within five sitting days after the filing of the motion.

Then this is where Motion No. 48 standing under my name comes into effect. Clause 25(2) provides:

> A motion taken up and considered in accordance with Subsection (1) shall be debated without interruption for not more than one hour, during which time no Senator or Member may speak for more than ten minutes—

I think when the Hon. Member for Regina West was speaking to this group of motions he indicated that this motion was reasonable. I would have to agree with him. I think it is a fair compromise. His argument for the open-endedness of this particular provision is that his motion would not provide any time limit. In general I agree with that, but we are really not dealing with legislation here, we are dealing with a regulation. The provision in this Bill for the possible debate of a regulation is something not often found in legislation. So it is a step in the right direction.

While I have no argument with the hon. Member's Motion No. 49, I thought that because we were dealing here with a specific regulation, not a group of regulations, three days was certainly a lot better than one hour. I think the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) elaborated on that very well.

In this Bill putting a great deal of latitude and discretionary power in the hands of a number of people, particularly the Administrator and others charged with the responsibility of administering the grain handling and transportation system. In the course of our deliberations we tried to incorporate as many of the players as possible, particularly the producer; but the

bottom line is that sooner or later regulations will have to be made and this provision is, in principle, a commendable check and balance which I certainly support and agree with. However, having said that, the Government certainly should provide sufficient latitude to do the job well.

In my humble opinion, to debate a controversial regulation in one hour certainly does not fit the Bill. My view is that non-controversial regulations would naturally not be brought before the House for debate; but clearly if one is important enough to be brought before either House for debate, there should be sufficient latitude and provision for debate to take place in full. Perhaps three days is not enough, but it is a happy compromise and, I think, reasonable. So I hope Government Members seriously look at Motion No. 48. It goes some way in alleviating some of the concerns which could crop up, and I concur wholeheartedly with the comments made by my colleague from Calgary West. As one who is not happy with any kind of allocation or predetermined time limit, I think we have gone some way in meeting an objective of fairness and reasonableness and I commend Motion No. 48 to the House for support.

* * *

● (1250)

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I would like to designate tomorrow as an Opposition day, this as usual being subject to change.

[*English*]

I would like to designate tomorrow as an Opposition day, this, as usual, being subject to change.

* * *

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motions Nos. 47 and 49 (Mr. Benjamin) and Motion No. 48 (Mr. Mazankowski).

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to shed some light on the issue that is before us today, Bill C-155 and its various proposed amendments. In order to shed some light on this issue, I propose to read some brief quotations from that Canadian lady poet of great renown, Pauline Johnson.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, I hope these quotations are relevant to the amendments before the House.

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Speaker, they are not only very relevant but they are also very brief and read as follows:

What saw you in your flight to day,
Crows, awinging your homeward way?
Went you far in carrion quest,
Crows, that worry the sunless west?

Now, Sir, I shall read the final stanza that deals specifically with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and his Liberal cabinet colleagues:

Thieves and villains, you shameless things!
Black your record as black your wings.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that these three motions have been grouped for debate because they all pertain to regulations regarding performance objectives and awards and sanctions. I believe that what we have just heard demonstrates why specific time limits have been put in this Bill. It demonstrates why the one-day debate—

An Hon. Member: One hour.

Mr. Flis: It demonstrates why there is a one-hour debate on the Bill rather than a three-day debate.

Let me turn to some of the comments made by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) dealing with his Motion No. 47. He seems to be very concerned about the requirement for 30 Members giving notice. He wants to reduce this to 15 Members. I do not know what his concern is unless it is that after the next election his Party will not have 30 Members in the House, but will only have 15. We do not have that concern, Mr. Speaker.

When we are asking for 15 Senators out of 100 to give notice, it mean only 15 per cent of the Senators must give notice. I think we should keep the number of Members of the House involved at about the same percentage. We are dealing with about 10 per cent of the Members or more when 30 Members give notice, versus 5 per cent when 15 would give notice. I do not think that 5 per cent of the Members of the House should get up and filibuster as they are now, Mr. Speaker. That is what this motion is trying to prevent. It is trying to prevent a minority group from getting up in the House and filibustering and wasting 12 sitting days of the House.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary would like to correct an earlier comment that he made. He may have inadvertently said that this provision allows for a one-day debate when in fact it allows for a one-hour debate.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I purposely said one day to see if Hon. Members opposite are listening. I am very pleased to see that they are listening.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rebut some of the comments made by the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes). The Hon. Member for Calgary West offended all of the parliamentary standing committees of the House of Commons when he spoke, because what he failed to realize was that these suggested regulations would be debated for 30 days in committee. He went on and on about how there is only one representative in Cabinet. Well, what he is saying is that he is incompetent and that the representatives from the West cannot represent the wishes of their constituents in the committee. If he was doing his job, Mr. Speaker, surely he could represent the wishes of his constituents in 30 days.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary is implying that Cabinet members sit in on committee.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that Cabinet members like the Minister can be called before the committee, as was done in the debate on Bill C-155. I wish the Hon. Member would learn his parliamentary procedures, Mr. Speaker.

We feel that after debating something for 30 days in committee, we really do not need more than one hour in the House to pass what the committee approves. If there is great dispute within committee, surely it will not be resolved in three days in the House as suggested by the motion moved by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). Again, Mr. Speaker, we on this side do not see the need for Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49, and we will be voting against them.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being afforded the opportunity to speak on Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 because these motions give us a good insight into the value the Government places on the House of Commons when arriving at adequate decisions regarding this particular Bill or any other Bill.

First, Motion No. 47 deals with the ratio of 15 Senators to 30 Members of the House of Commons. Our motion suggests that the ratio should be 15 Senators to 15 Members, the implication being that 15 Members are of as equal value as 15 Senators. I am not sure of the need for the involvement of the other place at all because the matter must still come to Parliament.

Motions Nos. 48 and 49 deal with the accountability of the Administrator to the Parliament of Canada and in that way are very important. Just to give you some idea of the kind of concern we are expressing by moving this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, I must mention that during the committee hearings a question was asked of an official of the Department of Transport as to why this particular kind of clause should be included in the Bill. The answer to that question given by the official of the Department of Transport can give us some idea of the importance of having the situation debated by the House of Commons. Mr. Lefebvre answered the question put by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) by saying:

> This idea emerged while discussing this scheme and when the industry people did not have some specific ideas as to how it would work. It crossed our minds that it was a very substantial power to give to the Governor in Council or to the Minister or to the Administrator, because it can impose some awards and sanctions on private parties, if you wish. Since it was to affect the rights and obligations of citizens under the law, it was felt better if Parliament had a good look at this.

As far as Liberal Members are concerned, Parliament can take a good look at something in one hour. I think that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

LEBANON—BOMBING FATALITIES SUFFERED BY UNITED STATES AND FRENCH FORCES

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Madam Speaker, I hope that I speak for all Members in this House when I say that words are inadequate to express the feeling of horror and dismay that surged through all of us over the weekend on learning of the savage and unprovoked slaughter that occurred in Lebanon during which upwards of 200 American and French servicemen died in their sleep under the rubble of buildings that were heartlessly demolished in a sneak attack on their barracks.

The American, British, French, and Italian forces are in Lebanon for one purpose only, namely, to provide negotiating time so that the contending forces in that war-weary and faction ridden country can work out their differences and produce a durable solution.

That shameless, senseless, and subhuman attack can only set that process back. Those responsible will have to bear the total burden for their iniquitous behaviour in destroying defenceless men, because they will inevitably call down on themselves the retribution they so richly deserve. I think that this House will want to send its condolences to the families of those victims.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

S.O. 21

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LAY-OFFS AT DOMINION BRIDGE PLANT IN WINNIPEG

Mr. Robert Bockstael (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I rise to speak on a serious matter of loss of jobs at the Dominion Bridge plant in Winnipeg. This plant laid off another 65 workers in mid October. This western plant has manpower facilities, capacity, ability and experience to fulfil transmission tower line construction contracts abroad.

Several weeks ago Dominion Bridge of Winnipeg submitted the lowest of four Canadian tenders on a $7.5 million transmission line project in Pakistan under our CIDA program. As soon as the contract is awarded, many of the laid-off workers would be eligible for recall as this project is expected to provide 65 man-years of work. I urge the Minister responsible to expedite the approval and signing of this contract without further delay.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM

CLOSING OF NATIVE FRIENDSHIP CENTRES

Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo-Chilcotin): Madam Speaker, today the doors of Native Friendship Centres from coast to coast are closed to protest delay in delivery of funding for the new Native Friendship Centre Program which was approved by Cabinet on May 13, 1983. In front of 60 Friendship Centre representatives in Vancouver on May 29 of this year, the Secretary of State announced that the new program would come into effect April 1, 1983, and would run for five years.

The present Native Friendship Centre Program encompasses a network of 84 Friendship Centres, six developing centres, their provincial and territorial associations, as well as a national office. This well thought out and excellent Program is designed to improve the quality of life for native people in an urban environment, and it provides such services as employment counselling, legal information, emergency shelter, youth programs, alcohol counselling, family counselling, and others.

The delay in delivery of this negotiated program has caused centres to incur thousands of dollars in bank interest charges and has brought many to the brink of financial collapse. The success of Friendship Centres in assisting native people to adjust to mainstream society is recognized by all levels, including Cabinet. Therefore it is unacceptable that the Government should now go back on its word and jeopardize this most worth-while program. Funding, as promised, should be provided immediately.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

NEED FOR AGREEMENT WITH QUEBEC ON PROMOTION OF SKI REGIONS

Mr. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Madam Speaker, I am rising under the provisions of Standing Order 21 to launch an appeal for action by the House of Commons.

Last Friday, the Quebec Minister of Hunting and Tourism announced his negotiating position with respect to reviving this industry in Quebec. He said that $20 million was available to eight major centres for the purpose of improving downhill skiing facilities. I also found out that last Friday, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) and the Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Johnston) attended a federal-provincial meeting, and that this item was on the agenda. In the Eastern Townships, which have four major centres, namely, Orford, Sutton, Owl's Head and Bromont, an agreement of this kind would provide the desired industrial diversification to help former workers in the textile, clothing and footwear industries. Since more than 2,000 jobs will be created in this way, it is extremely important to have this agreement finalized as soon as possible.

* * *

[*English*]

UNITED NATIONS

ORGANIZATION'S AIMS AND PRINCIPLES

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Madam Speaker, today is United Nations Day. We would do well to remember the purpose of the United Nations which was set up to create a system for the maintenance of international peace and security. To that end a set of principles was drafted for the conduct of states. Chief among those principles is the commitment not to use force in international affairs, and not to interfere in other states' domestic affairs. Those principles are as valid today as they were when the UN Charter was drafted in 1945.

But we need only look around us to recognize that every citizen of every nation must redouble their efforts in support of those principles. Today, there are some 45 states, one out of every four nations, at war. More than four million soldiers are directly involved in those wars, and between one million and five million people have been killed in them. Today we should be mindful of that.

We should also be mindful of the threat to international security posed by the rising tide of terrorism. Yesterday's senseless bombing in Beirut, which has now claimed more than 170 American lives and more than 40 French troops, all assigned to Lebanon on so-called peacekeeping missions, is only the most recent and most graphic example. Our condemnation of terrorism must extend to the attacks on Corinto and

Puerto Sandino in Nicaragua, it must extend to South Africa's raid on Maputo, Mozambique, and to the senseless attack in Chandighar, India, last week which claimed 16 civilian lives.

As parliamentarians we must do more than deplore senseless acts of terrorism. We must recommit ourselves to the vital goals set down in the United Nations Charter—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

INDUSTRY

MAISLIN TRANSPORT LTD.—SELLING PRICE OF LICENCES

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Prince Edward-Hastings): Madam Speaker, my statement today will be quite different, in that I wish to correct an error made in my statement of Thursday, October 20. At that time I indicated that the selling price of the licences of Maislin Transport was, in my words, "a pittance". I was incorrect.

The price being paid for the licences is in fact well above their value. The point is that, because of generous tax allowances, the U.S. trucking company is able to move into Canada and pick up these valuable concessions in a manner not open to Canadians. In addition, because of the heavy handed manner of the major bank involved, employees have been told that they will receive less if the deal is not approved. It is interesting that the bank will recoup nearly all its funds, while small companies are unprotected.

I support the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce on his decision to send this matter to FIRA. It is the least that can be done under the circumstances, circumstances that once again point out the flagrant way the Government regularly wastes taxpayers' money on deals for its friends, with no thought for Canadian workers or small business.

* * *

THE UKRAINE

SOVIET INDUCED FAMINE—SUGGESTED INVESTIGATION

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, it is now 50 years since the first recorded holocaust in the history of mankind, and the largest holocaust of this century. It preceded the Jewish holocaust by some ten years, and was possibly its precursor.

To those who survived it, it is known as "the great famine", or "the great artificial, man-made famine". Between 1932 and 1933 some six million to ten million Ukrainians in the rurai areas of the Ukrainian-Soviet Socialist Republic were systematically starved to death. Those responsible for this crime were never brought to justice, and the Soviet Government has done everything in its power to remove any evidence relating to this horrifying deed.

S.O. 21

• (1410)

On behalf of those Canadians of Ukrainian origin and, indeed, on behalf of all Canadians, I urge the Government of Canada to propose a General Assembly resolution at the United Nations calling for an independent inquiry to determine who was responsible for the holocaust.

To date, based on the studies mostly of Ukrainian scholars, survivors, their relatives, and on a few reports of correspondents of the time, the Soviet Government of that era is the obvious prime suspect. Crimes of such magnitude against humanity must be investigated by judicial bodies of international stature to establish legal identification of the perpetrators. Only then could public opinion in free nations be harnessed to strengthen further human rights legislation and its enforcement to prevent further such horrendous crimes.

* * *

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

SUPPORT FOR REINSTATEMENT

Mr. Gerry St. Germain (Mission-Port Moody): Madam Speaker, invididuals charged and convicted of brutal murder have been released on parole and have subsequently been charged with committing other crimes. I do not want to dwell on the specifics of any case, but I want all of us to think about our families, our children, and the citizens of the country, and wonder how much protection innocent Canadians really have.

I am an advocate of capital punishment to protect the innocent. I know capital punishment is not the sole answer to resolving the weaknesses in our justice system, but it is a major step toward protecting the innocent. I know it is difficult for some Hon. Members to accept that capital punishment is a deterrent to those warped humans who kill in cold blood. It is hard to understand what goes on in the minds of cold-blooded killers. However, I know, after being a police officer for six years, that with the reintroduction of capital punishment convicted murderers will not murder again.

The people of my riding have seen more than their fair share of brutal crime, and they speak with one mind on the issue of capital punishment. The majority of the people of Mission-Port Moody want to see the reintroduction of capital punishment for convicted first degree murderers. We, as lawmakers of the country, should heed this call.

* * *

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

LEVEL OF WORLD MILITARY SPENDING

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, my statement follows on an earlier one made by the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant). I am concerned that the Canadian Government, by testing the Cruise missile, is directly contributing to an already too expensive nuclear arms race, which in turn is contributing to the

general economic decline affecting all nations of the world. At a time when peace is desired by so many, too much money is being spent on armed conflict and in the preparation of defence against future armed conflict. This weekend 1.5 million concerned Europeans and North Americans protested the deployment of the Cruise and Pershing II missiles, and the further escalation of the arms race throughout the world.

The global obsession with weapons and military might has resulted in total military budgets throughout the world of more than $550 billion per year, about $100 billion of which is spent on the growing stockpile of nuclear weapons. The world's military budget equals the annual income of $1.8 billion people in the 36 poorest countries. If the world's nuclear arsenal were reduced by only one-half, it would free up $50 billion a year to tackle some of the social and economic problems facing the world.

The social, economic, and security costs of the arms race are too high. The Canadian Government must be doing more to stop the arms race, not fuel it. We begin that path to peace by first refusing to test the Cruise—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

TOURISM

EFFECT OF ALCOHOL TAXES

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Madam Speaker, on Thursday of last week in my riding we held a tourism day in which 100 individuals from a 450-mile radius participated. We felt it was a very worth-while day. Recently the Government budgeted another $7.4 million to tourism advertising in addition to the $31.9 million already budgeted, but on the other hand the Government has increased by 13 per cent the tax on alcohol. As the President of the Metro Toronto Hotel Association said, "The Government has taxed the product so much that we can't sell it". As a Member who comes from an area where tourism is important, I say to Hon. Members opposite, "Please don't tax the tourism industry any more".

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—MARXIST POWER SEIZURE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Of course he will be aware of events in the Caribbean over the weekend, including a meeting of Caribbean leaders to deal with the murderous take-over in Grenada. The leaders of the Caribbean nations suspended trade and commercial arrangements, among other activities, with the extreme Marxist group which has seized power in Grenada. Given the role of Canada as the leading Commonwealth member in this hemisphere, is it the intention of the Government of Canada to follow suit in pursuit of this objective?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, at this time I cannot add much to what was said by the Minister of State for External Relations on Friday. We are looking at the reactions of the countries of the area, and we are assessing our future policy. To my knowledge none has been communicated to me this morning, but I would sit, in deference to the Hon. Minister of State, if there is some further point he can make.

MINISTER'S STATEMENT ON RECOGNITION OF NEW REGIME

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, one of the most startling things that has been said in regard to external relations for a long time was stated by the Minister last week when he indicated that Canada would recognize the new Government after a reasonable, decent period of time. In other words, no matter what transpired down there, no matter how heinous the activities, we were just going to close our eyes for a while, irrespective of the manner in which the new government seized power, and things would be fine by and by. They are not fine. They are getting worse day by day.

In light of this, and because of the strategic importance to Canada and the United States of developments down there, I ask the Prime Minister whether that bizarre statement by the Minister indeed reflects government policy on the one hand. On the other hand, what assurance can he give that officials, people in Canada on student visas, and those who are seeking landed immigrant status, will be given every right and permission to remain in Canada until such time as the situation is clearly normalized down there?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I was not in the House on Friday, but I had occasion to read the answers of the Minister of State for External Relations. It seems that the Leader of the Opposition is doing him some injustice in saying that, no matter what, we would recognize that government in a matter of time. For instance, as reported at page 28199 of *Hansard,* the Minister said:

> We need to find out what the relations will be between the government in question and neighbouring governments, and what the reality of the administration exercised by that government will be.

On the following pages of *Hansard,* in answer to other Hon. Members, he repeated the same statement and seemed to be qualifying rather considerably the unfortunate misquotation of the Leader of the Opposition. I think the Minister gave a perfectly reasonable answer. We want to assess the situation. We will be influenced by other Commonwealth and Caribbean countries in the area, which presumably know more about the situation because they are closer. I have just heard from the

Minister that the Department is in the process of undertaking those assessments and consultations.

In so far as the latter part of the question is concerned, I cannot give a theoretical answer. I do not know how many Grenadians are in Canada, nor what are their backgrounds and conditions. Perhaps some should be given permission to stay; perhaps some should not. I think we would have to examine each case individually.

Mr. Mulroney: That is absolutely remarkable. I hoped that he would immediately say that all Grenadians would be allowed to remain in Canada until the situation is clarified, and that they will not be forced to go back there.

REQUEST THAT GRENADIANS BE PERMITTED TO REMAIN IN CANADA

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, there was no misquotation by me whatsoever. It was a very clear statement by the Minister to the effect that it was the intention of the Government of Canada to recognize the new Government "after a reasonable, decent period of time". That was the statement of the duly authorized representative of the Government of Canada.

In light of this, will the Prime Minister give the House a formal guarantee that all Grenadians presently in Canada, for the reasons that I mentioned, will be allowed to stay here, and that no pressure of any kind, directly or otherwise, by Immigration Canada or anyone else will be brought to bear on them, so that they can remain here until the matter is fully resolved to the satisfaction not only of the Government but of all Members of the House of Commons?

● (1420)

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I am somewhat astonished that the Leader of the Opposition would insist on being so absolute about this. He repeats "all Grenadians". That was his first question, "all Grenadians". How do I know if there are not some Grenadians in the group who should be sent back? Maybe there are some who are in cahoots with the Marxists there, who helped in some way. I do not know. Surely it would be irresponsible for me to give to the Leader of the Opposition the guarantee he asks of me, and for which he gets applause.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

SAFETY OF CANADIAN CITIZENS IN GRENADA

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is also directed to the Prime Minister. As there is grave concern for many Canadians who are on the island, will the Prime Minister indicate specifically what steps have been taken to ensure the safety of these Canadians and, specifically, have all Canadians who wish to leave now been removed from this island?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of State (External Relations)): Madam Speaker, I will try to answer this question. We now have a plane ready to go. The regional group which met during the weekend stopped all air and sea links. I do not know the value of that decision. It is supposed to be unanimous, but it was only a majority decision. Be that as it may, we now have a plane ready to go, as I already said. We have obtained clearance from the CARICOM group. We now have clearance to take off from Barbados. We have clearance from Grenada to land, in principle anyway. We hope that later today, or tomorrow, the plane will pick up those Canadians who have expressed the wish to return. To be specific, there are apparently 24 of them.

REQUEST THAT AID TO GRENADA BE SUSPENDED

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is also directed to the Prime Minister who, as we know, quoted from his Secretary of State for External Relations today. He referred to the fact that the Secretary of State for External Relations made reference to neighbouring condemnation as far as the situation in Grenada is concerned. In view of the fact that the majority of those neighbouring nations have, in no uncertain terms, condemned what has taken place in Grenada, will the Prime Minister state that there will in fact be a suspension of Canada's aid to that island until there is at least a reputable Government in power, bearing in mind that that area, on a per capita basis, receives one of the highest amounts in aid that Canada gives to any country in the area?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I would have to verify to see whether that figure is correct. When the Hon. Member says one of the highest amounts of aid, I suppose that could put it tenth or twentieth in ranking, knowing the Hon. Member's way of thinking. From memory, I know that there are several countries which receive a higher amount of aid per capita than Grenada.

The Hon. Member refers to the Minister's statement on Friday. I have it here at page 28200 of *Hansard*, "Indeed, we will consult with the Governments of different West Indies islands". We are in the process of doing so. I know for a fact that even Mr. Bishop's Government, which is now regretted by some of these leaders and which, I understand, is even regretted by members of the Official Opposition, was one with which we did not decide to cut all ties. We said "Well, at least he is there; he is a member of the Commonwealth." I remember telling the Leader of the New Democratic Party that we were hoping that he would have elections soon. I had raised the matter with Prime Minister Maurice Bishop, indicating that we hoped he would have elections soon. It was not the Government with which we had cut ties. It was a Government which was practically put in quarantine by several other countries which are now beginning to say that maybe we were better off with Bishop than we are with this new crew. That is why this Government does not act as hastily, and does not shoot from the hip as the Hon. Member is accustomed to doing.

We look at the situation and we study it before making condemnations, realizing that some people are worse than others, and we are better, once again, with those who are half way than with those who have gone the whole way towards revolution and murder.

* * *

DISARMAMENT

DEPLOYMENT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN EUROPE—ISSUE OF FRENCH AND BRITISH MISSILES

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. On the weekend millions of people around the world were demonstrating for the cause of peace, particularly the cause of disarmament, concerned about the apparent deadlock that exists in the talks between the superpowers.

Last April I asked the Prime Minister if he thought any reasonable calculation of the balance of forces between the two great nuclear powers should include the French and British missiles. At that time the Prime Minister dismissed the question. Since then a number of European leaders, a number of former NATO generals, and Canadian Admiral Falls have said that the French and British nuclear missiles should be included in such calculations as a means of making a constructive proposal that could lead to some kind of settlement. Has the Prime Minister rethought this matter, and will he now agree that the French and British missiles should be included?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member asks if I have rethought the matter. I do not want to sound immodest, but I have been thinking of it for quite a few months. When he suggests that I dismissed his suggestion, I think the expression is perhaps incorrect. I do not remember the exact exchange, but even those who listened to rumours at Williamsburg will know that the question of counting the French and English missiles, at some point, in some way in some talks, is not unreasonable. I have said that on various occasions. Therefore, I am not dismissing it out of hand. I have not dismissed it. It is a very complex negotiation.

When we are talking of the INF negotiations in Geneva, I do not think it is right to contemplate including the British and the French systems, because they are strategic systems. They are not theatre, or they are not intermediate nuclear forces. They are considered by those sovereign nations as strategic forces and, therefore, the solution might be to count them at some point in the START talks but not in the INF talks.

I cannot speak for France or Britain. I do not want, as a NATO ally, to state any position which would not be agreed to by them. I know that for the point of view of the Germans, for instance, they cannot count on the French or the British nuclear arms because they are strategic arms used by those countries to protect their sovereignty. The Germans, who have no nuclear arms under their total control, have to count on the Americans.

It is not unreasonable for the Americans to say, "Well, we should have as much as the Soviets." If the Soviets say, "We must put the American, British and French in the same basket and we Soviets have equal to that total", then obviously that is a way for the Soviet Union to state that it must have absolute superiority over the United States. I do not think that even my hon. friend would want that to happen. Therefore, it is somewhat complex to make a bland statement about the French and British missiles.

DISCUSSIONS AT WILLIAMSBURG SUMMIT MEETING

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister seemed to come down again on both sides of the street in this admittedly complex issue. As he knows, the largest mass based democratic party in western Europe, namely, the SPD in Germany, which to some extent can be regarded as the author of the two-track policy which the Prime Minister has given a lot of support to, is now, with its leader, clearly saying publicly, as are Canadians and Americans of some distinction, with considerable expertise in this field, that there ought to be such a calculation that takes into account the French and British missiles.

• (1430)

I would like to ask the Prime Minister to be a little more declaratory here today. He said there were rumours coming out of Williamsburg. He is usually the first to dismiss rumours. Would he now tell us if in the discussions that took place with President Reagan in particular he put forward, on the part of Canada, a package that included the counting of the French and British missiles? If he did not, why did he not?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Member has accused me of being vague and being on both sides of the street. I noted his words, "such a calculation", which would include the French and the British. If he reads my previous answer he will see that there are some circumstances where "such a calculation" would be possible, but there are other ways in which it would not be possible if we intend to include them in the INF talks. I do not think that is coming down on both sides of the street; that is making a difference between INF and START. The Hon. Member, by using these words "such a calculation", put himself squarely on both sides of the street. I would like to know what he means by "such a calculation"?

Mr. Broadbent: If the Prime Minister from time to time would participate in the debates on disarmament in this House we would all learn very well where the Government stands. He should just do that, once in this House.

REQUEST THAT AMBASSADOR FOR DISARMAMENT BE APPOINTED

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, as a final question to the Prime Minister I would like to ask him, considering the importance of disarmament, and considering

that we have not had an ambassador for disarmament, not for one, two or three months, but for many months, when will he be announcing the replacement for that position so that the commitment that he has made publicly to take disarmament very seriously will in fact be fought out in public forums, including the United Nations, by a Canadian ambassador appointed for that job.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is rather churlish in suggesting that I do not participate in debate. We are having one now in this Question Period. He asked me a question and I answered it. I asked him a question and he fluffed it, Madam Speaker. He does not know what he means by "such a calculation". In so far as the ambassador is concerned, Madam Speaker, we are considering the matter.

* * *

CROWN CORPORATIONS

CANADAIR—IMPACT OF AEROSPACE POLICY

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. The Minister responsible for Canadair has indicated that any future decisions regarding further financial assistance to Canadair will be taken within the context of an aerospace policy of the Government. Would the Minister indicate to the House whether that aerospace policy is under way, and when will it be issued to the public for debate?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Madam Speaker, the aerospace strategy is an ongoing process. This is one of the reasons we have decided to invest some money with the private sector in the Bell helicopter project. With respect to the specific strategy for Canadair and de Havilland, the Minister responsible for both of those Crown corporations has indicated he will be bringing that forward in the very near future and he will be going to the parliamentary committee, as the Prime Minister has indicated on several occasions, with respect to the role of Canadair and de Havilland in the over-all aerospace sector in Canada.

FUNDING OF CORPORATION

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Madam Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Since the request for future funding of Canadair is probably going to amount to some hundreds of millions of dollars—there was a report the other day that suggested it might be as high as $400 million—will the Prime Minister commit to this House that no further request for funds will be made until we have had a chance to see this aerospace policy from the Government? Also, will the Prime Minister instruct Canadair not to take any action which will cause these moneys to be spent in anticipation of funding approvals to be received from the Government and to make the position of this Parliament totally irrelevant?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, I may remind the Hon. Member that the Minister responsible for Canadair and de Havilland made an exhaustive report to the Standing Committees of the House on the specific situations in these corporations.

The Hon. Member will also recall that a decision to provide additional funding for Canadair will depend on an assessment of the Corporation's viability and especially of the Challenger aircraft which is now showing very good signs of being viable.

[*English*]

APPOINTMENT OF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Madam Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of National Revenue. Four and one-half months ago the Minister in the other place, responsible for Canadair, stated that a new executive officer was going to be recruited to run Canadair. In view of the importance of the aerospace industry to Canada and the magnitude of the problems of Canadair, can the Minister tell the House when that appointment will be made?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, I shall ask the Minister responsible about this, and I shall then be happy to answer the Hon. Member's question.

[*English*]

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DIRECTORS

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Madam Speaker, at the same time I wonder if the Minister might address himself to this problem. Four and one-half months ago the same Minister made a commitment to make additional appointments to the board of directors of Canadair to strengthen its input into the activities of the company. Once again, in view of the importance of the aerospace industry to Canada and the magnitude of the problems of Canadair, when will the Minister commit to this House to appoint to the board of directors the people the Minister refers to as having experience in the aerospace industry?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, I am surprised at the Hon. Member's question and his wanting to appoint more people to Canadair's board of directors, since on the opposite side of the House, Hon. Members often worry about there being too many people at the top in our Crown corporations. By establishing the Canada Development Investment Corporation, the Government has tried to provide for better management of corpo-

rations like Canadair and de Havilland, and that is already a considerable improvement. However, I do not think the Hon. Member's suggestion to increase the number of directors will provide a solution to Canadair's problems.

* * *

[*English*]

INCOME TAX

REASSESSMENT OF FARMERS' INCOME—ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS FOR AUDITORS

Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo-Chilcotin): Madam Speaker, my question too is for the Minister of National Revenue, and it concerns Section 31 of the Income Tax Act. A number of farmers who have been audited and reassessed under Section 31 are planning to go before the tax court of Canada. In this forum they have the right to subpoena information and witnesses. Can these farmers subpoena the individual auditors from Revenue Canada whose very lack of agricultural knowledge has in many cases forced these farmers to the brink of financial ruin?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, people who go to court may call any witness they wish. As far as the Hon. Member's comment on local auditors is concerned, these are experienced people who do their work using their knowledge of the Income Tax Act and its applications.

[*English*]

APPEARANCE OF AUDITORS BEFORE COURTS

Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo-Chilcotin): Madam Speaker, I make just one comment. Some of those auditors do not know the difference between a horse and a cow, as far as I am concerned.

Would the Minister please inform or instruct the various divisions of the audit department that these auditors indeed do have to appear before the tax court, because they are telling people in my riding that under law they do not have to appear?

An Hon. Member: The horse is the taller one.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, I feel that when people are called to testify in court, it is up to the court to subpoena witnesses, who will respond as they are asked to testify.

EMPLOYMENT

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL PROGRAM TO FACILITATE ADMISSION OF CERTAIN IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Rémi Bujold (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. In view of the concern of the Minister and the Government for job creation, has the Minister considered new ways of improving immigration procedures for business people, with a view to promoting economic growth? In this connection, has the Minister developed a special program that would facilitate the admission of immigrants whose business projects might help create jobs in Canada?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Yes, Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

It is true that we attach great importance to improving the entry of entrepreneurs into Canada. We intend to attach more importance to this than we have in the past. We have developed a whole variety of flexible procedures to encourage that to happen, including changed criteria and the positioning abroad of officers who will encourage this to happen. The details of this program will be announced later on today, or certainly later this week, and we hope to have this program in full operation by the beginning of next year.

* * *

● (1440)

DISARMAMENT

PROPOSED MORATORIUM ON DEPLOYMENT OF CRUISE AND PERSHING II MISSILES

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. He would know that there is a good deal of feeling everywhere in the world that the second part of the two-track position has not been given a good enough chance yet, and that there needs to be more negotiation at the INF talks in Geneva before deployment takes place. There is the proposal of the Prime Minister of Greece, for example, that there be a moratorium on deployment of the Cruise and Pershing II while further negotiations at the INF take place.

I wonder if the Prime Minister has had any correspondence or discussions with NATO ministers in recent months, apart from the big three, so to speak—the Prime Minister of the Netherlands, the new Prime Minister of Italy, the Prime Minister of Denmark and other NATO partners. Has he had any correspondence or discussions with them on the matter of postponing the deployment while talks continue at Geneva?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, in answering the second part of the question I will answer the first in part.

When I met Prime Minister Papandreou in Greece about a month and a half ago, the Hon. Member will recall that the Prime Minister had proposed such a six-month moratorium, and he asked me for my opinion on that. I indicated to him that I thought it would be wrong to propose a moratorium at this stage. After all, the Soviets had known since December, 1979, that the deadline was December 1983. I think it would not be conducive to conclusive negotiations in the weeks that remain if, suddenly, that pressure were lifted and if the moratorium brought us to some deadline in June because, as I asked Prime Minister Papandreou, what will happen in June if there is still no agreement? Will we then have another moratorium and, if not, why not? If we can go from moratorium to moratorium, then the deadline we set four years ago would be meaningless.

I think we must stick to this dealine and hope that the two superpowers will reach some conclusion in the short time remaining that will make deployment unnecessary.

Miss Jewett: Madam Speaker, of course the Prime Minister will recall that one of the difficulties in getting the talks going was the new administration in the United States which waited for ten months before it even started thinking about it. Given that, it would seem to me advisable that one give a bit more time now that the negotiations have actually started.

NUCLEAR FREEZE RESOLUTION

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister if he is prepared to take the initiative and pursue this with other NATO Prime Ministers and, indeed, with Leaders of the Opposition as well, and look again at the Sweden-Mexico nuclear freeze resolution at the UN last Fall. Canada voted against the motion. It was one of 17 nations opposing that nuclear freeze resolution. Would the Prime Minister look at that again and tell the House whether Canada will be prepared to support that resolution? It will be coming forward again in a few weeks time at the UN.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, you realize that the question is hypothetical. If the matter comes forth again, I do not see why Canada should change its vote from last year. Our position last year was that the Soviets had modernized their equipment by replacing the SS-4 and the SS-5 with the SS-20. In 1979 we told the Soviets that we would be doing the same thing and replacing our armaments with more modern armaments. I do not see why we should freeze when, in that particular theatre, the Soviets have given themselves an advantage since 1970.

Miss Jewett: Read the resolution.

Oral Questions

INCOME TAX

DEPARTMENT'S TREATMENT OF TORONTO SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA MUSICIANS

Hon. David Crombie (Rosedale): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. The Minister may know that for 61 years the musicians in the Toronto Symphony Orchestra have been considered to be self-employed artists for the purpose of taxes. Recently members of the Minister's Department have ruled that, from now on and, indeed, retroactive to January, 1983, such musicians are to be considered as employees of the Symphony. This is going to cost the musicians money, and is going to raise the expenses of the Symphony Orchestra. Since this situation does not obtain with the Montreal Symphony Orchestra, for example, I should like to ask the Minister if he would give the undertaking that he will place a moratorium on that ruling, and meet with the principals involved?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, this is the second time in two weeks that Hon. Members are asking the Minister of National Revenue to declare a moratorium for a group of taxpayers. Last week, it was artists, today it is musicians. This could be an extremely dangerous practice. After two or three months we might get to the point where no one in Canada would be paying taxes. I can assure the Hon. Member that the recent ruling made by the Toronto District Office will be given careful study, but I must point out that the ruling was made in accordance with the provisions of the Act, that it makes a distinction between a person who is self-employed and a person who is employed by someone else, and that such rulings must be made in the light of our legislation and of rulings in similar cases across the country.

[*English*]

Mr. Crombie: Madam Speaker, I can assure the Minister of one thing. If he keeps on with these tax policies there are not going to be any artists in this country. I will be on my feet every day asking questions about these policies.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER MEET MUSICIANS

Hon. David Crombie (Rosedale): Madam Speaker, I want to ask the Minister two things in this context. First of all, this is not a rule that applies across the country to all symphony orchestras. That is why they feel that they are personally being prejudiced by the Minister's officials. Second, this policy is retroactive to January, 1983. The musicians have not even had a chance to respond.

Within that context I should like to ask the Minister, in fairness, if not to the artists of this country at least to the musicians, if he will not give them an opportunity to have a meeting with him before he taxes all artists right off the land?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Hon. Member will not take the time to try and understand the situation. If the Hon. Member would care to read again the question he put last week regardng a specific group of artists, he will see that he was entirely mistaken. In his question he assumed that inventories of artists, including paintings and graphic art, were taxed, which is entirely false. I suppose he has had a chance to check his facts and find out that he was wrong.

Instead of worrying whether the application of the legislation to a specific group is fair or unfair, he should realize that when we apply an administrative policy on taxation or, as in the present case, on the insurability of a group of workers for unemployment insurance purposes, this must be done in accordance with existing legislation, and we must also ensure that other groups that find themselves in the same situation are not, as a result, treated unfairly. That is what we are doing.

* * *

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

PRIME MINISTER'S 1980 STATEMENT

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. On Thursday last I asked the Prime Member a question on these lines. In view of the fact that federal Government expenditures have been increasing at a considerably faster rate than the rate of increase in the GNP, would the Prime Minister advise the House what steps the Government intends to take to bring the rate of increase of total federal government expenditures in line with the rate of increase in the GNP as he assured the country he intended to do during the election campaign in 1980?

In view of the fact that Statistics Canada has reconfirmed to me that total federal government expenditures increased steadily from 19.6 per cent of GNP in 1979 to 25.9 per cent of GNP in the first six months of this year—

Madam Speaker: Order. Is the Hon. Member going to come to the question?

Mr. Chrétien: Next week.

Mr. Hees: Yes, right now, Madam Speaker. When does the Prime Minister intend to make good on his election promise that he would keep expenditures in line with the rate of growth in the GNP?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, it is unusual, but I must say that the Hon. Member disappoints me when he compares 1979 with the first six months of this year. I do not believe that one can compare one year to six months and establish a valid trend line, Madam Speaker. It is well known that in the first half of the fiscal year the major part of government spending happens, and then it tapers off. However, there can be variations from year to year.

• (1450)

I would suggest that the Hon. Member ask the Bureau of Statistics this question. Let him take the trend line from 1979 or 1976, or whatever, and follow it through with the projections of the Minister of Finance. He will see that, though we did go above that trend line, I believe last year especially, when we were attempting to deal with unusually high unemployment, the trend line, according to the projections of the Minister of Finance, is downward, not upward.

Mr. Hees: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to assure the Prime Minister that I have already done just exactly that, and the result is as follows. In 1979 federal expenditures increased—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member must ask a supplementary question, if he has one, and not read in more statistics. A question.

1980 ELECTION COMMITMENT

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Madam Speaker, the figures which I have here show the Prime Minister has been misleading the House because there has been a steady—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: Not deliberately, not deliberately.

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: Not deliberately.

Madam Speaker: I recognize that the Hon. Member might have some statistics which prove something else, but that is debate, and the time allotted now is for questions. If the Hon. Member does not have a question, I am afraid I will not be able to recognize him. A question.

Mr. Hees: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that Statistics Canada have given me figures which prove exactly what I have said in my first question, and disprove exactly what the Prime Minister has tried to put over in the House, I would simply ask him when he is going to make good on the commitment which he gave to this country when, on January 20, 1980, he said, "Our commitment is this: we will hold the line on government expenditure growth to, at, or under the rate of growth of the GNP".

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, if the Hon. Member for Northumberland reads the projections of the Minister of Finance in his last budget he will see that we are attempting to live up to that. If he has obtained the figures from the Bureau of Statistics, as he says, I wonder why he has given us just a six months' figure.

Mr. Hees: Because they are the latest figures which are available.

Mr. Trudeau: But is that six months' figure, Madam Speaker, seasonally adjusted on an annual basis, or is it just the average? Hon. Members opposite who know anything about it know you cannot take a period of the year when you usually spend more, then double it and say that will be the average for the whole year. I wish the Hon. Member would send over the statistics and then I will have them checked with the Bureau of Statistics.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Prince Albert.

Mr. Hees: For 1982 it was 23.7 per cent. That is for the whole year, and you know it.

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hees: You had better get your own figures straight. The Trudeau Bureau of Statistics is not good enough.

* * *

RAILWAYS

BRITISH COLUMBIA TAX ON GRAIN CARS

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. The Minister is no doubt aware of the imposition of the British Columbia sales tax on the use of Canadian Wheat Board grain cars in that Province. Since such a tax will be taken directly from the incomes of western grain producers, will the Minister tell the House what steps he has taken to prevent the implementation of this tax?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, it would appear quite obvious that an action taken by the British Columbia Government is an action which should rightfully be debated in the British Columbia Legislature. It would be my presumption that the Hon. Member would be in touch with members of his own Party in that particular Assembly to bring the matter to their attention. It might take their minds off some of the other areas of interest which they are presently debating. I will certainly look into the matter. However, I would suggest to the Hon. Member that the first area of recourse would be for that Legislature to come to the recognition that it is probably not a very smart thing to do.

Mr. Hovdebo: I can agree with the Minister that any sane government would run as far as possible away from the policies and actions of the British Columbia Government, which the Minister seems to be doing.

FARMERS' ABILITY TO PAY

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Madam Speaker, as a supplementary question I would ask the Minister about the central issue here, and that is the ability of the farmers to pay. With the prospect of a tax jungle of provincial sales taxes and the federal Government's increase in freight rates of 500 per cent, will the Minister undertake a complete study of the farmers' ability to pay and to absorb these increased costs in both freight rates and taxes and still be able to produce the grain which is so necessary for Canadian exports?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I would first like to say to the Hon. Member that in making the case in British Columbia about the imposition of the sales tax, I believe it would be important to point out that the benefits which will accrue to that particular Province, and to many others, will be billions of dollars of benefit. Therefore, if the Hon. Member is interested in helping us develop a case as to why there should not be a sales tax, he may also be prepared to help us encourage the passing of the Crow Bill so we can get those major benefits flowing into the Province of British Columbia, as well as into other areas.

As far as the second question of the Hon. Member is concerned, I would just like to make one small suggestion to him, that is, that he look at the present Bill because there is already full provision for review in which we would be looking at the whole question of the method of payment and the ability to pay.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

EASTERN TOWNSHIPS SKI AREA—STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS WITH QUEBEC

Mr. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance.

I am aware that the Minister and his colleague, the Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology, met with their provincial counterparts last Friday to discuss a future Canada-Quebec general agreement on regional economic development. Since their agenda includes the ski industry, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance whether he could inform the House on the progress of negotiations, and especially about the possibility of an agreement on the development of this industry which is of vital importance to the Eastern Townships.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, in recent months there have been a number of meetings between federal and provincial officials to discuss the tourism industry in Quebec, with special emphasis on skiing. At these meetings, a general outline for a development plan for the ski industry in Quebec was prepared, and the Government of

Quebec decided to announce its views on the subject last Friday.

We have indicated that we were prepared to discuss with the Quebec Government the role of the Canadian Government in this regard. Programs are available under the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Regional Economic Development, and we shall see exactly what form our contribution will take. We are indeed very interested in making this industry, which has a considerable impact on employment, a flourishing one in Quebec, and we are looking at effective ways of contributing to the growth of this industry.

* * *

[*English*]

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE

ESTABLISHMENT OF DUTY-FREE STORES IN ONTARIO

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. On March 1 of this year I raised the question of the establishment of duty-free stores in Ontario. On October 6 the Hon. Member for Algoma raised the same issue. In both instances the Minister urged us to contact the Province in order that it would give us a favourable answer. I am pleased to announce the Ontario Cabinet has given us an answer. It is willing to go along with the federal Government in principle. When will the Minister open up a duty-free store in the riding of Erie?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, as soon as we have managed to reconcile principles and practice.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I understand that the oral question period is now over.

Madam Speaker: Oral question period always ends at three o'clock.

Mr. Pinard: In the circumstances—

● (1500)

[*English*]

—I would like to deal with House business. There have been some consultations, and contrary to what I indicated earlier today, tomorrow will not be an Opposition day. Also contrary to what was said last week, we will not wait until after we get final approval of Bill C-155 before seeking the approval of four other Bills which are needed before we consider proroguing. Therefore, what I am about to say is to confirm, after consultation with the House Leaders in the Opposition, that we have agreed to give passage to all stages of four Bills before tomorrow at 6 p.m.

The first item of business this afternoon will be Bill C-163, dealing with air safety. The understanding is that we will have one speaker per Party and we will then dispose of all stages of that Bill.

That will be followed by starting debate on report stage of Bill C-152, Government reorganization.

Tomorrow morning between eleven o'clock and one o'clock we have a firm agreement that we will deal with two Bills through all stages. First is Bill C-169, dealing with the Canada Elections Act, the agreement being that we will have one speaker per Party and we will then dispose of all stages of that Bill.

Second is Bill C-168, dealing with the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the agreement being one speaker per Party and that we will then dispose of all stages of that Bill. All of that will be done before one o'clock. What I have said is based on a firm agreement and understanding and we do not require a House order for that purpose.

Bill C-152, as I said earlier, is the other top priority for the Government to get through before we consider proroguing. We will start debate on report stage this afternoon and resume debate immediately after Question Period tomorrow afternoon. Here I have a House order to make it clear that at the end of the afternoon all questions will be put to dispose of that Bill through remaining stages.

Therefore I seek the unanimous consent of the House for this motion:

That on Tuesday, October 25, 1983, the business taken up under Government Orders after Question Period shall be Bill C-152, an Act respecting the organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto; and

Notwithstanding any Standing Order, no later than 5.45 p.m. that day, every question necessary for the disposal of the report stage and the third reading stage of the said bill shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, the program outlined by the Government House Leader is that which he discussed with me, and on behalf of this Party we consent to that House Order. We also have a clear understanding that if we do require additional time for additional speakers to be heard after 5.45 p.m. tomorrow night, there would be no difficulty in obtaining consent from the Government side to extend the hours for that purpose.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, similarly, we understand the business of the House today and tomorrow will be as the Government House Leader has put forward, including the question raised by the Opposition House Leader regarding the extension of time if necessary tomorrow to complete Bill C-152.

Madam Speaker: If there is unanimous consent, then it is so ordered.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Mazankowski: Madam Speaker, I think you will find the House disposed to consent to allow the following motions to be put for consideration in the interests of improving Bill C-155 when we resume debate on this Bill. The first motion is as follows:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 58 by immediately adding after line 13 at page 34 the following therefor:

"58.(3) Notwithstanding anything in this Act based upon the recommendations of the committee established under Section 59(2) to examine the method of payment, the Governor in Council may subject to approval by Parliament, make regulations prescribing the manner in which, and the Parties to whom, payment of the Government contribution, including the Crow benefit, shall be made".

Briefly, that would allow an enabling provision to incorporate a modified method of payment depending upon the recommendations of the inquiry that will flow therefrom.

The second motion is as follows:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 43 by adding immediately after line 34 at page 24 the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the rate a railway company may charge a shipper for the movement of grain for the period January 1, 1984 to July 31, 1986 shall not exceed the existing rates in effect on August 1, 1983".

That, Madam Speaker, would preserve the statutory freight rate until the end of the crop year 1986 and until such time as the review was completed. I ask that you seek unanimous consent that these motions as read be placed before the House when it resumes debate on Bill C-155, namely an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member wants unanimous consent to waive the notice. Is that very clear?

Mr. Mazankowski: Yes.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member is seeking unanimous consent to waive the notice for those amendments to be placed on the Order Paper?

Mr. Mazankowski: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Very well.

Mr. Axworthy: Madam Speaker, we are in agreement that such amendments be brought forward and considered for debate. I want to assure the House that that does not imply we are in agreement necessarily with the substance of the amendments. But we are certainly in agreement with the proposal.

I would like at the same time to solicit approval of the House for amendments relating to safety net provisions which I would like to propose in the same spirit we are offering to the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Mr. Nielsen: Put them up now.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, at the outset I want to say that I hope no one is labouring under the misapprehension that somehow or other what the Hon. Member for Vegreville has just done was in any way related to the decision we took regarding the House Order put forward by the Government House Leader.

Mr. Pinard: Not at all.

Mr. Deans: I must confess that the request comes to me without notice and I am not in a position at the moment to grant the unanimous consent necessary for it to proceed since the matter was never discussed with me. If the Hon. Member and the Minister of Transport want to work out their cozy deals, they best come talk to us in advance before they ask for unanimous consent.

Mr. Axworthy: Madam Speaker, in that same spirit of openness and generosity that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain expressed, I might also raise with the House a motion concerning the consideration for debate of a motion relating to the safety net, or would you like—

Madam Speaker: I would just like to finish the matter we are now dealing with. The Hon. Member for Vegreville has just asked for permission to waive notice to allow two amendments to be placed on the Order Paper for debate.

Mr. Nielsen: For debate.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, I want to ask both the Minister and the Hon. Member for Vegreville, who obviously would want to have the matter before the House, to postpone asking for that unanimous consent until we have had an opportunity to look at the amendments they are asking for.

Mr. Mazankowski: Madam Speaker, I am surprised at the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain because he in effect gave that concurrence last Thursday when he stated, and I quote from page 28174 of *Hansard:*

More important, on behalf of my colleagues, we would be prepared to consider the matters the Members have put on the floor, at least to this point, and for which they are seeking unanimous consent.

● (1510)

I think that was a clear concurrence of the fact that the Hon. Member wanted these motions for amendment to be put before the House for debate. We have since advanced two motions which we consider of paramount importance with that in mind. I hope the Hon. Member has not changed his mind.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, as in the past, I refuse to negotiate on the floor of the House. Show me amendments, put the motion later and I will be glad to consider it, hopefully in a favourable way.

Madam Speaker: Since it is only a matter of the Hon. Member reading the amendment and perhaps being in a position later on to give his unanimous consent or to refuse it, according to his decision, perhaps we could proceed to other items of routine business. Perhaps that would be helpful to the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, you have been asked by the Hon. Member for Vegreville to seek the unanimous consent of

the House to waive notice for the two motions that he has put. I anticipate, judging from the fact that the Minister has risen in the House, that he will be rising to seek consent with respect to some other aspect of the Bill. May I suggest, Madam Speaker, with respect, that you ask for that unanimous consent now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: I was only trying to help the House plan its work. However, if that is the desire of the House, I will ask now if there is unanimous consent to the proposal made by the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Axworthy: I rise on a point of order to propose to the House that the House give unanimous concurrence to the consideration of amendments for debate that would take into account the provision of a safety net, which is a concern that I know is shared by all Members of the House. As all Hon. Members will know, it is a very lengthy motion but it would be in exact accordance with Motion No. 157 which was on the previous Order Paper and with Motion No. 74. Perhaps I could dispense with the reading of those motions. They would require a 10 per cent safety net for farmers in order to protect them against increased prices. I would ask the House for unanimous consent.

Mr. Deans: Similarly, Madam Speaker, if the Minister wants unanimous consent, he should come and talk to us.

[*Editor's Note: The motions referred to above are as follows:*]

Motion No. 157

That Bill C-155 be amended by striking out the heading "Part IV" preceding Clause 59 at page 34 and substituting the following therefor:

"PART IV
SHIPPER SHARE LIMITATION

59. In this Part,

"freight to price ratio", in respect of any calendar year, means an amount equal to the quotient, expressed as a percentage obtained by dividing the average cost to the shipper of moving one tonne of grain in that calendar year by the weighted average price for that calendar year;

"shipper share limitation adjustment", in respect of any calendar year, means an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying

(*a*) the number of percentage points by which the freight to price ratio in that calendar year exceeds 10 per cent,

by

(*b*) the product obtained by multiplying the weighted average price for that calendar year by the total number of tonnes of grain moved in that calendar year;

"six grains" means wheat, oats, barley, rye, flaxseed and rapeseed;

"weighted average price", in respect of any calendar year, means the weighted average determined under paragraph 60(1)(*b*) in respect of that calendar year.

60.(1) The Commission shall, on or before March 1st of each year, using the information that it deems appropriate, determine, in respect of the preceding calendar year,

(*a*) the average price per tonne at which each of the six grains, in storage, was available for sale on each trading day at the port that handled the largest volume of that grain in the calendar year;

(*b*) the average of the average prices referred to in paragraph (*a*), weighted on the basis of the number of tonnes of each of the six grains moved in the calendar year;

(*c*) the average cost to the shipper of moving one tonne of grain in the calendar year; and

(*d*) the freight to price ratio.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1)(*a*), the average price per tonne at which each of the six grains was available for sale shall be determined on the basis of the price per tonne of the grade of each of those grains the largest volume of which was moved in the calendar year.

PART V"

and by renumbering the subsequent Parts and Clauses and amending all references accordingly.

Motion No. 74

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 37 by striking out lines 37 to 43 at page 19 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*a*) the estimated government commitment less an amount equal to the CN adjustment in respect of that crop year, plus or minus the total of the interim adjustment for the current crop year and the final adjustment for the preceding crop year, plus the shipper share limitation adjustment for the preceding calendar year, as determined under Part IV, by".

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to the proposal made by the Hon. Minister of Transport?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

PRESENTATION OF TWENTY-FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the twenty-first report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

TABLING OF PAPER ON GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Jack Burghardt (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Madam Speaker, under the provisions of

Standing Order 46(2), I would like to table in both official languages the federal Government policy on the CBC entitled "Building for the Future toward a Distinctive CBC".

* * *

METRIC COMMISSION

TABLING OF 1982-83 ANNUAL REPORT

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table in both official languages the tenth report of Metric Commission Canada for the year ending March 31, 1983.

* * *

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

UFFI—GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table in both official languages the federal Government's response to the report on urea formhaldehyde foam insulation of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

* * *

PETITION

MR. ANGUISH—CALL FOR PASSAGE OF BILL C-678

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, I would like to present to the House of Commons today a petition signed by residents of my riding, particularly those from the centres of The Battlefords, Ruddell, Vawn, Cochin and Cole Bay. The petition, Madam Speaker, was signed during "An Evening in the Park" which was sponsored by the Battlefords Association for Nuclear Disarmament and calls upon Parliament to debate and pass Bill-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone, and thereby place the nation of Canada in a position to act as a mediator in the worldwide nuclear disarmament process.

Madam Speaker: Motions. Since Hon. Members are capable of appreciating the great number of motions that we have on the Order Paper, if any Member wishes to move, perhaps he could indicate to the Chair and I will call that motion.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, on this occasion only, because I would not want to see a poor precedent established, I would suggest that the procedure followed by the Chair in asking Hon. Members if they wish to move motions they have on the Order Paper is acceptable for today. However, It may well be that on some other occasion a Member such as myself or any other Member may wish to rise and, on behalf of another Member, move a motion that is on the Order Paper in that Member's name.

Madam Speaker: Yes, that would necessitate that the Chair read all of the motions. However, it is not a precedent. I will ask every day for permission to waive the reading of these motions, but Hon. Members realize that this would take a lot of the time of the House, aside from exhausting my energies.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, dealing with these notices, I would be willing to give consent that they be scratched from the Order Paper.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, we believe far too deeply that parliamentary reform is something that should never be scratched from the Order Paper.

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, it looks like Liberal and Tory Members are back in bed again, does it not? However, on this occasion only we will allow that we forgo the reading of all of the motions. It is nice to see them working together again.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,857, 5,011, 5,020, 5,026, 5,039 to 5,135.

[*Text*]

ASSISTANCE FOR FIELD CROPS IN NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 4,857—**Mr. Howie:**

For the fiscal year (a) 1980-81 (b) 1981-82 (c) 1982-83, what amount was paid to farmers in New Brunswick to assist with field crops?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Assistance paid to farmers for field crops in New Brunswick is as follows:

	(a) 1980-81	(b) 1981-82	(c) 1982-83
Crop Insurance Program	$ 318,595	$ 505,056	$ 462,756
Agricultural Development Subsidiary Agreement II*	494,301	624,760	256,285
Advance Payments for Crops Program			
—payment of interest on advance payment	312,894	569,857	262,073
—payment of interest for default accounts	—	33,441	19,154
—default accounts paid out	—	—	78,291
Fruit and Vegetable Storage Construction Financial Assistance Program	$ 25,000	$ 170,417	$ 28,521
Agricultural Stabilization Board	931,018	3,712,080	26,757

	(a) 1980-81	(b) 1981-82	(c) 1982-83
South East New Brunswick Program	—	—	52,412
	$2,081,808	$5,615,611	$1,186,249

* Transferred from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to the Department of Agriculture in September, 1982.

PETROCAN/BLUE JAYS SEAT CUSHION DAY

Question No. 5,011—**Mr. McCuish:**

1. Was July 27, 1983 designated as PetroCan/Blue Jays seat cushion day at Exhibition Stadium in Toronto, Ontario?

2. Were 20,000 seat cushions distributed to the general public free of charge and, if so, what was the total cost incurred by Petro-Canada as a result of the development, promotion, and production of the cushions?

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Petro-Canada reports as follows:

1. Yes, July 27, 1983 was designated as Petro-Canada Seat Cushion Day at Exhibition Stadium in Toronto, Ontario.

2. Twenty-three thousand seat cushions were distributed free of charge to members of the public attending the Blue Jays game on July 27, 1983. The total cost incurred by Petro-Canada as a result of this promotion was $31,700. There were no development or production costs incurred by the Corporation.

IRDP PROGRAM

Question No. 5,020—**Mr. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton):**

1. Since the inception of the Program, how many applications were (a) received (b) approved for IRDP Programs in the constituency of Victoria—Haliburton?

2. What is the total amount of funding for approved IRDP projects in the constituency?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): As of September 12, 1983, the reply for the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Regional Economic Expansion is as follows:

1. (a) Four. (b) To date, no decision has yet been rendered.

2. Nil.

TAXES COLLECTED ON TOBACCO, LIQUOR, WINE AND BEER

Question No. 5,026—**Mr. Stewart:**

In (a) 1980 (b) 1981 (c) 1982 (d) 1983 to date, what was the total amount collected by the Department of National Revenue through taxation on (i) tobacco and tobacco products (ii) liquor (iii) wine (iv) beer?

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue):

(i) Tobacco and Tobacco products

1980	$419,559,483
1981	$427,467,127
1982	$447,425,506
1983 to August	$366,193,779

(ii) Liquor

1980	$396,933,059
1981	$446,911,191
1982	$452,796,660
1983 to August	$278,735,121

(iii) Wine

1980	$23,152,164
1981	$28,744,477
1982	$32,530,514
1983 to August	$26,583,061

(iv) Beer

1980	$221,118,056
1981	$264,107,539
1982	$283,505,862
1983 to August	$219,267,735

LEGAL SERVICES—FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

Question No. 5,039—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Peter J. E. Cole of the firm of Wiens & Cole, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,040—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to W. C. Middleton, Q. C. of the firm of Middleton & Boni, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,041—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Warren G. Barber, of the firm of Meighen, Haddad & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,042—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Garry T. Miller, of the firm of Hirschfield, Hunt, Fjeldsted & Miller, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,043—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Joseph A. Mullally, of the firm of Carroll, Mullally, Paterson & Midwinter, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,044—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to James H. Treble, of the firm of Treble & McRae, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,045—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to E. W. Hawkins, of the firm of Hawkins & Sanderson, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,046—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Sydney Perlmutter, of Hamiota, Manitoba, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,047—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Duncan E. Geisler, of Ashern, Manitoba, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,048—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to D. D. St. John, Q.C., of the firm of St. John & St. John, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,049—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Kenneth R. Hanssen, of the firm of Duncan & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,050—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to David G. Greenberg, of the firm of Greenberg & Greenberg, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,051—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Orest W. Pressey, of the firm of Miller, Miller & Pressey, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,052—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Marcel J. J. R. Gregoire, of Roblin, Manitoba, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,053—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Ernest R. Goossen, of the firm of Plett, Goossen & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,054—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Robert P. Smith, of the firm of Smith, Neufeld & Stewart, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,055—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to C. W. Buckingham, Q.C., of Virden, Manitoba, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,056—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Alain J. Hogue, of the firm of Teffaine, Monnin, Hogue & Teillet, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,057—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Morris Kaufman, of the firm of Margolis, Kaufman, Cassidy, Zaifman & Swartz, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,058—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to E. M. Shewchuck, of the firm of Monk, Goodwin & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,059—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to P. W. A. Westbury, of the firm of Inkster, Walker, Westbury, Irish, Rusen & Hughes, or to the firm itself, with

respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,060—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Paul Lewans, of the firm of Lewans & Associates, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,061—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Roderick MacDonald, of the MacDonald Law Firm, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,062—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to James I. Ulmer, of the firm of Coxworth & Ulmer, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,063—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Paul D. Elash, of the firm of Kohaly & Elash, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,064—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Dennis P. Ball, of the firm of Hill, McLellan, Ball, Cundall & Bridges, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,065—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Louis E. H. Stringer, of Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,066—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Marilyn Scott, of the firm of Sutherland, Behiel & Scott, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,067—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Donald J. Roberts, of the firm of Roberts & Setrakov, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,068—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Edward A. Komarnicki, of the Komarnicki Law Firm, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,069—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Alex G. Robertson, of the firm of Robertson, Baynton, Moskal, Stolniuk & Strilchuk, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,070—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Raymond G. Cariou, of the firm of Cariou, Partyk & Francis, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,071—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Jacob Eisner, of the firm of Eisner, Eisner & Associates, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,072—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Grant Carson, of the firm of Carson & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,073—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to John D. Hillson, of the Hillson Law Office, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,074—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Mervin C. Ozirny, of the firm of Ozirny, Wrubell, Fisher & Tourney, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from

January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,075—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to John D. Cooper, of the firm of Grayson & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,076—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Roy A. Dickinson, of the firm of R. A. Dickinson & Associates, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,077—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Terance W. Ocrane, of the firm of Chow, Ocrane, Walper & Hagen, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,078—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Donald J. Osman, of the firm of Goliath, Osman & Gardner, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,079—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to James Eremko, of the firm of Eremko & Eremko, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,080—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Brian M. Fitzpatrick, of the firm of Taylor & Fitzpatrick, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,081—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Dennis R. Maher, of the firm of Maher, Lindgren & Blais, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,082—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to David W. Shury, of the firm of Shury, Migneault & Miller, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,083—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Calvin J. Clark, of Outlook, Saskatchewan, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,084—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to J. H. Clyne Harradence, of the firm of Harradence, Longworth & Zatlyn, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,085—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Wayne D. E. McIntyre, of the firm of Balfour, Moss, Milliken, Laschuk, Kyle, Vancise & McIntyre, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,086—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Ian McLellan, of the firm of Gerrand, McLellan & Mulatz, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,087—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Anthony E. F. Merchant, of the firm of Pedersen, Norman, McLeod & Todd, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,088—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to William James Serne, of the firm of Serne, McKenzie & Miller, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,089—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Tom Malloy, of the firm of MacDermid & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Order Paper Questions

Question No. 5,090—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to John A. Stack, of the firm of McKercher, McKercher, Stack, Korchin & Laing, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,091—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Donald J. Dermody, of Shaunavon, Saskatchewan, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,092—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Warren J. Holland, of Swift Current, Saskatchewan, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,093—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Donald K. Krueger, of the firm of Krueger, McLaughlin, Forrester & Rittinger, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,094—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Frank A. MacBean, of the firm of Wilson, MacBean, McIntosh, Wiebe & Tessen, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,095—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Harold T. Hepting, of Unity, Saskatchewan, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,096—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to James E. Young, of Unity, Saskatchewan, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,097—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Philip L. Kotyk, of the firm of Kotyk & Zawislak, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,098—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Thomas A. Schuck, of the firm of Nimegeers, Schuck, Wormsbecker & Bobbitt, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,099—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Walter Bieber, of Wilkie, Saskatchewan, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,100—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Walter Paulson, of Wynyard, Saskatchewan, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,101—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Arliss W. Dellow, of the firm of Dellow & Greenhorn, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,102—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Stanley G. Kyba, of Yorkton, Saskatchewan, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,103—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Wayne M. Rusnak, of the firm of Rusnak, Balacko & Kachur, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,104—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to R. B. Logan, of the firm of Logan and Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,105—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to E. P. MacCallum, of the firm of MacCallum & Ritter, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disburse-

ments for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,106—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Dale Wilson, of the firm of Fraser & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,107—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Kenneth W. Lutes, of the firm of Crerar & Lutes, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,108—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to G. J. Burrell, of the firm of Walsh & Young, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,109—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to G. R. Knaut, of the firm of Knaut, Johnson & Sawle, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,110—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to W. Harry Gough, of the firm of Ross, Todd & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,111—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to R. G. Wheatley, of the firm of Wheatley, Sadownik & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,112—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Stuart Campbell, of the firm of Cox, Trofimuk & Campbell, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,113—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to David J. Cooke, of the firm of Cooke & Thompson, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,114—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Gerald Eherer, of Fairview, Alberta, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,115—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to J. W. Freeland, of the firm of Freeland & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,116—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Charles A. MacDonell, of the firm of MacDonell & Sutcliffe, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,117—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to D. B. Todd, of the firm of Ross, Todd & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,118—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to R. H. Scammell, of the firm of Johnson & Ming, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,119—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to James Dixon, of the firm of Herbert, Fielding & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,120—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to P. G. Flanagan, of the firm of Flanagan, Sully & Surkan, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from

January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,121—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to J. I. Boras, of the firm of Boras, Hogan & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,122—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to F. S. Peta, of the firm of Huzil & Peta, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,123—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to D. J. MacLean, of the firm of MacLean & Wiedemann, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,124—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to D. L. Wilkins, of the firm of Pritchard, Lerner & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,125—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to G. C. Mathieu, of the firm of Campbell & Marceau, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,126—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to J. W. Fowler, of the firm of Fowler & Cardwell, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,127—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to J. F. Ulan, of the firm of Ulan & Associates, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,128—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Richard Holeton, of the firm of Holeton & Langager, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,129—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Charles A. Webb, of the Charles A. Webb Professional Corporation, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,130—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to D. P. MacNaughton, of the firm of Sloan & MacNaughton, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,131—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to J. A. Blonsky, of the firm of Blonsky & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,132—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Duncan Crerar, of the firm of Reynolds, Crerar & Hurdle, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,133—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to Alex G. Robertson, of the firm of Robertson & Baynton, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,134—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to David Mercer, of the firm of Nickerson, Roberts & Hilborn, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Question No. 5,135—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the government to P. L. Adilman, of the firm of Adilman, Sirrs & Watson, or to the firm itself, with respect to fees and disbursements for work rendered for or on behalf of the Farm Credit Corporation of Canada and/or its clients (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, of the amount received, what proportion was (i) a retainer (ii) assessed as a percentage of negotiated loan amounts (iii) a fee for service (iv) for other expenses?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): The Farm Credit Corporation advises that for Questions Nos. 5,039 to 5,135 inclusive the answer is as follows:

Funds payable by Farm Credit Corporation to local solicitors or their firms, with respect to legal fees and disbursements for services rendered for or on behalf of the Corporation, were so made payable in all cases upon the express direction of borrowers out of the proceeds of mortgage loans made to such borrowers by the Corporation in (a) 1980, (b) 1981, (c) 1982 and (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983, in which case the Corporation does not maintain any records of funds so paid and does not segregate any such funds upon payment thereof with respect to the proportion of such funds borrowers may agree to have payable by way of legal fees, disbursements or otherwise.

[*English*]

Mr. Forrestall: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is somewhat of a tradition that has evolved in this Chamber, one that has been adhered to generally by Governments for a long time, and that is the tradition of fairly rapid responses to starred questions. The Chair will be aware, Madam Speaker, that I have now risen in my place on three different occasions to make inquiry as to when in fact the Government will honour that tradition and respond to what is in fact a starred question. The starred question I am referring to is No. 5,038.

On at least three different occasions I have had an indication from the Parliamentary Secretary that he in fact would endeavour to respond to the starred question that I have mentioned. He indicated that he would respond to it with some facility, that type of facility that would tend to preserve the right of a starred question to remain on the Order Paper or to be used as a vehicle by Members to receive what in the Member's judgment is urgent information.

Might I ask through you, Madam Speaker, whether the Parliamentary Secretary would wish me in fact to withdraw my starred question or whether he might take some action today which will recognize the tradition and the utility to Members of Parliament of the practice of starring questions?

Mr. Evans: Madam Speaker, this was brought to my attention some time ago, as the Hon. Member has indicated. As a result of his inquiry, I looked into the question but I have also looked into the precedent surrounding starred questions.

There is no precedent with regard to the speed with which starred questions are answered. The fact that a question is starred simply means that an oral answer will be given in the House to that question. There is no precedent for that question to be given any attention different from any other question that is put on the Order Paper. But I will look into the matter and try to give the Hon. Member an answer as soon as possible.

• (1520)

I wish to point out that there is no precedent given to starred questions with regard to the timing of answers.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, that is absolute rubbish! I have never heard so much rot in all my life. If the Parliamentary Secretary was right, there would be no purpose to starring questions at all. It is for the purpose of seeking oral information at the earliest possible moment. Before he ever came to this place, years ago, before all these traditional changes that have come about, we used to have starred questions answered in 48 hours. Now we are not getting answers for weeks and indeed for months.

Mr. Forrestall: Madam Speaker, of course the written word of our rules and procedures and the advice that we have in written form confirms that. I was addressing my concern to the principles and practices that have been developed in the House over the last 116 years with respect to starred questions.

If the distinguished Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council is in fact indicating that starred questions have no preference whatsoever, perhaps it is something that the appropriate standing committee now concerned with parliamentary reform might consider. It will be a sad and regrettable day should that happen.

If in fact the practice has fallen into disuse, it is, as the Hon. Member for Yukon has indicated, a result of new rules and parliamentary reform that have come into play within the last two or three years and in the last year particularly. That in no way diminishes the validity of the principle behind starred questions, which is the opportunity for Members in this Chamber to receive verbal urgency in a very rapid, short period of time.

Mr. Evans: Madam Speaker, looking at the precedents in the Standing Orders, in Beauchesne, Bourinot and other references, there is no indication that starred questions are to receive different treatment from other questions except for the fact that a starred question requires an oral response in the House of Commons at the time questions on the Order Paper are answered. That is the only precedent I can find.

If the Chair has a different ruling or interpretation of starred questions, I would certainly appreciate the Chair giving me such a ruling. In my inquiries, as I have indicated, I have found that starred questions simply mean that at the time questions on the Order Paper are raised in Routine Proceedings, the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council or the relevant Parliamentary Secretary reads the answer orally. That is all that a starred question means.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I would request the Chair not to rule on this question so that the Parliamentary Secretary might have ample time, instead of sticking his nose and keeping it buried in the clinic of the green book or Beauchesne, to go back into the debates of this place for 25 years and see the remarks that were made with respect to governments of both Conservative and Liberal times when the parliamentary starred question process meant something.

The fact is that this Government, this outfit, has so distorted the traditions of this place that starred questions no longer mean anything. We should go back to the practice that has existed for so many years in the House.

Madam Speaker: I know that it is a very old debate. I have heard it so often that I cannot remember exactly how it was resolved. However, I will look at all the arguments that were put forward and certainly try to clarify the matter for the House.

Mr. Forrestall: Madam Speaker, might I now ask the Parliamentary Secretary when he intends to answer my question on the Order Paper?

Mr. Evans: Madam Speaker, both the one with the star and those without the star will be answered at the earliest possible moment. I will look into all of them.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, now that we have partially solved the matter about the starred questions, I am wondering about questions that are not starred and have been on the Order Paper for more than two and a half years. That is over 30 months.

I asked a question, Question No. 2,329. It was put on the Order Paper on April 2, 1981. It is a simple question which asks who was invited to the banquet at which President Reagan spoke. Surely the Parliamentary Secretary cannot tell me that those lists were not prepared. They had to be prepared before the banquet. Can the Government not find them? I would like to get an answer to this question. If he is trying to hide the fact that he invited some defeated Liberal candidates and did not invite any defeated candidates from other Parties, he is not hiding anything: we know that. But we want to have the names. Surely we can get an answer after 30 months.

Mr. Evans: Madam Speaker, I will certainly try to get an answer for the Hon. Member. However, it seems rather ridiculous because if he already knows the answer, why ask the question?

Mr. Young: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary what the possible delay could be in answering my question No. 5,315 on the Order Paper, which concerns some 40,000 Canadian pensioners. I raised this question with both the Prime Minister and the Minister of National Health and Welfare some weeks ago. The Minister partially responded to that very question on Friday. If she could at least verbally answer that question partially, why can I not have the written response?

Mr. Evans: Madam Speaker, if the Minister has responded partially, I will certainly see if I can urge her to provide both parts in writing.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I mentioned one part of my question. There are other parts to it as well. I would like a full answer to the question.

Furthermore, I learned in my earlier legislative days that you never ask a question if you do not know the answer.

Mr. Dingwall: I would ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*English*]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

WITHDRAWAL OF BILL C-399

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Madam Speaker, I have a Private Member's Bill, Bill C-399, which has been on the Order Paper for some time. I would ask unanimous consent of the House to withdraw that Bill.

Madam Speaker: Does the House give its unanimous consent to withdraw the Bill of the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen)?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Madam Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

CANADIAN AVIATION SAFETY BOARD ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-163, an Act to establish the Canadian Aviation Safety Board and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would bring to the attention of the House Leader of the Official Opposition that all I would like to do at this time is have unanimous consent of the House to move consequential amendments.

After looking at the Bill as proposed by the committee, it had removed the word "general" from Clause 7. We noticed that the same word "general" must therefore be removed from Clause 23 and Clause 12 of the Bill.

I know that the committee itself has not moved the amendments, but I am sure, through unanimous consent, we can move these consequential amendments. This has no bearing whatsoever on the matter of the Bill. We could then proceed with debate and third reading, if we had agreement. I would be prepared to read this motion if you so agree.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, that is perfectly satisfactory with us.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Minister has unanimous consent.

Mr. Axworthy moved:

Motion No. 1

That clause 12 of Bill C-163 be amended

(a) by striking out line 23 on page 6 and substituting the following:

"and causes and recommendations"

(b) by striking out line 32 on page 6 and substituting the following:

"tributing factors and causes and"

Motion No. 2

That subclause 23(1) of Bill C-163 be amended by striking out line 2 on page 14 and substituting the following:

"include in its report recommenda-"

Madam Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motions?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motions agreed to.

• (1530)

Mr. Axworthy moved that the Bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Madam Speaker: When shall the Bill be read the third time? By leave now?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Axworthy moved that the Bill be read the third time and do pass.

He said: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased, as events have turned out, that we have an opportunity today to give final passage to Bill C-163, to establish the Canadian Aviation Safety Board. I recognize that this proposal receives the full endorsement of all Hon. Members of the House, and well it should because it is very important step forward in putting in place good protection for the Canadian travelling public and advancing our ability to pursue safety standards in the country. In so doing, I pay tribute to members of the Standing Committee on Transport from all Parties who worked very diligently to deal with the matter. In fact, they moved it along with a great deal of dispatch and a strong sense of support.

The Bill itself contains several major changes which will ensure that aviation safety is both seen to be and will be a matter of high priority and in which the most adequate and effective form of investigation will take place. The first major principle of the Bill is in fact the establishment of a board to conduct all investigations and inquiries into any aviation occurrence. The importance of that is highlighted in the findings of the Dubin inquiry which pointed out the inconsistency of having the Minister of Transport being responsible for the rules and regulations on safety and for investigating any infraction of those rules. It is like being judge and jury at the same time.

The Bill will set up an independent board that will be able to work in an arm's length fashion from the Department of Transport and therefore be in a position to deal with any aviation accidents in a very open and clear manner without any sense or perception that somehow it is a matter about which the Department of Transport, the Government or someone else is trying not to provide all the facts. The independence itself is a very important matter.

The second major result of the Bill will be to ensure that inquiries and investigations will make public recommendations so that there will be no apprehension on the part of the travelling public or of any other member of society that something is being held back. In fact, the Bill gives the Safety Board the right to hold public inquiries and to request the Governor in Council to set up such inquiries under the Inquiries Act.

I am sure Hon. Members will know that just two weeks ago I established a public inquiry to look into the Gimli air accident where, because of the unusual circumstances surrounding that particular problem, there was a high degree of concern on the part of many people about follow-up disciplinary actions and the questions of culpability and responsibility. Therefore, a public inquiry was called which took an exceptional initiative. We had to clear it through Cabinet and take unusual action. The establishment of this Board will no longer require that to take place. The Board will have the authority to hold public inquiries or to initiate them. In itself that is a major improvement.

While the Board itself will be a three-person board, it will have a full range of experts to call upon to work on its behalf. Therefore, it will be able to offer a very extensive and comprehensive examination, assessment and judgment on any aviation occurrence. I want to make this clear because some questions were asked in committee and also in the Senate prehearings concerning its range, whether in fact it would involve matters dealing with search and rescue questions. Of course it would be in a position to examine aviation-related matters and would cover a widespread concern relating to air incidents.

Under the provisions of the Bill it would be my hope that we will be able to identify clearly the causes of many of the occurrences or incidents and have them reported so that we can prevent accidents. Unfortunately, we are too often in the position of responding after a tragedy occurs.

Also, under the provisions of the Bill the Air Safety Board will be in a position to have a clear monitoring responsibility or reporting responsibility so that if it begins to detect a pattern of problems occurring, it will be able to act before the tragedy occurs and to recommend to Government, to other agencies or airlines the necessity to change a technique, a pattern or a behaviour in order to prevent the occurrence. On that basis we hope the Safety Board will be able to act before the fact rather than after the fact.

Further, this Bill by its very definition deals with matters of aviation safety. That is a clear response to the Dubin inquiry. However, the Government does not intend to stop there. We recognize the necessity of setting up similar kinds of improvements in other modes of transportation. Hon. Members of the House will know that we presently have the Deschênes inquiry in the maritime area. I asked the Commissioner of that inquiry to see whether it might accelerate certain of its findings so that we will perhaps be in a position to take further action in the maritime area on the safety issue, whether it be a matter of melding it into this Board or whether it be a separate board. After discussions with Mr. Deschênes, he agreed to attempt to move his study forward at a faster pace so that perhaps we will be in a position in a few months to bring recommendations forward to the House and therefore to committee for further examination in the maritime area and to provide a full and comprehensive approach to the problems in transportation safety.

I do not think I have to argue this Bill at third reading. Since it is accepted, I will simply reiterate my appreciation for the support given to it by members of the Standing Committee on Transport. I endorse it to the House and to the Senate, so that we can get on with the business of ensuring that Canadians will be safe when they travel.

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is difficult to step into a debate quickly, as we have to do this afternoon, and try to express in a very few moments the feelings of all my colleagues on a Bill as important as Bill C-163.

I want to commence my remarks by making a few references to the *Hansard* of this House over the past few weeks. Something has happened which I frankly find quite distasteful in reference to the Bill. For example, on September 19, the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) said, as reported on page 27247 of *Hansard:*

—there is a bill to establish a new air safety board presently before the Transport committee. If the Opposition were to co-operate we could get that legislation through very quickly and into the House so that we could have a proper mechanism under which public inquiries could be undertaken.

The next statement to which I want to refer is reported on page 27765 of *Hansard* for October 5 where, in answer to a question during Oral Questions put by the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm), the Minister of Transport said:

As soon as the Opposition is prepared to pass it, we will be in a position to bring forward the aviation safety Bill.

Then, on October 20, as reported at page 28193 of *Hansard*, in reply to the Hon. Member for Peterborough in the adjournment debate, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Flis) said:

The Hon. Member might also speak to his leader because such an occurrence would be investigated by the Canadian Aviation Safety Board under Bill C-163. However, we saw in the House the despicable behaviour of the Official Opposition filibustering Bill C-155. Therefore we cannot bring in Bill C-163. We have an all-Party agreement to put it through the House quickly.

All three of those quotations are frankly, and colloquially, a crock.

• (1540)

This Bill was instigated initially by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) when, as Minister of Transport in the Thirtieth Parliament, he asked that the government inquiry deal with matters of safety in the air transportation field. After that report came in, the then Minister of Transport, now Secretary of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin), started the process to bring the Bill before the House.

He, as was his wont, confided with the members of the Standing Committee on Transport in the fall of 1982. While he may have been speaking in confidence at the time, there is no point in not repeating the fact that he told us that the Bill having to do with the Canadian Aviation Safety Board was ready and he was looking forward to an opportunity with his House Leader to get it before the House of Commons. Some months later, earlier this year, after a great deal of negotiation and pleading on our part to have that Bill brought before the House, finally the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) allowed it to be brought before the House on the second or third last day of June. We, as we had promised to do, passed it through the House rapidly. As I recall, we sent it to committee that very afternoon.

Unfortunately, there was a bell vote. The Committee could not finish its deliberations. We were unable to complete the deliberations on that Bill in committee prior to the House shutting down for the summer recess. On very short notice, we had appearing before us the President of the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association as well as the General Manager of that Association, the President and one other member of the Canadian Air Line Pilots Association and the senior executive officer, I do not know whether it was the President, of the Air Transport Association of Canada and others of that type who where willing to give the Committee the benefit of their advice and counsel. They came on very short notice.

I should go on record to point out that the President, if that is his title, of the Air Transport Association of Canada returned, as did the General Manager of COPA to the Committee meetings in the fall. They indeed acted as expert witnesses before the Committee.

The Committee, and certainly this Party, dealt with this Bill in the most expeditious and responsible way that could be expected of any Party. Never at any point have we held this Bill up in any way, shape or form. While I am at it, I might point out that the Transport Committee, as it has in the past, dealt with the Bill in a very non-partisan way. We debated amendments and dealt with the Bill in a manner that would put it through as it should have been a long time ago.

The Bill is a pretty good Bill. It was made better by the amendments made in committee. I want to pay full tribute to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall), who prepared a number of amendments over the summer. He submitted them to the Chairman of the Committee and the Minister and his staff. Some were adopted by the Committee. The Bill was made considerably better by the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East who has sponsored Private Members' Bills over the years and in other ways

attempted to get before the House the principle of a safety board, not only for aviation but for other modes as well.

I am delighted to hear the Minister point out that we are now going to be dealing, to quote him, in an expeditious way with a similar safety board for the other modes of travel. His use of the word "expeditious", given the fact that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East has been asking for this legislation for a decade or better, is a bit of a contradiction in terms. Nonetheless, it is on its way.

As I said, the Bill is not bad. It was made better and could have been made better yet. I will refer only to two further amendments that were put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East, both of which, in the opinion of those Members who sit regularly on the Committee, would have made it better. I stress that because, as happens frequently in committee hearings, a number of Government Members were brought in and asked to vote just as they were told about a subject they knew absolutely nothing about. That is a shame because the two amendments were quite straightforward.

In the Bill there is a requirement that the Board report to the House through a Minister other than the Minister of Transport. Again, my colleague for Dartmouth-Halifax East put in his amendment that the report should come through the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan).

The purpose was very clear and simple. It would seem quite illogical that this most important Board would report through, for example, the Minister responsible for the Status of Women, the Minister responsible for Mines or some other Minister, important though they may be, but who know little if anything about the intricacies of this matter. Therefore, to have this Board report through the chief law officer of the Crown, the Minister of Justice, because it deals with legal matters, seems to be entirely sensible and reasonable. I do not understand why it would be rejected.

Frankly, for a moment I thought about attempting at this late point to ask for unanimous consent to repeat a request of a Member of the House. I think, with his consent, I will not now do so. The Bill is that far along that we will see it through this afternoon. I am sure the Member would agree with me that while the legislation would be better and the results would be better by having his amendment in place, nonetheless we would rather have the Bill pass with this one fault than not have it pass at all. We will not take the chance of not having it passed. The amendment was very simple. I will not read it in detail, line after line.

The amendment was simply that any witness appearing before the Canadian Aviation Safety Board would have the right to the protection of the Canada Evidence Act. It is very simple, half a dozen words, but it has a lot of meaning. A great deal of stress was put on this in the Committee by the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley-Hants (Mr. Nowlan) and others who felt that these few words in the amendment would have given people appearing before the Board a safety factor that they do not now have. It would take time, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to see exactly what will happen. I guess the only thing we can say is that, slightly flawed as it is, we would rather see the legislation go through knowing that a few months down the road we will have an opportunity to act as a Government and, if we see that it is necessary, we can put an amendment in place at that time. At that time, Mr. Speaker, they may well agree to it.

● (1550)

There is little need for further comment on the Bill. The Bill is, as I said, the result of years of effort on the part of the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East. It is the result of the definitive effort of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) as a former Minister of Transport. We have, indeed, taken too much time now to bring that Bill to fruition. I am delighted that we finally have it. I hope that, given the kind of co-operation that we always received in the Standing Committee on Transport, we will have the opportunity soon to implement much of the balance of the Dubin inquiry report.

I cannot resist, Mr. Speaker, putting a plug in here for a document on domestic air carrier policy that was prepared by that same Committee on Transport. This was unanimously approved by a committee that worked hard, day and night, for many weeks. It was submitted to the previous Minister over a year ago. To date we have had no report. We assume that the major appointment to the Canadian Aviation Safety Board will be that of a friend of the Government. We get used to that sort of thing. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is an extremely important post. We trust that when the Government starts looking for a friend to put in this prestigious position it will look very hard and choose one that is competent, because it is a particularly important post. It is needed now and it has been needed for some time.

With that, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our Party I will give our blessing to the legislation now so that it passes this afternoon.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and my colleague for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Ellis) in speaking on third Reading of this Bill.

I know that I am biased and other Members who were members of that Committee might be as well, but over the 15 years and some months that I have been here, and historically, Governments of both the old-line Parties have seen fit to accept amendments from, and take seriously and do something about the recommendations of, the Standing Committee on Transport, which used to be the Standing Committee on Canals, Telegraphs and Railways.

Mr. Speaker, I have noted particularly under the new rules that one of the reasons put forward for the House not sitting beyond six o'clock was that this would allow the committees opportunities to meet in the evenings. I have not checked the record, but my impression is that most committees have not been meeting in the evening. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Transport met evening after evening after

evening all summer, all fall and some of the spring. We did, in fact, function in the evening when the House was not sitting.

On this legislation, as my colleague for Prince Edward-Hasting has said, there was a determination by Members to achieve speeds parliamentary action on instituting legislation for the Canadian Aviation Safety Board. There was no disagreement on the principle of having such an institution. There was disagreement on some particular parts of the Bill; some were resolved by amendments and compromises. I suppose I could also say I am happy to see this Bill going through because crows are part of aviation. I might want to have some aviation safety board hearings on the crows that might get shot down if another Bill passes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Committee, the Hon. Member for Prince Edward-Hastings, the Parliamentary Secretary and the Minister of Transport for accepting my amendment. There are two others they did not accept, but I guess nobody is perfect. The one that they did accept is welcomed, with a great sigh of relief, by the Canadian Air Line Pilots Association, the Air Traffic Controllers Association and the Canadian Association of Pilots and Owners. It was not the objective of the Aviation Safety Board to apportion any blame or liability in connection with aviation occurrences. After meeting with the officials and discussion in the committee we came up with the revised wording. I was assured by the officials and we agreed in the Committee that the wording would meet the objective that I had in mind with my original amendment.

There is much confusion about the words "occurrences, incidents and accidents". An occurrence can be merely that, or an occurrence can be an incident, or an occurrence can be an accident. Concern was expressed by those involved in the aviation industry—again I am thinking of the pilots, the air traffic controllers, the flight attendants, the Pilots and Owners Association, the Canadian Air Transport Association—that the purpose of an aviation safety board is not only to investigate an accident, an occurrence that is an accident, or an occurrence that could lead to an accident. This is where I had some difference of opinion with my colleagues in the Committee and with the Government officials. It is the responsibility in law of the Department of Transport and its air transport committee to investigate occurrences that could lead to an accident or an incident that would be dangerous. It is also its responsibility to look into the efficacy of regulations. My experience has been in another mode of transportation years ago. Certainly what employees in the aircraft industry, the aviation industry, the marine industry and other transportation modes have said is that too often there is a tendency on the part of either a Government or a corporation to do what is called "scapegoating".

There have been three or four incidents and accidents involving Canadian commercial aircraft in the past year or so. I do not want to interfere with grievances that might be going on between the Canadian Air Line Pilots' Association and Air Canada or any other grievance, but all this indicates to me that people are still looking around for someone to blame.

• (1600)

When I worked on the railway, Mr. Speaker, there was a mishap about ten miles away from where I was working and the chief dispatcher sent me over to handle train orders and such things. The section foreman at my place of work who handled about 15 miles of track, in three different years had been awarded the prize for having the best section in the whole 600 or 700 miles of track in the Medicine division. Every spring he would plead and beg and ask for enough new ties, rails, rail anchors, spikes, ballast, weed spray and other things to keep the track in a safe operating condition. Every year his requirements were cut back. Although he had been awarded the prize for the best kept section in the division, when that accident occurred in the snow and rain in April, there were eight carloads of grain in the ditch—two of them contained flax which at that time was worth about $3.50 per bushel—and after it was all over, that poor section foreman received 30 or 40 demerit marks because of a broken rail. That man never missed a day of work. Every time a train went by he followed it and inspected the track. Even on Saturday and Sunday when he was off duty, if there were extra trains, he would follow them. He got demerit marks. Still, he was blamed for not finding the broken rail. It did not matter that every year he had begged and pleaded for new rails, or complained that some of the rails in use had been made in 1905 or 1910.

Quite often the causes of transportation accidents, in this case an aviation accident, can be traced back to those who are in charge and have the final responsibility—the place where the buck stops. The pilot who saves lines while his aircraft is out of fuel deserves a medal; he does not deserve to be taken out of the service.

If the regulations governing training of ground crews and refuelling are not enforced sufficiently and properly, then mistakes will occur somewhere down the line and some poor pilot or some poor kid holding a jet fuel hose on the tarmac will be the victim. I submit that the Aviation Safety Board should follow matters up the line to determine who goofed in not making sure that everyone was fully aware of his responsibility and that he carried out those responsibilities so there is no scapegoating when we have a terrible occurrence, and aviation accident.

I appreciate the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Prince Edward-Hastings about the Canada Evidence Act. The failure of the Government to include that is going to leave the Government open to lawsuits down the road. It seems to me that two things will happen if the protection of the Canada Evidence Act is not available. First, some of the legitimate efforts of the Aviation Safety Board will not be carried out because witnesses who could shed light on the matter will be less than forthcoming, or not forthcoming at all. The Minister should have an amendment made when the Bill goes to the Senate. When it comes back to the House we will deal with it in an hour or two; there is no problem about that. But without the protection of the Canada Evidence Act, if a witness is forthcoming fearful of being blamed and ends up being or found liable even in part, I suspect he will go all the way to the

Supreme Court; not only on account of the Evidence Act, but on account of the Charter of Rights.

The purpose of a Canadian aviation safety board is not only to find out causes, why an accident happened, but to determine the chain of events, without laying any blame or assessing any liability, so that subsequently the courts or the lawyers for the parties concerned can assess matters and arrive at agreement, or the courts will settle the matter. I submit that that should be the limit of the work of an aviation safety board.

There may be incidents, such as near misses involving aircraft separation. This is where there may be some duplication of the legislation. The Department of Transport and the Air Transport Committee could be looking into occurrences and incidents that do not necessarily end in an accident. The whole matter of aircraft separation and ground movement on an airport while air traffic movement is going on is a concern. There was a problem about that recently. In the end, the Ministry of Transport has responsibility, and the legislation requires an investigation of occurrences that are incidents or occurrences that do not result in an accident in order that any deficiencies in the regulations or training, or whatever, are corrected, and corrected promptly.

The difference between the authority of the Department of Transport and the Aviation Safety Board is the difference of time. An aviation safety board may take months or years to arrive at conclusions, whereas investigations of incidents and occurrences—as was set out in the amendment that the Government did not accept in committee—are the responsibility under law of the Department of Transport and the air transport committee of the CTC and can be dealt with much more quickly. They can be very minor things, but they can be dealt with in a matter of days or weeks. The effect could be something like preventive medicine. If an Aviation Safety Board takes upon itself the investigation of an occurrence that did not result in an accident—and it can under the legislation—I submit that will do nothing more than give the Department or the CTC an excuse or may compel them to delay making a decision.

That is the problem with the duplication of effort that will occur as a result of the law as it stands and the provisions of the Bill. I hope that those who administer it and those who serve on the Aviation Safety Board will not be in conflict. I hope they will confine themselves to the area in which they are best qualified to act upon and to report on. If that is accomplished, Mr. Speaker, then we have done some excellent work with this legislation, because of the trauma a whole nation feels when there is an accident, whether or not there are any lives lost. A number of my colleagues and myself attended the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference in New Zealand in 1979 when the DC-10 crashed at the South Pole. That whole country went into trauma. It was widespread around the world, but in that country itself the soul-searching and agonizing has gone on ever since. What did we do wrong? What could we have done to prevent that from happening? A piece of legislation like this, Sir, is important to the whole matter of safety for every nation.

• (1610)

I believe the laws of this nation are very deficient in railway health and safety practices, in highway health and safety practices and in marine health and safety practices. It took years to get survival suits for sailors on vessels sailing in the wintertime in the northern climate of Canada. It was to give these men a chance to survive and perhaps allow them to survive a few hours in cold water, and the years it took to get that done is no credit to this Parliament or this Government, and no credit to those who owned the ships and did not want to do it because it was too expensive.

We must do whatever is required with this legislation and the law as it already deals with transportation. When it comes to health and safety you cannot put price tags on the lives of people, whether it is a customer or an employee. The more we can do as a country to maximize safety and, more important, the prevention of accidents, whether by air or any other mode of transportation, the better we are as a society and the better we do as a Parliament.

I hope that the Minister of Transport will reflect upon the work of the Committee on this legislation and on other pieces of legislation. Perhaps he will allow the Transport Committee to consider Bill C-155 for a few months. He might then find himself with some legislation which will be acceptable to most of those affected by it.

We are prepared to support this legislation. I hope the Minister will ask the Senate to consider the amendment mentioned by the Hon. Member for Prince Edward-Hastings regarding the Canada Evidence Act, so that there will be no delay. The Senate can then return it, we can deal with it in an hour or so, and the Bill will be much improved.

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

* * *

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT, 1983

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-152, an Act respecting the Organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members are aware that there are eight motions on the Notice Paper at report stage of Bill C-152. I have examined these motions and have concluded that Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8 should be grouped for debate. A vote on Motion No. 1 will also dispose of Motions Nos. 2, 3, 7 and 8 as in each case the words "of State" are being inserted. Motions Nos. 4, 5 and 6 will be grouped for debate and voted as follows: (a) the question will be put first on Motion No. 6. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 6 will dispose of Motions Nos. 4 and 5; (b) a negative vote on Motion No. 6 will necessitate the question being put separately

on Motions Nos. 4 and 5. We are grouping at this stage Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3 7 and 8.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West) moved:

Motion No. 1

That Bill C-152 be amended in Clause 4 by striking out line 1 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"4. A Minister of State for International Trade".

Motion No. 2

That Bill C-152 be amended in Clause 5 at page 2 by striking out line 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"5. A Minister of State for External Relations shall"

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-152 be amended in Clause 12 by striking out line 19 at page 4 and substituting the following therefor:

"12. Subject to section 6, the Minister of State for"

Motion No. 7

That Bill C-152 be amended in Schedule 1, Item 21(b), Column II, at page 20 by striking out the words "The Minister for International Trade" and substituting the following therefor:

"The Minister of State for International Trade".

Motion No. 8

That Bill C-152 be amended in Schedule 1, Item 21(b), Column II, at page 20 by striking out the words "The Minister for External Relations" and substituting the following therefor:

"The Minister of State for External Relations".

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is an amendment I would like to have put forward, notice of which has not been given. I would like to ask the Chair to seek the unanimous consent of the House for notice to be waived on this particular amendment, which is as follows:

That Schedule 1 to Bill C-152 be amended by—

Mr. Lambert: On a point of order, please.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has recognized the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council so as to hear what he has to say. We will then deal with the point of order, if there is one.

Mr. Evans: The motion continues as follows:

(a) adding, immediately after item 4 thereof, the following item:

"5. Canagrex Act 1980-81-82-83, c. 152

Paragraph 4(3)(c) is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(c) one from the Department of External Affairs." "

(b) renumbering the subsequent items accordingly.

The intent of this amendment is simply to allow a member of the Department of External Affairs to sit on the board of Canagrex. That is the only intent. I am asking that the Speaker seek the unanimous consent of the House to waive notice and allow this particular amendment to be introduced.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council has asked the unanimous consent of the House to introduce at report stage a further amendment to the Bill. This can be done only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There appears to be unanimous consent.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, I was rising on a point of order as to your groupings, and that has to be done at this point. If the Bill is perused with some care, one will see that the Minister of State for International Trade and the Minister of State for External Relations hold two different offices. The Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan) has a whole section under the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), whereas the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin) is frankly an assistant Minister and is so described in the legislation. He will do those things that are assigned to him by the Minister. Those two are not in the same category, therefore why should they be lumped together in one vote?

● (1620)

Mr. Bosley: Lumped together for debate or for the vote?

Mr. Lambert: Lumped together for debate and for a vote. This is what I find rather extraordinary. Someone has given this matter insufficient consideration, and I humbly submit that Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7 should be together and, as my colleague, the Hon. Member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley), says, Motions Nos. 2 and 8 should be lumped together. There is no way international trade should be confused with external relations. The two offices are quite different.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has made a point of order. The Chair will take the Hon. Member's observations under careful consideration. Meanwhile the House can perhaps proceed on the grouped Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7 provisionally while the Chair re-examines the point the Hon. Member has made.

So we invite at this stage debate on Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7. The Chair reserves the right to make further observations having examined the argument the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) has made. At this stage the Chair invites the Hon. Member for Edmonton West to confine his remarks to Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, this Bill received some discussion in the House and I am the proposer of these amendments, although my colleagues whose specialties are in external relations and international trade and DREE will be carrying the bulk of debate in so far as the organization of Departments are concerned. I will accept the fullest responsibility, if any, with regard to the deletion of Clause 25 of the Bill because that is a different matter.

Let us look at the purport of Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7, which have to do with the title of the Minister for International Trade. Clause 4 of the Bill says a Minister for International Trade shall be appointed. This is a mandatory requirement in the House that we should have a Minister and he shall assist the Minister for External Affairs in carrying out his responsibilities relating to international trade. Therefore, he is a Minister appointed to assist another Minister in carrying out a

portion of what you might call Canada's external relations. That is the trade side. Then the Minister of International Trade has certain responsibilities which may be given to him as they appear in Clause 12 of the Bill at page 4. But here there was an amendment introduced in committee, which met with unanimous consent, that Clause 12 would be subject to Clause 6 because:

A Minister appointed pursuant to section 4 or 5 shall act with the concurrence of the Minister in carrying out his responsibilities and shall make use of the services and facilities of the Department of External Affairs.

This is in effect taking the trade commissioner service and all those aspects of trade out of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and merging them into the Department of External Affairs. There will be an under-secretary of state for external affairs who will be the senior deputy minister. Then there will be the appointment of a person of a deputy minister rank who will be in charge of the administration of international trade. He will have the rank, I suppose, of an associate under-secretary of state for external affairs, to keep the title in the same sort of wording.

Then we have another appointee who is going to be called a Minister for External Relations, and that has to do with those amendments which appear in Motions Nos. 2 and 8. But he has no direct responsibilities except to assist the Secretary of State for External Affairs in discharging those duties which may be assigned to him by the Minister. This is what we have seen in practice. The Minister of State for External Relations is here in Ottawa and he becomes the spokesman for the Government on an international matter, non-trade, in the event the Minister for External Affairs is absent from the country or incapacitated.

In addition, the Minister for External Relations can also be a spokesman for the Minister for International Trade in the event that that individual is absent from the country, incapacitated or unable to speak on behalf of the Government. If the Minister for External Affairs is not able to act, for whatever valid reason, it is the Minister for International Trade who shall be senior in the Department and Acting Minister for External Affairs.

● (1630)

This was explained to the committee in some detail. However, strangely enough, there has been an odd choice of people for the jobs. The man who presently occupies the position of Minister of State for External Relations is the number three man in seniority in the Cabinet. In the absence of his Minister, who happens to be the Deputy Prime Minister and number two man in seniority in the Cabinet, it is the Minister of State for External Relations who speaks over his colleague, the Minister of State for International Trade, who would otherwise have spoken. That is one of those little accidents that occur in the combinations of seniority on the Privy Council list and the so-called seniority of the pecking order of that Department.

This combination has been going on for some time. As a matter of fact, we know that in Canadian posts abroad, the trade commissioner has been under the active direction of the ambassador or head of mission for perhaps 12 years, if my memory serves me correctly. In fact, if one examines the list of heads of missions across the world today, one will see a good number of men and women whose careers began in the service of the trade commissioner. I think that this has proven to be a fair combination. If it had not, there would have been too much emphasis in the Department of External Affairs on what they call the straight or political people.

Another change that has occurred is that the heads of missions have assumed direct control over the representatives of any Department represented in a foreign mission. To that extent, immigration officers, for instance, fall directly under the head of mission. That is why there now exists this stupid anomaly. I say that it is stupid because it creates another layer of bureaucracy in which to lose people and to lose track of files. It creates another bureaucratic strata of immigration people in the Department of External Affairs. I see no reason for that and I have already run into that difficulty when trying to find a file. The people in the Immigration Department jealously guarded that file while I talked to a senior officer over on the—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair hesitates to interrupt the distinguished Hon. Member. The Chair would like to make a ruling.

The Chair has considered the matter the Hon. Member raised previously. Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7 are now being grouped for debate. It is assumed that a vote on Motion No. 1 will dispose of Motion Nos. 3 and 7 at the same time. Motions Nos. 2 and 8 are being grouped subsequently. A vote on Motion No. 2 will dispose of Motion No. 8.

The Hon. Member has been speaking for ten minutes on the first grouping. Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to extend his remarks?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lambert: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was just winding up by showing that this very large empire has been created. To that extent, we are not impressed. I think that experience will show that the wheel can go around and perhaps ten years from now, Hon. Members in the House will be asked to approve the decentralization of this Department, as has happened to many a Department in the past.

I saw the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce being born back in 1964. It is now being buried. It is dying through this Bill. Trade has now disappeared into the Department of External Affairs, and I suppose commerce will now be included in the Department of Industrial Expansion. We do not know where domestic trade will go, but that is another question.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, dealing with the question that was raised by the Hon. Member, with whom I have worked very closely and co-operatively over the years with regard to the

titles of the Ministers, I believe we are dealing with those amendments at this time. I will deal with the reason for the change that has occurred in the titles of Minister of State for International Trade and Minister of State for External Relations.

Although the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan) and the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin) will have identical powers as Minister of State, they will still be Ministers who assist the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen). The purpose of identifying them as such and creating these positions through a new Act rather than through the Ministries and Ministers of State Act is to provide a higher international profile for these Ministers. It is important that they be seen as full Ministers in the international sphere even though they are Ministers of State for purposes of administration within the Government of Canada. That is precisely the purpose for the change.

If the Hon. Member considers the Bill very carefully, he will see that the powers of these two Ministers are restricted to those powers granted to Ministers of State even though they are not called Ministers of State. They will have a higher international profile and a higher profile within the configuration of the Department of External Affairs. That is why the titles were changed. The Hon. Member has asked that question and has proposed to change the titles back to Minister of State. The Government has certainly put these changes forward for a very good reason. We would be reluctant to see those titles revert to the more traditional titles for those Ministers.

Mr. Lambert: May I respond, Mr. Speaker?

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad if the Hon. Member would respond. If I may say so, and I expect the Hon. Member will agree with me, the Parliamentary Secretary has missed the point the Hon. Member was making.

As we in the House have pointed out previously here and in committee, one of the great anomalies in this Bill is that whereas the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan) has a deputy minister under him, the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin) does not. In fact, the administrative chart indicates that the Minister of State for External Relations is hanging in limbo. We will deal with that in more detail when we reach the next two motions.

We understand the reason for this technical change in the title of Minister of State to Minister. There is no question in our minds about that. We also understand why the post of Minister of State for International Trade is a post that shall be created whereas the post of Minister of State for External Relations is a post that may be created. I do not think the Parliamentary Secretary needs to worry about our understanding of these particular amendments as we have spent a very great deal of time on them in committee.

I first addressed the larger problem in the House on June 22 of this year, as reported beginning at page 26,705 of *Hansard*. In the case of the grouping of amendments, the problem is whether or not the Government made a wise decision when it decided to break up the old Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and put the industry part in the new Department of Regional Economic Expansion and put the trade part in External Affairs. As the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) said, we are not too sure where the domestic commerce part will be put, but it will probably be put in the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion. Unfortunately, that is now a fait accompli.

I do believe that the reorganization which has resulted in this Bill was the brainchild of the former Secretary of the Privy Council. The Cabinet simply found it difficult to unravel this incredible creation that he had made. It will probably take the Department years to try to accommodate itself to these reorganizational changes as is quite clear when one examines the most recent chart issued by the Department of External Affairs.

• (1640)

With respect to attempting to combine trade with external relations, it will have two consequences. I simply want to repeat those consequences but not dwell on them today since it is a fait accompli and not much can be done about it. The first consequence of separating industry from trade is that the trade side is deprived of its clientele, so to speak, which is the industrial base in Canada. When the two were together one could examine the export performance of Canadian industries in particular and relate that directly to the trade needs and expectations of the Canadian Government. While trade commissioners were under the authority of External Affairs in their missions abroad, there was a very tight link at home between the people involved with trade and those involved with industry. Some of us fear that this linkage, which is so essential to the development of Canadian export industries, will be lost in this reorganization, and that industry, which is currently under the Department of Regional and Industrial Economic Expansion, will be narrow and inward looking rather than in the broad and outward looking tradition of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Indeed, I can remember when the Department of Industry was first created as a separate Department from Trade and Commerce in approximately 1964. It operated that way for a few years until it was recognized to be more desirable to combine industry with trade and commerce for the very reasons I have given.

Now, as a result of the elaborate ideas of the former Secretary of the Privy Council, they are separated again. In my opinion it is a mistake and will be shown to be so as this unravels.

There is a second reason why some of us are concerned about placing the Minister of State for International Trade essentially within the Department of External Affairs to assist the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen). Rather than being a separate Minister in the Cabinet, we have a fear that trade orientation in the Department of External Affairs could possibly take over from orientation on policy and political matters, which is so crucial in all foreign policy

discussions and decisions. Indeed, the Minister of State for External Relations appeared before the Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates. He was asked before the Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates. He was asked if the message from this departmental reorganization was that our External Affairs would be much more dominated by trade orientation—although I think it will be unsuccessful—to which the Minister said, "Yes, that is the message."

Some of us would have thought that it would have been far better to leave trade and commerce with industry where it was operating quite satisfactorily. There were close links at the mission level in the field with External Affairs. If we wanted to give a particular message in foreign policy terms, it might have been more desirable to have a Minister assisting the Secretary of State for External Affairs in such matters as arms control and disarmament. I suggest that could have been the type of additional policy thrust that could be used and, in my view, should have been used.

These points have been raised before and I have already indicated that there is almost no further point in talking about them because this is a fait accompli. Since the reorganization is under way I can only hope that when it comes time for the Committee to discuss the performance of the new Department we will have more clear charts of the organizational structure so that we can better understand it and have a clearer picture of the process of integration that all of this reorganization is supposed to achieve. While we are skeptical at the moment, we hope that at least within a year there will be something good to say about this particular reorganization, and specifically on these motions in relation to the Minister of State for International Trade.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon)—Garnishee, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act—Delay in proclamation. (b) Source of objections to proclamation; the Hon. Member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling)—Finance—Trust companies' restrictions on renewal of mortgages. (b) Request for legislation to assist home owners. (c) Government position; the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen)—Energy—Radioactive land fill in British Columbia.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT, 1983

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-152, an Act respecting the organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto, (as reported with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, and Motions Nos. 1, 2, 3, 7 and 8 (Mr. Lambert), and Motion (Mr. Evans).

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Mr. Speaker, this is of some interest to members of the Committee and I rise to speak on this Bill because Members who were on the Committee know that this Bill has been the subject of some conversation in Committee. I hesitate to correct the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) but it is important to realize, in understanding this, that the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan) does not have a deputy minister for international trade. There is a deputy minister for international trade who does not report to him but in fact reports to the Secretary of State (Mr. Joyal), as was pointed out a moment ago by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary. I will come back to his remarks because they reflect the nub of this issue.

To bring Members up to date let me say that some time ago the decision was taken to merge international trade with External Affairs. That decision has been taken and the reorganization has taken place. As the Hon. Member who preceded me stated, it is a fait accompli. In fact, when we were dealing with the diagrams with regard to this Bill at the committee, we discovered that the diagrams were out of whack with the Bill. The Government had to amend the Bill to bring it into conformity with the diagrams it was already circulating to its employees. This meant quite clearly that we were dealing with an administrative event after the fact. Let us accept that because we accepted it at committee.

When we were asking the question why we were changing the status of a Minister, it became very clear that there was more to this than the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary suggests. As the Government proposed, there was not to be a department of international trade within the Department of External Affairs, as there could have been, with the Minister at its head. There were some who believed that that was the streaming that made sense in order to preserve the integrity of the trade officers and the trade commissions. However, the Government, in its wisdom, chose not to do that but to make the whole thing report to a three-headed ministerial group, one of whom shall be the senior Minister and two of whom shall be junior Ministers. Quite reasonably, the Government used the Prime Ministerial power of appointment of Ministers of State to say that there shall be two Ministers of State under the Prime Minister's authority, one for international trade and one for external relations.

That is when the problem arose. I should explain that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has the right to appoint, withdraw or change his Ministers of State at any time unless those Ministers of State have status in law as the head of a Department under which the departmental authority is given to them by the House. We had two Ministers of State. The question arose as to whether the position of the Minister of State for International Trade could be abolished? The answer was that it could. Then someone wisely said that we had better come forward and obtain legislative authority to say that there shall be a legislative mandate stipulating that there shall be somebody—and I will come back to this in a minute—for international trade under the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Then we got the Bill indicating that there shall be—not may be—a Minister of International Trade. The proposed amendment suggests that there shall be—and that wording is important because it protects, as was intended, the guarantee that there would be somebody responsible for International Trade—somebody responsible in the Department. The amendment before the House guarantees that because we believe there should be somebody in the Department responsible for international trade. However, the Government went further than that. It did not simply say that there shall be a Minister of State but, rather, it said that there shall be a Minister. The argument made in committee, as was made here a few minutes ago by the Parliamentary Secretary, was that in the world at large there needed to be a Minister as opposed to a Minister of State.

● (1650)

The role of the Minister of State underneath the Minister is generally used in the world. In fact, if we look to our Mother Parliament, we find that the Secretary of State for External Affairs, or the British equivalent, has four Ministers of State under him, all of whom are widely accepted around the world in the export development role, the trade role, the general bilateral role between countries and the expected multilateral discussions, whether they be for foreign affairs, trade or whatever.

Then we return to the question of why Canada was doing it. In other words, why were we being asked to change a Minister of State who had no Department, no authority or no people, into a Minister? There are two answers to that question, which go beyond the question of the international role of developing trade. First, the incumbent of the post of Minister of State for International Trade did not like being called Minister of State; he preferred being called a Minister. It was not an international issue; it was a domestic issue. However, the most important part, after reading the entire Bill, was that under the Salaries Act a Minister of State who does not have a Department, as is the case of the two current Ministers of State, is not eligible for or does not count in the creation of the post called "Parliamentary Secretary". I will deal with the section on Parliamentary Secretaries in a moment, but it is relevant to mention it for the time being. Ministers of the Crown count in the creation of the post called "Parliamentary Secretary". The maximum number of Parliamentary Secretaries which can be created today is equivalent to the number of Ministers of the Crown.

The Bill proposes to say that the maximum number of Parliamentary Secretaries shall be the number of Ministers of the Crown, plus the number of Ministers of State who have Departments to administer. Lo and behold, someone figured out that neither the Minister of State for International Trade nor the Minister of State for External Relations would count in the Parliamentary Secretaries section because neither of them had a Department. In order to create two more Parliamentary Secretaries, the Government proposes to rename the two Ministers of State as Ministers. It does not change one whit, as the Parliamentary Secretary admitted a few moments ago, the status, power, ability or legislative authority of any of the occupants of the positions to call them "Ministers". It changes the capacity of the Government to add two more folks to the roster or the Government's payroll who will be called "Parliamentary Secretaries". Everyone who knows the House of Commons knows that we are desperately running out of Liberals who have not already had the plum. That is the only effect of the change as it is proposed.

I suggest that Hon. Members opposite should read the amendment very carefully because it is designed and written to meet the concerns of the Department and those concerned with international trade. It is reasonable that there should be the word "shall" in the clause on appointment in order to ensure that someone exists who is charged exclusively, if under the Secretary of State for External Affairs, with the responsibility for international trade development. This is absolutely essential to the future of Canada, but it is not important in terms of the administration or the law. It does not make any difference whether that person is called a Minister of State or a Minister.

Hon. Members opposite may or may not choose to rise to debate this point. I ask them to bring forward evidence, because none was presented before the committee, to refute it. We have asked repeatedly those involved in international trade whether the issue was a guarantee that there would be somebody named in the law, somebody who cannot be withdrawn by the Prime Minister, somebody who has been created by an Act of the House of Commons, to work exclusively in international trade, given that trade was being merged into external affairs. The answer has been, "That is what we want. If we cannot have a full trade commission, if we must accept the merger, at least give us someone responsible for trade".

In this amendment we are saying that there shall be a Minister of State for International Trade, but there does not need to be another Parliamentary Secretary and, therefore, there does not need to be a word change from Minister of State to Minister, a Minister who will have no staff or authority, save that delegated in writing and over the signature of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, no Department, no people to administer.

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, I did not take part in the committee hearing, but I have heard what has been said this afternoon. I am amazed, with the television program from Great Britain, "Mr. Minister", having such

wide appeal across Canada, that the Government would suddenly create another Minister for no purpose. Can we imagine a Minister being asked, "What is your Department?", and the Minister saying, "Oh, I do not have one; I am sort of the runaround boy for the Minister". Who will say, "Yes, Minister"? Does the Minister say, "Yes, Minister" to the Minister's Minister? Where do we go?

This is an effort to add to the illusion of having a Cabinet Minister responsible for something when in fact we do not have a Cabinet Minister responsible for anything other than carrying the bags of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. If that is what is intended, why does the Government not organize to have a series of Parliamentary Secretaries to assist the Secretary of State for External Affairs or, at the very most, a Minister of State to assist him? Surely to goodness to create another Minister who has no Department or direct responsibilities just so that he can be called a Minister makes no sense. That is what is being proposed by the Government in Clause 4 of the Bill.

Therefore, the amendment of my colleague makes eminent sense. We cannot go on forever trying to pretend that people are something they are not. The Government is pretending that it has a Minister in charge of international trade. Well, it does not. It has a Minister who is responsible to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It does not have a Minister for International Trade; it has a person who carries the suitcase of the Secretary of State for External Affairs when he goes on a trip. It may be someone the Minister can send on a trip to represent him, but the person is really not a Minister because the person has no direct ministerial responsibilities.

I, for one, feel that the reorganization Bill is wrong. We should have trade commissioners who are responsible to a Minister of trade. Trade matters should be followed up separately and distinctly from matters involving diplomacy, peace, war and the rest. Trade is perhaps one of the most important things we can be doing. Efforts should be made to have a Minister in charge of international trade as well as a Department of international trade. We do not need someone following the Minister of External Affairs around the world, somebody who is not directly responsible. We need someone who is responsible for ensuring that international trade is conducted for the advancement of the affairs of Canada.

● (1700)

This is a hopeless system. We have a Minister, but there is no Department for that Minister. The Minister is to assist the Minister in carrying out his responsiblities relating to international trade. What kind of law is that? If we are going to have a reorganization of the Government, we should rethink the whole Bill. If we want the person in charge of international trade as a Minister, as he should be, surely he should be responsible for international trade and have a Department. He should be the Minister of International Trade.

That is not what is happening here. This person who is to be called Minister is not a Minister, but a batboy. He is somebody who will carry the suitcases. He does not have the right to make a decision, he does not have a Department to direct and he cannot commit the Minister. He is to assist the Minister. He is an assistant or executive secretary.

That is not a Minister, and let us not say it is. Let us call him a Minister of State. There is nothing wrong with having Ministers of State. In fact, this is probably an excellent way of organizing the Cabinet system. Let us not get carried away by calling someone a Minister who is not a Minister.

As the Hon. Member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley) said, the only reason for this is so that the Government can appoint an extra Parliamentary Secretary. Why have a Parliamentary Secretary for a Minister of State? If there is a need for additional help, surely that can be obtained. Perhaps we need more parliamentarians involved on the Government side. We should involve Parliament more often, but it should not be necessary to appoint a Parliamentary Secretary to a Minister who is not responsible for anything other than to carry the bags of the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

All that has happened here is that the current Ministers of State involving external relations and international trade feel a bit slighted by being called Ministers of State. They want to be full Ministers. That is too bad. Is there any reason why we should change the legislation of Canada in order to come to grips with the personal problem of two Ministers who should be Ministers of State because that is the way the organization chart works?

The statute we are now debating is not to be debated because of the personalities of the two Ministers of the Crown. They are Ministers of State. If their obligation is to follow the directions given to them by the Minister of External Affairs, that is their obligation in the Cabinet system. In that sense they are Ministers of State. Let us not call them Ministers, because they are not Ministers. They are batboys or servants, but not Ministers.

In the organization of Government, we must determine what is meant by the designation "Minister" and what is meant by the designation "Minister of State". It has been that the Minister of State is a Minister who assists another Minister, a sub-Minister or assistant Minister, if you like. We have a Minister of State for Finance to assist the Minister of Finance. That is proper. It is perhaps the way it should be organized.

I have some difficulty with this, but if it is the Government's organization pattern, then there should be a Minister for External Relations or External Affairs and Ministers of State as may be required to handle the External Affairs portfolio. Perhaps two or three Ministers of State are required to assist the Secretary of State for External Affairs. After all, the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) is not very competent. We saw how competent he was in the Finance portfolio. Undoubtedly he needs a lot of assistance. He needs a great deal of help. There is certainly no call to have all of his helpers called full Ministers.

On that basis, it is totally wrong to follow through on the Bill in the way it has been presented. I commend to the House amendment No. 1 and the other amendments dealing with this

issue in Clause 3. This is the way a matter of this nature should be handled.

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate on Motion No. 1 in the name of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). The speakers from this side who preceded me have made the points very well. I will enter into the debate from the position of looking at other Departments. If you read the Bill, you will see that it states:

A Minister for International Trade shall be appointed—

The active word is "shall", not "as may be required". It states "shall be appointed". If that was standing by itself without the knowledge that we have of the Department and of the reorganization Bill, it would probably be an acceptable amendment. If the Government wished to create a Minister, it would imply that there would be a ministry. We could all accept that.

However, it goes on to say, "Shall be appointed by commission under the Great Seal to assist the Minister in carrying out". That refers to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. If that is put in context, the amendment that stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Edmonton West turns that around and states, "A Minister of State for International Trade", not a Minister.

Most people in Canada consider that a Ministry includes a Minister. If you look at the reorganization chart for the External Affairs Department, you see a fairly solid line connecting the present Minister of State for International Trade, who under this Bill will become a Minister. If you turn it around and look at the other side of the Department and look at the Ministry of State for External Relations, it is a very thinly dotted line connecting that part of the Department of External Affairs to the External Relations Secretariat as it now exists.

● (1710)

Mr. Speaker, if you would like to draw another conclusion with other Government Departments that we see now, under the Secretary of State there is a Secretary of State for Multiculturalism, and under the Department of the Secretary of State there is a solid hiving off with officials and with responsibilities under the Secretary of State for Multiculturalism. As a matter of fact, that Secretary of State for Multiculturalism, included in the Department of the Secretary of State, has more power than the Minister for International Trade, who will be assisting the Minister of External Affairs in his responsibilities under this Bill. He has more power to act as a Minister, to sign on behalf of his hived-off Department than we see under this amendment. Bill C-152 says that there will be a Minister of International Trade created, but there is no Ministry for that person to become involved in.

I guess you could go two ways; either there is a Secretary of State for International Trade and that is all, or there is a full Ministry. But under the Government reorganization Bill it is neither chick nor fowl. We are half in and half out. There is not the responsibility, there is not in this Bill a full Ministry, yet we are pulling a hoax, we are trying to prevent a Member on the Government side from having that power and being a full Minister.

What would happen if there was conflict? I think, Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that in international affairs there can occasionally be conflict between trade and relations with other countries in the External Affairs Department. If there is some point of recognition by the Government through External Affairs of some action which could jeopardize trade, who would carry the message for the trade side? Would it be, as in the Government reorganization Bill, the Minister for International Trade (Mr. Regan), who really is just an assistant to the Minister of External Affairs, or if it were set up as a separate Ministry, would they argue as equal Ministers or, as it is under our amendment, would it be the secretary of state for international trade who, all in all, would then be recognized purely and simply as being an assistant?

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, we can expect understanding and sympathy from the Canadian public when words really do not mean anything. Either a Minister is a Minister with a full Department or a Minister is a Secretary of State assisting another Minister in a Department. If we are going to be straightforward and factual, as in the amendment put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Edmonton West, the Minister of State shall be called the Minister of State for international trade. There would not be any hoax. There would not be any use of words that misdirect people into thinking that there is a full Ministry behind the Minister for International Trade.

I hope that because the Government would like to represent itself as being straightforward so that there be no misunderstanding about its direction in this reorganization Bill it will accept the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West that the minister of state for international trade shall be appointed. When you say "shall" you are appointing a Minister without the full responsibility which most people in Canada expect from a Minister of the Crown.

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills): Mr. Speaker, I want to add a few observations as well to the amendment put forth by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7 are an attempt by my colleague to bring some common sense to a proposed Government reorganization. Of course we know it is not going to be accepted in spite of the fact that it would be in the best interests of the nation and it makes sense, just practical, on the street common sense. It will never come about because the Government, the Cabinet, has decided it is going to be a certain way and it does not matter what any of the Opposition Members think. The Government will be backed by its Members who will not understand one bit of what this is really about but will stand and rise because the Cabinet made the decision.

We also know that the reason for the decision to call these two gentlemen Ministers rather than Ministers of State is

really simply to flatter their personal egos. Where you were once a Minister to be seen to become a Minister of State is an enormous demotion in your personal status and image. Therefore, the whole operation of the Government of Canada is going to be shifted around so that two individuals can "keep their egos intact".

What a ridiculous way to run a Government. Surely the bottom line should always be what is in the best interest of the nation. I think the evidence is clear from many, many experts in the field that you simply cannot weld all of that world of external affairs where you have to deal with individuals in foreign countries and you have to deal with all sorts of political ideologies. You might, as a matter of external affairs, need to take a position in your country that is quite opposed to a position that you might take in trade. For example, throughout many wars in the past, where nations as a matter of external affairs have been in a state of war, they have continued at a different level to operate in trade. With both of those functions being under the Minister whom we normally call the Secretary of State for External Affairs, he has the total and final responsibility to try to weld these two together. It simply cannot be done. That is why we argue.

My friend, the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) said that if we are going to go into this as a matter of principle we should have a separate Ministry for international trade. There are a lot of arguments to show that should be in place, because we are, as Canadians, a trading nation. We are a small nation with enormous resources. I think that most of our ordinary citizens genuinely do not appreciate the extent to which foreign trade brings wealth to this nation. Perhaps in the West we understand it because so much of our population is engaged in agriculture where the grain is exported directly. I would have thought that in manufacturing, most people working in plants, particularly the automobile industry, would realize that a lot of the automobile parts and cars are exported to the United States. At the grassroot level we do not seem to appreciate the fact that we are a tremendous trading nation and therefore surely that should be the most important of Departments.

What has the Government done? The Government has decided to make International Trade *de facto* a Ministry of State because all the powers and functions of the Minister responsible are the functions of a Ministry of State with no Ministry underneath, no departmental officials. Because of the ego factor we have to call them Mr. Minister so that they can feel important even though they do not have any Department. That is an incredible statement about the conduct of the national affairs of this nation by the Liberal Party and the Cabinet.

Mr. Speaker, this reorganization also shows the incredible departmental battles that go on below the Cabinet level of which most of us as individuals, even though we are elected here and attend committee meetings, have no idea. We had an example of that in the Canagrex battle where it was agricultural officials against IT and C officials. Unfortunately, again in that instance, Industry, Trade and Commerce lost the battle. All their trade officers, who have done an excellent job in international trade, were lost. They lost the battle, and a new Crown corporation, Canagrex, was created which can put officers in the field. We have further emasculated the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and put the trade operation in with the Department of External Affairs. We are going to have an industry in Canada carrying on with no direct links with the trade function and the trade commissioners. At the same time, the Department of Agriculture will be operating on its own. We could have half a dozen officers in Tokyo all from different Departments and acting as agents for the Minister of State for International Trade, and none of them knowing what they are doing. There will be confusion and, as a result, export sales will be lost. I can say without fear of contradiction that within a few years, even months, we will be reorganizing that Department. When it costs us exports, it costs us jobs, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps then, when thousands more people are drawing unemployment insurance, the Government will respond and common sense will prevail.

• (1720)

If we had put this in the hands of half a dozen Members of Parliament and ignored the politics of it we could have found a solution which was far different from this one. The parliamentary task forces have shown that it is possible.

I hope the Government has listened carefully to the Canadian Exporters' Association which made the case, and very forcefully, that policy and trade cannot be mixed. That association is convinced that the officials in the field who should be signing the bottom line, will now spend their time developing papers to be sent back to Ottawa will be taken over by policy end of things. We will have to watch that very carefully but under the present structure, I think it is inevitable.

I would ask my colleagues opposite to consider seriously Motions No. 1, No. 3 and No. 7, and not just follow the Government line. They should do what is right for the nation. It is clearly right for the nation that these people be called Ministers of State: that is what they are, *de facto*. Let us make them *de jure* what they are, *de facto*.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, last week in the House we had an example of an extraordinary situation of stumbling in precedence. The person who is third on the list in the Ministry is the Minister of State (External Relations). A question was put to the Minister of State (External Relations) (Mr. Pepin) which related to an external relations matter, namely the situation in Grenada. Up popped the Minister of State (International Trade) (Mr. Regan) to answer the question. The Minister of State (International Trade), is, at a rough estimate, about number 12 on the list of precedence. The Minister of State (External Relations) was in the House but he did not answer the question. The Minister of State (International Trade) answered the question on external affairs although the appropriate Minister, who is number three on the list of precedence in the Ministry, sat in his place and allowed the Minister of State (International Trade) to answer the question on international affairs.

I do not know whether this Bill is intended to sort out these anomalies and to clarify the situation with respect to precedence. As I understand precedence, it is arrived at by the date on which various members of the Ministry take the oath to become Minister. Therefore, I find it more than a little strange that number 12 on the list should override number three on the list and answer questions relating to a matter to which number three on the list would normally be expected to reply.

I suppose this whole thing boils down to the Bill before us to try to sort out the organizational mess in the Department of External Affairs by creating three Ministers—which is what the Bill seems to suggest is required—in order to run that huge Department. At one time there were something in the order of ten under-secretaries and assistant under-secretaries in that Department. About a week or ten days ago when I checked I found that there are 42 assistant under-secretaries or associate under-secretaries or deputy under-secretaries. Perhaps the creation of Ministers rather than Ministers of State is to give Members of Cabinet sufficient authority to keep track of and control these numerous members of the top echelons of the Department of External Affairs.

I know there has been a movement in the direction of integrating the trade commissioners service in Ottawa with the Department of External Affairs and getting the officers who have served abroad in the trade commissioner service under the same roof as members of the Department of External Affairs when they are at home. The purpose of this is not entirely clear to me. Having served a fair number of years in the Department of External Affairs, it was always my experience that members of the trade commissioner service were well integrated in the operations of the mission abroad. I can cite five, six, seven or eight posts in which I served where that was the fact. The reporting was done directly by the trade commissioner service to the Department of Trade and Industry. Through weekly meetings the other members in the post were made aware of the efforts being made by which the trade commissioner service abroad would find markets for our products.

Now we find that instead of remaining with the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the trade commissioner service officers have been shifted, for administrative purposes in Ottawa, into the Department of External Affairs. We find that in order to look after their affairs in that Department, we need a Minister of State (International Trade) or, as this legislation suggests, a Minister for International Trade. Perhaps the problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the Minister of State (International Trade) is not able to control the trade officers who are under his jurisdiction and, therefore, he has to be a Minister. This triple Ministry—tricephalous is a good word—is a three-headed monster, if I can translate for your edification, Sir. The Department of External Affairs is a three-headed monster. There is no shortage of monsters. A couple of them have been picked and now they want three of them, and they have decided they shall be called "Minister Monsters", and this Bill is intended to create those Ministers.

• (1730)

The amendments which have been proposed by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), is to restore the designations which they ought to have since they are not really in charge of a full Department. They should continue to be called, for example, "Minister of State for International Trade". That eliminates the brackets. At least it does that, Mr. Speaker. I commend the Hon. Member for bringing forward an amendment which would eliminate those brackets, as they appear in the list of Ministries in the Wednesday *Hansard*. The same applies to Motion No. 3, "The Minister of State for", and again Motion No. 7, "the Minister of State for International Trade". There are three Ministers in one Department and it is described in subsequent clauses of the legislation that the "Minister" shall do this, and the "Minister" shall do that. It says in Part I(2):

> The Secretary of State for External Affairs (in this Part referred to as the "Minister")

Now they are introducing two additional Ministers in that section. Perhaps the best way to categorize this legislation is that it is very sloppily drafted. It bears all the marks of an organizational whiz-kid who decides that he wants to reshuffle matters, possibly to the satisfaction of the recipients of those titles, so that they may satisfy their egos that they are indeed Ministers and not just Ministers of State.

I do not know whether one Minister or the other was instrumental in ensuring that this Bill was drafted and brought forward in its present form. However, I believe if we were to look at the table of precedents in the most recent Wednesday's *Hansard*, we would find that there are in fact nine Ministers of State responsible for a variety of different areas of Government; External Relations, the Canadian Wheat Board, International Trade, Economic Development, Science and Technology, Multiculturalism, Fitness and Amateur Sports, Small Business and Tourism, and Finance. Are we going to be faced, Mr. Speaker, in the days to come, with the requirement that all these Ministers of State, some of whom have Departments under their jurisdiction, some of whom have not, will be required to be called, for example, Minister for Fitness and Amateur Sports? The Minister of State for Finance will be in some difficulty because we already have one Minister of Finance, and that, Mr. Speaker, if I may suggest, is quite enough.

I do find it odd that we should today be debating this particular matter. Incidentally, I should add that a little advance notice on this would have helped. I had a number of notes on the reorganization proposals for the Department of External Affairs which I had hoped to be able to use in any discussion in the House on this particular Bill. I find, however, that those notes have somehow or other disappeared with a lot of other papers and have become mislaid. Consequently, I am not able to focus on these amendments to the extent I feel they deserve.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, we cannot have a three-headed Department of Government. I think we are asking for trouble. I think we should decide now to accept the amendments, and I do hope that Members on the other side will

consider the disputes which can arise as to jurisdiction within that Department. At one time, I believe, members of that Department could hold up their heads with pride at the job they were doing. Now, unfortunately, I have to say that altogether too many of them are just waiting for the day of their retirement. They are putting in their time, and that is a dreadful thing to have to say about public servants. They are not putting in that energy, that professionalism for which they have spent many years in training, into that particular Department. They are having to juggle themselves and rearrange themselves and unfortunately, I must admit, jockey for positions within that Department rather than attend to the matters to which they originally, with a great degree of dedication, were prepared to commit themselves to serve Canada both at home and abroad.

In support of my contention that they are having to jockey for position, I would suggest to you that some of the most highly trained, some of those with the greatest of experience, are serving at home because they find that the possibilities of getting along in the Department are much more likely to occur if they are within the range of one or other of these Ministers—it used to be just one. Now they will have to deal with three Ministers to make sure they have jockeyed in the right direction.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do urge upon Hon. Members opposite that they consider most seriously the amendments which have been put forward by my colleague, and that when the time comes to vote on these amendments, they will vote in favour.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to draw something to the attention of Hon. Members and to the Chair. There somehow seems to have arisen in Motions Nos. 7 and 8 some words which, frankly, result in a bit of nonsense. The purport of Motions Nos. 1 and 2 is to create positions, or to insist that there be positions of Ministers of State. Ministers of State are normally paid under Section 5 of the Salaries Act if they have a departmental responsibility. They are known as Ministers of State. If one looks at the amendment sections as proposed by the substitution, one finds the words:

—and substituting the following therefor: "the Minister of State for International Trade".

One sees that one is amending Section 4 of the Salaries Act which deals with Ministers only. In other words, not Minister of State, but "Ministers".

I do not know where this came from, where the gremlin crept in, because the memorandum of amendments which I signed at the Table did not include these two amendments. I do know, however, that there was a phone call to my office which suggested that something had to be done, there had to be something done to Schedule I. Thanks to the vigilance of the Hon. Member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley) who alerted me to the, shall we say, double-whammy of these amendments, and with the consent of the House I would amend my Motions Nos. 7 and 8. Motion No. 7 would be amended in line 4 by stopping after the word "Trade", period. There is no substitution. Motion No. 8 has not yet been called but I propose to do the same thing after the word "Relations".

• (1740)

Therefore, I move:

That Motion No. 7 be amended by deleting in line 4 thereof all the words after "Trade".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member seeks the unanimous consent of the House to amend his Motion No. 7 such as to leave in the words "the Minister for International Trade"—

Mr. Lambert: And strike out everything else.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): —and strike out everything else. I apologize to the Hon. Member but could he indicate to the Chair again what he wants to do with Motion No. 8?

Mr. Lambert: Strike out everything after the word "Relations". But only when Motion No. 8 is called.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): As the Hon. Member indicates, we are not yet at Motion No. 8.

The Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) seeks to amend his own motion such that the words following "The Minister for International Trade" would be struck out. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair is, of course, seeking other Members who may wish to enter the debate on Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7. Otherwise I will put the question.

Mr. Lambert: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I should indicate that it was Madam Speaker or the Deputy Speaker who ruled that Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7 would be grouped for debate and a vote on Motion No. 1 will also dispose of Motion No. 3. In that event I will put the question on Motions Nos.—

Mr. Lambert: Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It is not so indicated here. Therefore, I will put the question on Motion No. 1, and in due course that may or may not dispose of Motions Nos. 3 and 7. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motions?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I declare the motions lost on division.

Motions Nos. 1, 3 and 7 negatived on division.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In accordance with the ruling it would appear that the motions for debate at this point will be Motions Nos. 2 and 8. They are grouped for debate and a vote on Motion No. 2 will dispose of Motion No. 8. The Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, this deals with with position of the Minister for External Relations. In committee an amendment was introduced by the Government where, in Clause 9(2) the deputy minister shall be known as the deputy minister for political affairs. I do not know how many more types of affairs we are going to have but we have a Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), a Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin), and his deputy minister for political affairs. I know I am facing up to the Government in its monolithic thinking where the Cabinet has said that this is going to be and the voices line up behind it. We have had the explanation for the creation of a Minister for International Trade. That takes the Trade out of Industry, Trade and Commerce and of course the Industry part is going over to a Minister of Industrial Development, and Commerce just dies. Except that, initially, the Commerce part dealt with business in Canada, but somewhere along the line no continuing emphasis has been maintained in that connection.

As I explained on Motion No. 1 which dealt with international trade, we have in this particular instance a Minister whose duties could quite conceivably be discharged by an efficient Parliamentary Secretary, in fact, a second Parliamentary Secretary if the Minister is so over-loaded due to the indolent nature of the Minister. We know he is not the most active and energetic of men, a man who rather than face up to an issue will duck out and not appear. This we have seen time and time again when he was the Minister of Finance and in other capacities. I have known him for 20 years as a Minister and frankly that has been one of the characteristics of his administration. So I do not see the necessity for having these Ministers, and quite clearly, as the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans) said, these appointees are being given a title so that in the foreign pecking order they shall rank in title as full Ministers.

Then we have the Minister for External Relations. Well, if you did not know the difference, you might think he was the Secretary of State for External Affairs. But on the international level there is that ultimate pecking order and that is what we are being asked to look after in this particular amendment. In addition to which we are raising his title to that of a Minister under Section 4 of the Salaries Act so that he may be paid not only his salary as Minister but he shall be entitled to a Parliamentary Secretary. You see, Section 5 of the Salaries Act, Mr. Speaker, covers Ministers of State. Ministers of State who do not have as a specific assignment a section of a Department are not entitled to a Parliamentary Secretary. For example, the Minister of State who is responsible for financial institutions is not entitled to a Parliamentary Secretary. This particular appointee is being classified as a Minister for External Affairs so that he may have a Parliamentary Secretary. This Bill could become popularly known as the financial emancipation of the Liberal backbenchers Bill because it creates a maximum of five more Parliamentary Secretaries.

• (1750)

Section 25 of the Bill will allow for some Parliamentary Secretaries to be named in the other place because, apparently, somebody must be able to reply there beyond the two or three Ministers who are there already, none of whom have any departmental responsibilities. I suppose therefore that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) would like to have a nominee Parliamentary Secretary in the other place. Perhaps the Minister of State for External Affairs might like one as well.

I know that there will be two or possibly three Parliamentary Secretaries created by this particular Bill. I would like to reserve my argument on that, Mr. Speaker, until we get to the appropriate section. That is the only reason for the provisions of this Bill. They are purely cosmetic and will not improve the operations of the Department one jot or tittle. The Department of External Affairs will not be improved one iota by reason of the possible appointment of a Minister who will be called a Minister for External Relations.

Under the Ministries and Ministers of State Act there is already the power to appoint a Minister of State. This new Act allows for the appointment of a Minister for External Relations. He will be present in full cutaway coat and striped trousers if need be. That along with the creation of more Parliamentary Secretaries is the purpose of this Bill. Of course, the creation of more Parliamentary Secretaries is within the discretion of the patronage of the Liberal backbench. In the maximum of two years that it takes to rotate the Liberal backbench, somebody somewhere will have been able to collect something during that time.

There are presently 35 Ministers. There were 36 Ministers until one appointment went off like a damp squid. There are 27 Parliamentary Secretaries. There is now the potential for another five Parliamentary Secretaries. So the score in the football game will become that much closer. It will only be 35 to 32.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, if I could see something in these provisions which would improve the Department of External Affairs, I would agree with them. However, there is already a Minister of State, and my amendment proposes that

he shall exist. That could have been done under the Ministries and Ministers of State Act. The responsibilities of the Minister would have been the same. There would have been no changes, but because of the title that is to be given to this Minister, he may parade on the square in full dress uniform and will become entitled to a Parliamentary Secretary.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)): Before I recognize the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett), I would like to remind the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) that there was no seconder for the motion which was put before us. It would be helpful to the Table if we could have a seconder.

I recognize the Hon. Member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) as seconding the motion.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. May I at this moment bring forward the remarks I made with regard to Motion No. 8 which require amendment? I do not think I have to repeat the words, but the amendment, with the unanimous consent of the House, is to delete all of the words after the word "Relations" in line 4 of Motion No. 8 which is standing in my name.

I therefore move:

That Motion No. 8 be amended by deleting in line 4 thereof all the words after "Relations".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The House has heard the Hon. Member for Edmonton West and it has heard the amendment he has proposed with respect to Motion No. 8, which was identical to that which he proposed for Motion No. 7. That amendment is that after the words "Minister for External Relations," all other words in his own amendment be struck out. Dealing with the seconder to the amendment, I thank the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro). It was moved by Mr. Lambert and seconded by Mr. McKinnon (Victoria) as I have indicated to the House. It requires unanimous consent, and I presume that the House is prepared to give that consent.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): May I indicate that with respect to Motion No. 7 we simply lack a procedural formality and that is that there was not at that time a seconder for the motion. I would ask the House if it is acceptable that the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich be the seconder on that motion.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, while we are tidying up the motions of the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), I wonder if I could draw to his attention the fact that he has made what I am sure is an inadvertent mistake in Motion No. 2. He has said, in relation to line 2 of Clause 5 of Bill C-152, that the following should be substituted therefor: "A Minister of State for External Relations shall." Of course, I am sure that the wording that he intended was: "A Minister of State for External Relations may."

It is almost six o'clock, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I may continue my remarks tomorrow and perhaps I may remind the Hon. Member for Edmonton West that Clause 4 which reads "shall" was deliberately made to read "shall"; i.e., it was mandatory that there be a Minister of State for International Trade. Clause 5 reads "may" because the Minister for External Relations may or may not be appointed. A great many of us were confused by this and it was explained to us in committee. As a matter of fact, I very much hope that Conservative Members are not saying that a Minister of State for External Relations must be appointed. We do not think there should be any such Minister at all, but if the Hon. Member inserts the word "shall" as he does now, then it will become obligatory to appoint a Minister of State for External Relations. I do not think that is what the Hon. Member intended. May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): No, I would prefer it if the Hon. Member did not call it six o'clock for a moment. So that debate may continue in an orderly way tomorrow, I would call upon the Hon. Member for Edmonton West so that we can clear up the matter and move on at six o'clock.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that the answer to that question is that if the word was not present, the hon. lady would not be talking about this amendment and could not put forward her argument about not appointing the Minister.

Miss Jewett: I think the Hon. Member has missed my point.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In that case, I think the two Hon. Members can confer on this matter tomorrow.

● (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

GARNISHEE, ATTACHMENT AND PENSION DIVERSION ACT—DELAY IN PROCLAMATION. (B) SOURCE OF OBJECTIONS TO PROCLAMATION

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1983, I asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) a question concerning a delay in proclaiming Bill C-38. I now rise to participate in this adjournment debate because I find myself shocked and distressed at the treatment Bill C-38 has received since it was passed by the House on June 18, 1982. It is a year and a half since this House passed the Bill and it has not yet been proclaimed in all parts.

The Minister said in his answer, and quite truthfully, that the handling of this Bill was a "spectacle which might be considered rather unedifying for the people of the country." I am not certain that many people in the country are aware of this Bill. It mainly affects single parent families whom I do not expect have much time to watch the procedures of this House and look for this legislation. I would assume that the Minister responsible for the status of women is totally unaware of the effect the delay in proclaiming this Bill has on a very large group of women.

Part I of the Bill was proclaimed and is not part of my objection. Parts II, III and IV have not yet been proclaimed and consequently are not in effect after 17 months.

Let me read the title of the Bill so that Members will understand what I am talking about. Bill C-38 is:

An Act to provide for the garnishment or attachment of Her Majesty in right of Canada and for the diversion of pension benefits payable by Her Majesty in right of Canada under certain enactments.

The final paragraph of the Bill deals with proclamation. Clause 56 states:

(1) Part I shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

(2) Parts II, III and IV shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

I am particularly concerned that Part II, which deals with diversion of pension benefits to satisfy financial support orders, has not been proclaimed 17 months after it passed.

In general terms, Part II provides for the diversion of pensions to provide enforcement of financial support orders against pension benefits payable pursuant to the Superannuation Acts and like enactments referred to in the Schedule.

After waiting several months for Parliament's will to be done, I began to ask questions regarding this Bill. I believe I questioned the former Minister of National Defence on this matter at five or six consecutive meetings of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. It became apparent that a stall was being imposed on Parliament by its own bureaucracy.

In response to one of my inquiries, I received a copy of a memorandum sent to the Minister of Justice on June 20, 1983, which said:

Part II dealing with pension diversion is to be proclaimed at some point in the future. No time has been set for proclamation because of the need to iron out technical problems relating to the pensions of MPs and Senators.

That was signed by a departmental assistant in the Department of Justice. In all my inquiries about this Bill and its proclamation, I have never found a Senator or MP who questioned this Bill. In fact, they were quite unanimous in support of the Bill when it was before Parliament.

Another example of the attitude taken of Parliament by the bureaucracy in the case of this Bill is contained in a letter which the Minister of National Defence sent to me in reply to a question as to why a court order diverting 50 per cent of an annuity had been paid at a fixed dollar amount instead of rising with the indexation of the pension. The Minister of National Defence stated:

The legal advisors are of the opinion that 'Armed Forces pension income' refers to the CFSA annuity only and does not apply to any increase payable under the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act.

● (1805)

Part II of Bill C-38, which has not been proclaimed, indicates at page 9 that "pension benefit" in subparagraph (*g*) "includes any benefit payable under the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act or the Public Service Pension Adjustment Act in respect of that pension, annual allowance or annuity." In other words, it means that indexation will be applied to the payments made to the families.

The case before the courts which the Minister mentioned concerns only Part I of the Bill which has been proclaimed, garnishment of wages. I cannot see any reason a court action concerning garnishment should be used as an excuse for continuing delays in proclaiming Parts II, III and IV which deal with diversion of pensions to satisfy court orders for family support. It is quite different than garnishment of wages.

Members of Parliament knew what they were doing when they passed this Bill divesting themselves of an archaic financial self-protection device which was neither suitable nor equitable in this day and age. The Senators and the Crown agree, and what we have been faced with is a monumental affront to Parliament in this continuing war between democracy and bureaucracy.

Mr. Al MacBain (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, on September 16, 1983, when the Hon. Member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon) questioned the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) in the House about the delay in proclaiming Parts II to IV of the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act, litigation was proceeding in a local Small Claims Court. At that time the Minister indicated that perhaps further legislative clarification as to whether or not Members and employees of Parliament were affected by that legislation might be required. On October 12, his Honour Judge Tierney of the Seventh Small Claims Court of the Judicial District of Ottawa-Carleton ruled that the salaries paid to employees of the House of Commons may be garnisheed under the Act.

The decision on whether or not to honour the decision of the Court or to pursue an appeal is in the hands of Madam Speaker and the employee in question. I would simply note at this point that the Minister indicated that should legislative action be deemed necessary, he would be consulting with the House Leader and Opposition critics.

When Parliament passed Bill C-38, of course it fully intended that Members and the staff of Parliament should be subject to the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act. All of us want to ensure that this intention is carried out. If legislative action is required, I am certain the House will act quickly and expeditiously.

FINANCE—TRUST COMPANIES' RESTRICTIONS ON RENEWAL OF MORTGAGES. (B) REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION TO ASSIST HOME OWNERS. (C) GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington): Mr. Speaker, on October 14, as reported at pages 28027 and 28028 of *Hansard,* I asked questions of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) regarding the Interest Act and the fact that some trust companies and others were including a clause in their mortgage renewal loan agreements which required applicants for mortgage loans to waive their rights under Section 10 of the Interest Act.

I should like to quote from a current mortgage document. It reads:

> You expressly waive any right of prepayment you now have or hereinafter may have pursuant to Section 10 of the Interest Act (Canada) and/or any similar federal or provincial legislation permitting prepayment prior to the maturity date of the loan agreement.

The Government of Canada, in its wisdom, caused to be passed an Act entitled the Interest Act. That Act gives a right to a mortgagor who wants to prepay a mortgage. The Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba have passed similar legislation which gives rights of prepayment to a mortgagor. The essence of Section 10 is that one may prepay a mortgage which has a five-year or longer term upon the payment of three months of interest penalty.

It now appears that a federally-chartered trust company can write into a contract a clause which strips the rights given a home owner or mortgagor under legislation passed by the Parliament of Canada and the provincial legislatures of Ontario and Manitoba. I say that this is wrong. No corporation or other organization should be allowed to take from a citizen of Canada a statutory right passed by the Parliament of Canada and the legislatures of the Provinces and Territories.

● (1810)

Further, there was an action before the Supreme Court of British Columbia that dealt with the five-year period set down in Section 10 of the Interest Act. An insurance company claimed that the mortgage date for determining the five-year period set forth in Section 10 was the date of the Mortgage Renewal Agreement. By that strange logic you would never be able to exercise your rights under Section 10. By juggling the renewal date, they could arrange it so that the five-year anniversary date would never occur.

The B.C. Supreme Court ruled that the effective date of the mortgage for purposes of calculating the five-year period was not the renewal date, but rather the date the original mortgage document was signed.

To counter the ruling of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, some trust companies are adding a sentence that reads "The original mortgage is deemed to be dated as of the maturity date of the existing loan". This sets aside the ruling of the Supreme Court of British Columbia. There was no challenge to the ruling of the court. No appeal was launched. They merely added 17 words to a mortgage renewal document that sets aside the ruling of the court.

Where is this leading us? Is the Government and Parliament going to allow a handful of trust companies to write into their contracts provisions that take from one party in the contract a right of prepayment set forth in federal and provincial statutes? Is this what Canada is all about? Are trust companies above the law? Can they, by adding a clause to a mortgage contract, set aside the decision of the Parliament of Canada and the legislatures of the Provinces of Canada as expressed in statutes passed by those bodies?

Any commercial or private contract, mortgage, or other instrument that, through its languages, expressly removes a right given to one party in a contract by federal or provincial statute should be prohibited by law.

It is no defence to say the matter would be defeated in a court of law. That view only compounds the seriousness of the actions of some trust companies. It smacks of manipulation of the law, for it says that if you, the mortgagor, have the time and the money, you can pursue a decision through the court and thus exercise your right under the Interest Act. Otherwise, you are bound by the terms of the contract even though they may be declared void by an action in a court of law.

We are not dealing here with a corporation with resources. We are dealing with a home owner who has a mortgage, the interest rate of which has been increased, putting financial stress on the home owner. You may wish to argue that the financial condition of the plaintiff is of no concern to the court. Whatever your argument, it should not be lawful for a corporation or anyone to cause one party to a contract to be stripped of his or her rights in that contract.

There are those who would have you believe that a contract is a contract and the matter ends there. In fact, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola) has said as much; at the same time expressing her concern for the mortgagor.

Again, this is no defence for the trust company. We have written proof that the waiving of rights under Section 10 of the Interest Act was not discussed with prospective mortgagors. The addition of an interest differential charge was not discussed during the mortgage negotiations. In other words, most of the mortgage negotiations between some of the trust companies and the home owner seeking a mortgage were less than truthful.

We did have The Trust Companies Association before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. They were able to respond to a question on this subject, but the Chairman of the committee ruled that we must pursue other matters as The Trust Companies Association was before the committee on another subject.

We must continue to ask questions and take part in these debates and bring this matter to the attention of Parliament. Sometimes I wonder if anyone is listening out there, if anyone really gives a darn or if this matter will be frustrated along until, through the passage of time, the mortgages will run to term and the trust companies involved will have been successful in the largest rip-off in our history.

Adjournment Debate

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling) certainly shares with me and the Government considerable concern on this particular issue. I personally welcome the inquiries he has made and the initiative he has taken on this, and the opportunity he has given us to discuss government action and future courses of action.

I was with the Hon. Member on the Finance Committee when we deliberately raised this with the trust companies. I think he heard, as I did, that this is really a balancing act that we are trying to get across. On the one hand, as he pointed out very articulately, we have a problem with potential fraud or at least misleading innocent home owners. On the other hand we do not want to solve those specific cases by ruining the whole mortgage market. The Hon. Member knows that full well.

● (1815)

What has the Government done in this regard? First of all, I would remind him of the ongoing operation of the Canada Mortgage Renewal Plan. I personally helped one of my own constituents to get a $3,000 grant under this scheme to lower the impact of the mortgage payments on their family income. That grant still stands. It is a good safety valve for individual home owners.

Second, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola) indicated that she has the director of investigations and research checking, under the Combines Investigation Act, whether some kind of criminal or misleading behaviour has taken place.

Third, the Government has made it clear that it wants to review the Canada Interest Act to strengthen its provisions in order to avoid these kinds of misleading operations in the future.

Finally, we must remind all Canadians that they are signing a contract; that they are binding themselves.

I understand that there were about 750,000 people who took out high interest rate mortgages during the real crisis period of 1981 and 1982. Of those, we estimate that approximately 80 per cent or 600,000 took short-term mortgages, and that those people are seeing their problem solved now because mortgage rates have dropped so dramatically.

As for the other people, the vast majority knew what they were doing. They wanted the security of a four or five-year mortgage and they undertook that deliberately. The balance are people whose cases we have to investigate without destroying the whole mortgage market, but without allowing improper or misleading practices to continue I join the Hon. Member for Burlington in his concern about this issue.

ENERGY—RADIOACTIVE LAND FILL IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, on September 23 I rose in the House to ask a question of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien) regarding a land swindle that took place in Surrey in 1975. A constituent of mine innocently bought some valuable commercial property for his business only to find out later that the land fill on that property was material brought in from outside British Columbia which contained low level radioactive thorium, with the result that everyone in the surrounding area, and certainly the employees of the company working there, are very concerned about the exposure they face from that low level radiation. It may be that there is no immediate health danger, buit it may be that there is.

I have been working on this problem since 1978. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I have a letter dated September 2, 1978, from the former Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, one Mr. Alastair Gillespie of "coalgate" fame.

An Hon. Member: Cheap shot.

Mr. Friesen: He states, in the last paragraph of his letter: "I have asked the AECB to give priority consideration to the resolution of this matter in the interest of the concerns of the Surrey community". That was in 1978. If that is the speed with which this Government operates it is no wonder the country is in the mess it is in. At the time I did not know the interrelationship of that particular swindle.

A former Member of Parliament of the Liberal Government, one Mark Smerchanski from southern Manitoba, owned a company called Fundy Chemical. He represented southern Manitoba from 1968 to 1972, but was defeated in the 1972 election. Knowing what he was doing, he foisted that polluted land onto an innocent customer. As soon as the customer found out what he had bought he took Mr. Smerchanski to court. At the beginning of the court proceedings Mr. Smerchanski had $250,000 in a Fundy Chemical account, but by the time proceedings were finished the account was bone dry with the result that the company received nothing and is still waiting. Even though the customer won an $800,000 settlement, he has received nothing from Mr. Smerchanski.

● (1820)

I ask the Government whether it understands the kind of financial implication this has for a company? Does it realize that all the financial structure of a company like this is based on the value of its property? If that property is worth $800,000, or $1 million, according to the court's settlement, and he takes the value of that property to the bank as collateral for a loan and the bank realizes the land is virtually valueless because it is contaminated, how much would the bank give him? The whole financial structure of the company is raped because this one man violated a sense of trust with a customer.

Is the Government taking all these years to deal with the problem because it has a cozy relationship with Mr. Smerchanski and does not want to contaminate that relationship? Is the government slow in acting because it does not know what to do with the material or because it does not care? Is the Government pursuing options in British Columbia as a result of the possibility of a new site for this kind of material being found in the general area of Ashcroft. Does the Minister realize what this has done to the financial picture of this

company? Does he realize at all what it means to a company like this in terms of its financial future?

I ask the Parliamentary Secretary if we can expect an immediate resolution of this problem so that the employees working on the site can expect to work in safety. Will the Government underwrite soil removal on that land fill site so that employees are not in danger? For example, would the Government get different property for this company so that it does not have to bear the cost of having semi valueless property? Will it remove all that material to a site that will contain radioactivity, and thereby remove any threat to the health of the people of British Columbia, and particularly of Surrey? What kind of financial support will the Government underwrite for a constituent who has been violated by a former member of the Government and needs some kind of recourse to restore the health of his company?

● (1825)

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have always had a good deal of respect for the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen), but I must say I am a little disappointed that the case he advocates today is so full of innuendo.

It should be noted that the involvement of a former Liberal MP in this case has not in any way influenced the actions of this Government. I would remind Hon. Members that the low level radioactive waste at Surrey B.C. is the result of the importation and processing of a metallurgical ore in 1972. The resulting 350 tonnes of slag was on the Anvil Way property of Fundy Chemicals when it was bought by Comor Supplies in 1975. The import licence for the ore material included a requirement to obtain AECB approval before disposal.

The new owner was informed of the radioactive content of the slag by an AECB inspector in 1976 and has since successfully prosecuted the former owner for fraud. The latest judgment, which was for $642,000 from the B.C. Supreme Court in August 1982, was based on the cost of cleanup and removal of the wastes from the Anvil Way site. The new proprietor has also introduced a court action against the AECB and the B.C. Ministry of the Environment which, if successful, would require that a site be found for the waste. The federal Government is now actively co-operating with the B.C. Government in trying to resolve this problem once and for all.

However, the Hon. Member asked if the Government of Canada was doing anything or was concerned about low level radioactive waste. I wish to inform him that a Low Level Radioactive Waste Management Office under AECL has been set in motion and that office, Mr. Speaker, has two main objectives. The first is to undertake those studies and actions necessary to resolve historic waste problems which are the responsibility of the federal Government. Historic wastes are those which have been managed in a manner no longer considered satisfactory and for which the original producer cannot reasonably be held responsible. The historic wastes consist mainly of soil contaminated with radium and uranium and were formerly the responsibility of the Federal-Provincial Task Force on Radioactivity. The second objective is to establish or arrange for the establishment of a waste management collection and disposal service which can be used by appropriate producers and users of radio isotopes on a fee for service basis.

I am pleased to say that since the formation of this office considerable progress has been made with the co-operation of the provincial governments. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the coming months and, indeed, the coming years, this matter will be resolved, not only to the satisfaction of the residents of the Hon. Member's constituency, but also to the satisfaction of Members of Parliament.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It being 6.30 p.m., and in view of the honoured presence of the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker), the House now stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

At 6.30 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 25, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT (NO. 3)

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council) moved that Bill C-169, an Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (No. 3), be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain very briefly the tenor of this legislation, which, as agreed, will be passed at all stages within the next few minutes.

This bill introduces several amendments to one of the most important parts of the Canada Elections Act, namely, the provisions concerning election expenses. These changes have received the unanimous support of all parties represented in the House of Commons, and embody the recommendations of the Chief Electoral Officer and the political parties as formulated after the general elections of 1979 and 1980.

This legislation should be seen as both updating a number of rules and revising others. It would, however, be useful to point out four major changes. First, there will be indexation of maximum election expenses for parties and candidates. Second, there will be a new formula for reimbursing candidates' expenses. Third, there will also be a new formula for reimbursing expenses of political parties, and finally, election expenses may no longer be incurred by third parties.

The first change is therefore to index maximum election expenses for parties and candidates. The present maximum was set in 1974 and has not been adjusted since, despite a constant increase in election costs, so that now the maximum is much too low. This situation has to be corrected if all candidates are to be able to conduct a normal election campaign. The adjustment formula is based on annual indexation according to the consumer price index, going back to 1981, one year after the last general election. With this formula, it will no longer be necessary to amend the Canada Elections Act from time to time to adjust maximum expenses. Candidates and parties will now be able to spend about 30 per cent more during the next federal election than they could in 1979 and 1980.

The second change brings a new formula for reimbursing expenses of candidates. At the present time, reimbursement is based on postage costs for mailings to voters.

Because of the constant rise in postal rates since 1974, candidates in densely populated ridings would have been entitled to reimbursements equal to or in excess of the present maximum. This would have put candidates in sparsely populated ridings at a distinct disadvantage and would also have been a contradiction of the intent of the Act which is to encourage candidates to raise funds from their supporters.

Under the formula being proposed today, reimbursements to eligible candidates will be not more than 50 per cent of allowable expenses.

The third change introduces a new formula for reimbursing expenses of political parties. At the present time, 50 per cent of the broadcasting time purchased by political parties during an election campaign is reimbursed, which encourages parties to concentrate election expenses on advertising in the electronic media. Under the formula being proposed today, the parties, provided they meet certain criteria, will be reimbursed for 22.5 per cent of their election expenses, whatever these may be. This change was made in response to representations by the printed media regarding a formula they considered discriminatory.

Finally, the fourth change concerns the elimination of election expenses incurred by third parties. The intent of the present legislation is to equalize the chances of all candidates in all parties, by setting reasonable limits on election expenses and by guaranteeing reimbursement of a considerable part of those expenses. This basic principle of equality is unfortunately ignored at times by groups or individuals, other than political parties or candidates, that make substantial election expenditures during an election campaign without going through a candidate or party. There is no record of these expenditures, which gives some candidates or parties an undue advantage. Under the Bill before the House today, all election expenses shall be made solely by the parties and the candidates who are running.

Finally, the Bill provides that a broadcasting arbitrator, rather than the CRTC, will decide on the apportioning of broadcasting time to the parties concerned.

If I may summarize, Mr. Speaker, these are amendments that became absolutely necessary as a result of what happened

during the last two general elections. They reflect the intent of the Election Expenses Act of 1974, now part of the Canada Elections Act, which is to provide a legal framework in which all candidates and parties are given a fair chance during elections.

● (1110)

[*English*]

Mr. Chuck Cook (North Vancouver-Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to the amendments to the Canada Elections Act, which I believe to be one of the most fair in the world. In two elections a millionaire candidate ran against me and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, without the Canada Elections Act I doubt very much whether I would be here today. The Act limits the spending of candidates so that the poor man has as equal an opportunity to convince his riding that he should be sent to Parliament as the wealthy man.

In the past, of course, many elections were bought. If one candidate could spend $150,000, $200,000 or $300,000 on an election and another candidate could only spend $20,000 to inform the riding of the issues, the wealthy chap was more likely to get his message through. Those days are gone due to the Canada Elections Act; the amount of money that an individual candidate is allowed to spend now means that politics is not just a rich man's game.

We are all familiar with the abuses in elections in the past. This Bill covers most of them and the changes will contribute to an improved Act. We are all familiar too with the five-dollar voter who was common in other jurisdictions, with the excesses of New York's Tammany Hall over the years and those great elections in Chicago in the twenties when practically every resident of every cemetery in the city voted in the civic elections! The interesting thing about that was that, generally speaking, they voted twice in two different districts.

● (1115)

Of course, there has been the long, long struggle in terms of universal suffrage and ensuring that half of humankind—women—got the vote on an equal basis with men.

These amendments to the Canada Elections Act have been discussed, gone over and looked at in meetings I have attended for at least a couple of years now. All parties were involved in open discussion. There is no advantage to any individual party in these amendments, but there is an advantage in terms of every Parliamentarian and everyone who might wish to be a Parliamentarian.

I will give an example of exactly how this process works by referring to an amendment which went through earlier this year. All parties, represented by officials of the individual parties, had discussions with the Chief Electoral Officer. It was decided that there should be some change made in the length of time that an election ran. The discussions went on far into the night on many occasions. Quite frankly, coming from an urban riding, I was highly in favour of what some of the Provinces had done, that is, cut an election period back to 28 days or 30 days, something of that nature.

However, it became quite evident in these discussions, and particularly when the amendments got to the Privileges and Elections Committee, that there were many ridings where this would be totally unfair. In my Province of British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, we have ridings which are 500 miles long. It takes more than a full day to drive from one end of the riding to the other. There are other ridings, of course, much more compact in city centres. We found this distance to be a problem, not only in British Columbia but in Alberta, and I am sure some of the Quebec and Northern Ontario ridings also required more than that minimum time just to get around the riding.

For example, a riding up the coast of British Columbia right now wishes to hold its nominating meeting. It takes a minimum of five days—more likely eight days—to hold a nominating meeting. That is because meetings have to be held in five centres of population within that riding. That may sound a little strange to urban Members; however, when one travels to what we call "up country" in British Columbia, it is a totally different ball game. Therefore, there was a compromise involved. Certainly the period was shortened. It is now 50 to 55 days for an election, which is not really satisfactory to the urban people, but more than fair to those with these large country ridings. It was done in a sense of co-operation. It was agreed to by all parties in order to do what was best.

That is the way the process worked with these amendments. What are these amendments? There are a number of small housekeeping amendments which I do not believe need to be mentioned here, Mr. Speaker. However, there are some important amendments. There are seven major amendments. The major amendments will increase party and candidate expenses, and candidate expenses in geographically large ridings; stabilize party and candidate reimbursements; eliminate special interest advertising during the campaign; and clarify broadcasting provisions for the election period.

The calculation of fractions, I believe, is the first amendment which should be commented on. Bill C-169 proposes to link party and candidate election expenses to increases in the Consumer Price Index. The fraction calculated by the Chief Electoral Officer, using 1981 as the base year, is 110.8/88.9. That works out to about a 27 per cent increase. This fraction, when multiplied by existing party and candidate spending formulae, will provide spending ceilings for the individual candidate. This fraction is valid only until March 31, 1984 and at April 1, 1984 a new fraction, reflecting Statistics Canada's average index for 1983—which is published in January of 1984—will be calculated and published in *The Canada Gazette*. It looks very much like spending limits will increase by approximately 32 per cent to 33 per cent over the last election.

● (1120)

Although that sounds like a deal, it is only fair. If you look at the 1979 and 1980 elections, Mr. Speaker, and compare the

costs of printing, advertising, stationery and telephones at that time with, hopefully, the spring of 1984 when we should have an election in this country, then you can see it is only fair and reflects inflation.

The established formula for calculating a Party's spending limits remains. It is determined by multiplying 30 cents by the number of names appearing on a preliminary list of electors in those districts where a Party has endorsed a candidate. This amendment would also link increases in Parties' spending limits to increases in the CPI, again something that all parties in this House can agree upon as it is fair to everyone.

On the limitation of expenses for candidates, the established formula for calculating a candidate's spending remains. It is determined by multiplying each of the first 15,000 names on the preliminary list of an electoral district by one dollar, plus 50 cents for each name in excess of 15,000 but less than 25,000, plus 25 cents for each name in excess of 25,000. Actually, when you talk about that dollar in terms of the next election, it is likely to be about $1.32 in spending. Again it is linked to the CPI.

There is one change here, and again I mention the large ridings, some of which we have in British Columbia, ridings which are 500 miles long and very widespread. The extra costs encountered in large electoral districts for postage as opposed to hand delivery, the long distance telephone calls, the travel costs of persons other than the candidate and the cost of extra campaign offices are not considered in the present formula. However, to be fair to these large rural areas of Canada, in electoral districts where there are less than ten electors per square kilometre, candidates will be permitted to spend an additional 15 cents per square kilometre, to a maximum increase of 25 per cent of his spending limits over those in urban ridings with less costs involved.

The major provision in this Bill is in regard to candidate reimbursement. The amendment would prevent candidate reimbursement from exceeding 50 per cent of electoral expense. This may and will mean densely populated urban ridings. The new formula will provide an immediate pay-out, upon return of the writ, of 15 per cent providing the candidate has received 15 per cent of the votes cast. Candidates spending in excess of 30 per cent of their limits will receive a subsequent reimbursement equal to 50 per cent of their actual election expenses, less that initial 15 per cent. The existing formula for candidate reimbursement is linked to the cost of mailing a first-class letter. The increase in postal rates from 17 cents to 32 cents in 1983 precipitated this amendment to save the taxpayers of Canada money.

As to Party reimbursement and other things, Parties spending 10 per cent of their limits will be reimbursed 22.5 per cent of their actual expenses. It will no longer be tied solely to the cost of broadcasting but will apply to all election expenses, which means the broadcasters lose some slight advantage, the print media perhaps gains a slight advantage. In many regions of the country it is the local weekly newspaper which may perhaps be the most important election medium that can be used.

There is I suppose only one controversial amendment. I say it is controversial because I think it will undoubtedly end up being tested in the courts. This amendment would eliminate third party or special interest group advertising during the election period unless the third party had the express consent of a party or candidate for such advertising. In that case, the party or candidate would have to include the cost of that advertising as an election expense. As well, if the third party ceases to be a special interest group by registering as a political party and nominating candidates in at least 50 electoral districts, it could advertise.

● (1125)

This amendment is more severe than is realized and is more severe than the proposals discussed at the ad hoc meetings with the Chief Electoral Officer, but we agreed to it on the basis that it will be much easier to police. However, I suspect that any number of groups in the country may wish to challenge that provision as it strikes me as somewhat of an interference with the rights of an individual to lobby on behalf of a political party or candidate.

I shall turn now to the broadcasting provisions. It used to be that the CRTC decided on the broadcasting time of six and a half hours. Apportioning broadcasting time will now be done by a broadcasting arbitrator. Those are the chief provisions for which I propose changes. The changes are all useful and are all helpful.

I would like to take a few moments to show Hon. Members in the House and others who may be interested in the electoral process how these proposals will actually affect one riding and the cost involved in one riding. As an example, in my own riding of North Vancouver-Burnaby the existing formula provides for one dollar for the first 15,000 and so on, to a total of $27,544 that could be spent in an election under the present rules. With the indexing of the spending limits, that figure will rise to $34,319 so there will be a realistic raise in terms of inflation.

Under the existing formula for the reimbursement of that riding, if we were to use a 32-cent postal rate as we have now, that would mean that the riding would receive back $21,500. If we were to use the existing formula which provides for a 17-cent postal rate, the riding might receive back $13,000. Now, compare that $21,000 with the proposed formula, which will hopefully become law shortly. This would mean that the riding would get $17,000 back, not $21,000, a direct savings to the Canadian treasury of over $4,000. I do not think those figures are out of line for many other urban ridings as well.

There is far to go yet but these amendments to the Elections Act are another step on that road. After this Bill is enacted, elections in Canada will be a little more fair. Perfection is difficult to achieve, but I believe that this Act is another step toward a perfect Elections Act. I endorse the changes on behalf of our Party, Mr. Speaker. We are delighted to see this legislation go through because it is fair to all concerned.

Canada Elections Act

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to rise on behalf of the New Democratic Party to give our endorsement to the proposed changes within the Canada Elections Act. Bill C-169, the Bill which introduces these changes, is one step or more in the right direction.

• (1130)

The goal sought by our Party is that we not only have the political and stated right to run in elections, but also the economic means for all Canadians to run in elections. Not long ago the majority of people in the House of Commons were professionals such as lawyers, doctors and businessmen who could afford to run in campaigns. It was not long ago when individuals would spend 10 to 20 times as much as others on a campaign within a riding. It was not long ago when we heard of people spending up to $90,000 on an election campaign to seek election to the House of Commons.

The changes that came about in the mid-1970s and the changes that are proposed in the legislation before us today are really steps toward what we can call economic political democracy. There are many who still find it difficult to be elected to the House of Commons, as is evident by the fact that there are very few women and native people in the House of Commons. It is important that limitations on expenditures remain realistic, for if those reasonable limitations are removed the situation will return in which people will almost buy their way into the House of Commons.

Therefore we see these changes as steps in the right direction. However, we do have some concerns about this legislation. For instance, we are concerned that other changes suggested by the Chief Electoral Officer will not be passed prior to the federal election.

There are other changes that our Party feels should be included in the legislation. For example, the Hon. Member from the Conservative Party spoke earlier of the need to allow more expenditures in large geographic ridings. As the Member for Churchill, I represent a riding which comprises two-thirds of the Province of Manitoba and contains 160,000 square miles within its boundaries. Yet people who run in ridings such as mine are not allowed extra expenses to take into account the fact that we have more than one campaign office during an election. As well, long distance telephone charges are one of the largest items in our election budget. Nor are we allowed to claim as an exemption the travel expenses of those other than the candidate during the campaign.

It must be recognized that we are not asking to have unlimited expenses for these items but that those limitations should recognize that some expenses are incurred solely because of the large geographic ridings. Those expenses should be above the other expenditure limitations. As I said, these include telephone costs, travel expenses for those other than the candidate and extra campaign offices. The guidelines should allow for extra amounts to be set aside over and above the present limitations.

We believe other changes should be made in the future. My colleague from Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) has often risen in the House to talk about the need to increase the ability of absentee voters during an election campaign. Examples of these people include miners and woodworkers who may live in one constituency but work in other constituencies or remote areas. They find it difficult to exercise their franchise under the present rules and we believe new amendments should be introduced to take this into account. We have the assurance of the Government House Leader that he would speak with the Chief Electoral Officer about this issue. We believe this improvement is necessary.

Another amendment I personally would like to see is the provision of extra child care expenses within a candidate's expenses. I believe one of the problems women face in running for election is the fact that they quite often, rightly or wrongly, bear the main responsibility for child rearing in this society. This makes it difficult to run for election. While some expenses for child care are allowed under personal exemptions, I think a separate exemption should be given serious study in the next changes to the Canada Election Act in an effort to achieve real equality.

There are two other items I would like to raise at this time. The first is that according to the new formula 22.5 per cent of the costs of the federal Party are covered by the Government of Canada. That is a step in the right direction since it is not just money allocated for broadcast advertising but considers the total expenses of a party of which 22.5 per cent will be paid by the taxpayers of Canada.

While that is a legitimate step, I am still concerned that the majority of money spent by policital parties during a campaign will come from outside sources. This means that the banks in Canada, large steel corporations and others will pay the majority of the costs of a campaign. Therefore only those parties which appeal to that small segment of Canadian society will receive their funds. I suggest that this is an infringement on economic democracy.

It is interesting to note that American corporations have not been allowed to give direct funding to parties for many years and I believe an amendment such as that should be studied in this country in an attempt to enhance economic democracy.

I hear the fringe right of the House talking about unions. Unions do give money but I think that is legitimate because there are limitations simply because unions are not rich. They do not give the same amount of money as banks such as the Bank of Montreal. But if that is a concern we are willing to consider limitations on all outside parties. We recognize that corporations, especially banks which are committed to a high interest rate policy, should not give $50,000 and another $50,000 to the Liberal and Conservative Parties. Improvements are needed in this area so that corporations as well as unions have some limitation on the amount they can give to political parties during election campaigns.

The other matter I would like to speak on today is that of third party advertising and third party advocacy during a campaign. I share the concerns of the Conservative Party that

this may be an area which would be hard to enforce under the Charter of Rights. It does in some way impinge upon the rights of individuals or organizations to represent their opinions during an election campaign. I submit that all Members recognize that some of the most partisan, vicious and one-sided advertising takes place during election campaigns on behalf of so-called third parties. I believe it is incumbent upon the House not to follow the American example where all sorts of groups spend enormous amounts of money during an election campaign to emphasize a single issue while not always being bound by the truth, fairness or honesty. They are simply pushing a very emotional issue to the extent that it clouds the real political issues of a campaign. Therefore I look forward to the Chief Electoral Officer attempting to control and regulate advertising by third parties.

Just as the parallel campaign of the labour movement counts against the actual expenses of the NDP during an election, I believe if third party groups are advertising or working on behalf of a candidate or party, the expenses they incur must be part of the limitations of the party or individual they are supporting during a campaign.

In closing, a number of changes must take place in the Act in the future and I look forward to a new set of amendments being produced in the House. I am especially concerned there are not prosecutions for contravention of the Act at the present time. If we are going to have an Act seriously supported by political parties, by candidates and by official agents in the campaign, then they must feel that the Government of Canada, and the Chief Electoral Officer, are going to prosecute those who openly and blatantly break the provisions of the Act.

● (1140)

With that, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot to do but these amendments and this Bill are a step in the right direction and we will support them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Before putting the question, the Chair should explain that when I put the motion earlier it was understood the Bill would be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. It is the Chair's understanding that there is agreement among the Parties to refer the Bill instead to the Committee of the Whole House. Therefore, if there is consent, I will now put the question in that spirit.

Mr. Pinard moves:

That Bill C-169, an Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (No. 3), be now read a second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to a Committee of the Whole.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

[*English*]

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT (NO. 2)

AMENDMENT TO INCREASE SUBSCRIPTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister of State (Finance)) moved that Bill C-168, an Act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (No. 2), be read the second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to a Committee of the Whole.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill before us has the purpose of amending the Bretton Woods Agreements in a way which will increase members' quotas in the International Monetary Fund. Before addressing that specific question, I wanted to say a word about the circumstances in which the need for such an increase in the members' quotas has come about.

In the post-World War II world, members may recall the deep concern about the adequacy of the international monetary sytem in light of the chaos created first by worldwide depression and second by the severe disruptions of the Second World War. The International Monetary Fund was one of three post-World War institutions created to provide order and flexibility in the trading system upon which the prosperity of the world would depend. The IMF was created to lend stability to the global monetary and financial system. Paralleling the creation of the fund was the creation of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to provide long-term financing to member states in need of such support. Third, of course, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was instituted to bring a more liberal trading system to the post-war world.

The specific task of the international monetary system was to provide exchange rate stability and a greater degree of monetary co-operation among member states. From its inception in the immediate post-war years through to the 1970s, that was the paramount role of the International Monetary Fund and it played that role with outstanding success.

In the mid-1970s, however, the growth in world trade and the entry of substantial new players in the world trading picture required a new system of international monetary arrangements. I speak of the introduction of floating exchange rates by a number of countries which replaced the immediate post-war practice of fixed exchanges. The International Monetary Fund adopted, in the face of that growing need among member countries for greater flexibility, a recommendation of its main policy advisory committee to allow the fund to adapt to the practice of floating exchange rates. I might note that the chairman of that principal policy advisory committee which brought about that major change in the practices of the fund was the then Canadian Minister of Finance, John Turner. More recently, the IMF's efforts have been directed to maintaining financial stability of both developed and developing countries.

In the last decade a major change has occurred in the world trading scene and the world monetary scene. I speak of the impact in principle of the oil price increases, the sudden and in some cases devastating impact of price increases by the oil

producing countries. All of us are conscious of those price increases here at home in Canada and indeed in the industrialized world generally. Nowhere was that impact felt more severely than in the oil importing developing countries.

● (1150)

Equally, at the time when the large oil price increases were implemented, a worldwide recession was felt which, of course, produced a slump in world trade. The demand for the products of many developing countries fell off sharply, contributing to their already difficult balance of payment problems. Creditworthiness of such nations deteriorated sharply. The result was that the International Monetary Fund had a new challenge to confront, a new challenge to overcome.

A number of developing countries, including some of the largest debtor countries of the last decade certainly, have encountered severe liquidity problems and have sought renegotiation of their debt obligation. I need not remind the House of the problems that face a number of developing countries, particularly in Latin America, concerning their very large debt burdens which they attempted to finance against the background of much higher import costs, particularly for oil, and a sharp decline in their export earnings.

I am happy to note that the international debt situation is easing now, particularly as a result of falling interest rates around the world. The repayment schedules for the debt that has been incurred is easing. Of course, the improvement in terms of trade of a number of developing countries has also contributed to an improvement in their liquidity position. The expected increase in the net volume of exports of the developing countries in 1983 and 1984 should contribute to the further facilitation of their debt repayments. Nevertheless, a number of developing countries still face an acute debt service problem.

We in Canada have joined with a number of other countries in encouraging those debtor nations to seek International Monetary Fund assistance in easing their repayment problems. The IMF has responded to this difficult situation in two major ways. The first has been that it has contributed, as it has on many occasions in the past, to the financing of temporary balance of payment difficulties of the member countries affected. It has also brought together, and in this the Fund has played an imaginative and constructive role, the major creditors to renegotiate the debt agreements and to reschedule the debt repayment. Equally important, it has developed with the debtor countries the program of adjustment which has allowed them not only to meet their debt obligations, but to provide some degree of financing at home for their development commitments.

The provision of temporary financing by the International Monetary Fund, which is one of the elements of the broader subject we are discussing today, enables countries to make the necessary adjustment to their economic situation without resorting to many of the disruptive tactics which marked the world of the 1930s and, indeed, has characterized the activities of some nations which are not members of the IMF or have not been able to meet the IMF requirements. I speak, of course, of trading and capital restrictions that were imposed in such a way as to disrupt the channels of trade. We have seen countries engaged in aggressive exchange rate policies which equally disrupted world trade or imposed at home unduly restrictive domestic measures which have burdened the people of the country with policies that have curtailed their own growth and development. All those practices and others have been avoided by the role of the International Monetary Fund in creating a situation where such practices are unnecessary and where major disruptions to our international trading system are quite unnecessary.

Hon. Members will wish to recall that the International Monetary Fund does not itself engage in long-term financing. That is a role for the World Bank and for the regional development banks under the United Nations umbrella. The IMF does provide for a flexibility in our trade and global financial situation which is unique and which is available to those countries with balance of payment difficulties. That essential role of the Fund will be enhanced by the increase in the subscriptions or quotas which are provided for in the Bill in the case of Canada and provided for in the resolution of the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund last spring.

The increase in quotas is reviewed every five years. This is the eighth review by the IMF members of their quotas. It has resulted in a proposal of an increase in the overall quotas of members of some 47 per cent. The legislation before us today provides for Canada's increased quota within that total goal set by the Board of Governors of the International Monetary Fund.

May I just take a moment of the time of the House to engage in some numbers which may seem rather arcane, but it is worthwhile to spend a moment looking at what this Bill means for Canada.

Canada's quota subscription will increase from two million SDR, special drawing rights, or approximately $1.2 billion Canadian, to 2.9 million special drawing rights or approximately $3.8 billion. That is Canada's share of the total equity increase from the special drawing rights of $61 billion to $90 billion, which as I suggested a moment ago was approved last spring by the Fund's Board of Governors.

Before any Member concludes that Canada is undertaking a very substantial transfer of funds amounting to something over $2 billion to the International Monetary Fund, I would reassure that Member that the actual Canadian dollar cash payment as a result of this legislation will amount to about $3 million only. The remainder of the increase in the Canadian quota is paid in special drawing rights or in Canadian Government non-interest bearing demand notes. Therefore, the increase in our equity will maintain our relative share of IMF quotas. It will ensure Canada's continued right to elect an executive director and have a seat on the committees of the Fund.

I am sure Members will understand that that increase in quotas also has the effect of increasing the resources available

to Canada in the case of need. If at some stage we have to draw upon the resources of the IMF, our eligibility for future allocations of special drawing rights is increased by the measure before us today.

There is in a broader sense a benefit for Canada in moving forward with this legislation today in that it reaffirms Canada's support for international co-operation in maintaining an open trade and payment system so necessary to combat the protectionist tendencies which we have noted in the trading world, protectionism that can be a real brake on economic recovery as not only Canada but the world generally emerges from recession.

● (1200)

The flexibility that is afforded to the IMF by the larger quotas will contribute to confidence in the capacity of the international financial system to cope with current strains arising from global recession. I am sure that Hon. Members will want to support the work of the Fund by adopting this legislation so that it can continue to monitor and to ease the international debt problems which are hampering the development of the poorer nations.

The language of the legislation is somewhat arid, but it masks a real need and suffering on the part of many people in the developing world. The International Monetary Fund has an essential role in providing for gradual increases in the standards of living for many developing countries. The language of the Bill, as I say, may seem sterile, but behind that language resides the problems of a large number of developing countries in great financial difficulty, partly as a result of global recession. I do not doubt that Hon. Members will wish to support enthusiastically the role of the International Monetary Fund in contributing to the alleviation of those problems.

I am sure that we all recognize the need to sustain the global monetary system to promote the financial health of its member states through the medium of the Fund. I know that Hon. Members on all sides of the House will wish to join in supporting the decision to increase our contribution to the resources of the International Monetary Fund so as to contribute in that way. I quote from the Articles of Agreement of the Fund:

> To promote international monetary co-operation through a permanent institution which provides the machinery for consultation and collaboration on international monetary problems.

The Bill before us today helps to do just that. I would urge all Members of the House actively to support the work of the International Monetary Fund as well as the World Bank and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, as essential elements in global economic recovery, particularly the development of the poorer nations.

Mr. Heap: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, are questions permitted at this time?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Under the provisional Standing Orders normally no, but by unanimous consent, if the Minister wishes to accept a question, I suppose it could be done. Is it agreed?

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, I thank Hon. Members for permission and I will be brief. The Minister in explaining the purpose of the IMF and the World Bank, to which we are asked to give more money, outlined its general goals and work. In that connection I would like the Minister to comment on the recent disparities which arose in two cases. When consideration was given to lending money to South Africa, which is invading its neighbouring country Namibia, contrary to United Nations declarations, this was not considered by the United States to be a reason for refusing the loan to South Africa. When consideration was given to Vietnam taking a loan, at a time when it was invading its neighbouring state, Kampuchea, that was considered grounds for refusing a loan. Would the Minister comment on the principles of the Fund as relating to those two contrasting examples?

Mr. MacLaren: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take the time of others who may wish to speak during second reading of this Bill. We shall shortly go into Committee of the Whole when we could address any questions briefly, given the limitations we are working under today.

It is not, of course, for me to speak to the queston which the Hon. Member raises about the policy of another country, but I am glad to state for him the policies of this Government and indeed of Canada since the creation of the International Monetary Fund. In essence we believe that the Fund provides an essential service to its member states. It is of an apolitical nature, of a technical character if you wish, and which should not raise questions relating to the political coloration of member states.

I think that the Hon. Member opposite will recognize that different members of the International Monetary Fund will have different opinions about other members. If political considerations became a dominant element in deciding upon the functioning and activities of the Fund, a paralysis would soon set in that could only be of real detriment to the member states and particularly to the developing countries who are members of the IMF.

The Articles of Agreement of the Fund underline what I have described as the technical nature of its activities. I would only add that in supporting those Articles we recognize that it is impossible for the Fund to discriminate among members for political or other reasons.

Finally, there are ample channels, ample fora, available for the debate of political questions which exist outside the IMF.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be able to get up and support the Government on something occasionally. This is a Bill in which we wish to support the Government. There are a number of reasons but the first essential reason is that the people of Canada depend for their livelihood very, very extensively on international or foreign trade. I have not had a chance to get all the statistics together but I think around 28 per cent or 30 per cent of our

GNP comes from our foreign trade. Seventy per cent of that is with the United States, but in addition to the United States, of course, we have trade with the other countries of the world. Unless we have an international financial regime that enables the countries with whom we trade to pay us for the goods and services we sell them, we will be having no international trade whatsoever, or very little. Every person in this country will suffer if the world financial system no longer permits the 160 or 170 countries of the world to trade among one another knowing that they are going to be paid eventually for the goods and services they have sold.

It is of absolute first priority for us to support the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. To do that, as a western industrial nation and one of the wealthier nations of the world, we have to show our support for the International Monetary Fund. Never has its work been of such importance and never has it been in such a sensitive position as it is today. We are all familiar with the fact that there is almost a crisis in the international financial system. There are a number of countries that have huge debts. There are debtor nations that owe creditor nations of the world huge amounts of money. We are familiar with the situation in Argentina, Chile and Brazil and there are a number of other countries that have a great foreign debt at the present time. Because of the economic conditions that have affected the world for the last two or three years, they are not in a position to meet their obligations in this debt load that hangs over the world.

● (1210)

It is my opinion that there are at least two important conditions that affect whether we are going to have much economic recovery in the next few years. The first is the situation with respect to real interest rates. The second is the deficit position of the various Governments, including the United States and Canadian Governments. That has a tendency to keep interest rates high because of people's perspectives and their fears of the future. The third thing would be the status of the huge debt burden which is principally held by Third World countries and whether they can have an economic recovery that will enable them to meet the financial obligations they entered into in the last ten years.

The IMF is of first importance in determining whether they will be able to whether the storm. A functioning IMF with ample credit of its own to assist them is essential. It has to be in a position to offer financial relief if they meet its conditions. One of the great conundrums at the present time is whether these countries are prepared to meet the IMF conditions. Unless the Fund has that facility it cannot set any conditions for the economic rejuvenation of the countries involved. Argentina is the example at the moment and it is a question whether it can meet the conditions set for it. Brazil is another example. Canada has to do its share in providing the international financial facilities that are needed.

I did not hear all of the Minister's introductory remarks because I was engaged in other business. However, I believe that the last increase in the IMF quota was agreed to in 1978 and took effect in 1980 and that the current increase we are now considering was agreed to in April of 1982 and is to take effect on November 30, 1983. It is needed because of the debt crisis that I mentioned that affects so many Third World countries, South American countries in particular.

I was on a parliamentary visit to South America a year ago last August. At that time the effects of the recession had struck all those countries which are in a desperate state. In many of them the whole export revenue is required to meet the interest on the foreign debt. They depend on the IMF to keep going and to be able to overcome their problems.

As I understand it, there are 30 contributory countries that have now finished the legal process that is necessary to increase their contribution to the IMF; the United Kingdom is one of these. We are all familiar with the fact that President Reagan in the United States is dealing with Congress now so that the U.S. can meet the increase in its credit. It is a very controversial topic in the United States. I think that passage of this legislation and the Government's contribution may help in the argument that is now going on in the United States.

Our governor on the IMF is Mr. Bob Joyce. He is a very able civil servant and was Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance in 1979-80, when I was Minister. He is our representative on the Board of Governors and is doing a first-class job.

The amount we are being asked to contribute increases our quota from $2.7 billion Canadian to $3.9 billion Canadian, a 45 per cent increase. The average quota increase for all IMF members is 47 per cent.

For these reasons we are prepared to support the Bill. As a matter of fact we have agreed to co-operate in passing it in one day because of the importance of Canada meeting its obligations in this area.

A Member of the NDP brought up a question with respect to the criteria for loans by the IMF and other international agencies. I agree with the Minister's response. I think it would be an extremely retrograde step if we were to accept the principle that international agencies like the IMF, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank or any other agency, were to make loans based on political considerations or arguments about human rights or whether a country violates human rights. If those kinds of considerations are to be involved in decisions about whether loans are made or not, the result will be chaos in the international financial system. If the criterion is whether we approve of some other government and all its actions, that will cause a great deal of uncertainty in international lending. That would not be to our advantage or to the advantage of anyone else. It would only add to the chaos and repression in the countries involved.

I believe that loans made by the IMF, the World Bank and its agencies should be made on the basis of whether the loans are likely to be repaid, whether the economic and financial conditions set down by the IMF have been accepted and whether the country asking for the loan is prepared to put its economic house in order.

Those are the considerations that should be in the minds of the governors of the IMF, not whether they agree with the domestic policies of government in the field of human rights, civil rights, agriculture or any other area. If we are to make these kinds of value judgments, I do not know where it will end. Of the 160 or 170 countries in the world today, we know that the civil and human rights records of most of them leave a lot to be desired. It is not our job to be policemen for the world; our responsibility in this area is to ensure we have an international system that works so that we as a trading nation can trade with other nations. We must be in the position to know that we will be paid eventually and that they will be too. We need stability in the world's financial system. To allow these other considerations to enter into it would cause chaos, and I am opposed to the suggestion that this should become a feature. It would not help those people if that kind of step were taken.

We support the adoption of this Bill on second reading, Mr. Speaker, and we support its being passed today. We support Canada meeting its commitments and this should be done before November 30. We hope that the United States will meet its commitments as well. The alternative would be financial chaos in the world's economic system. Canada is one nation that would be most endangered as it is one of the nations most dependent on foreign trade for growth in its GNP.

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to this Bill particularly on a point that I consider has not been sufficiently examined by either of the previous speakers.

The problem I wish to point to is that whatever was in the minds of the people at Bretton Woods who created the IMF, and whatever may have been the conduct of the IMF and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development in the first years, the bank is now not what it set out to be.

● (1220)

I would like to quote from Article 1. One of the purposes of the International Monetary Fund is:

> To facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade, and to contribute thereby to the promotion and maintenance of high levels of employment and real income and to the development of the productive resources of all members as primary objectives of economic policy.

In fact, the IMF and the World Bank have not been following a policy of promoting high levels of employment and real income. This is the problem with which we have to deal. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has a similar statement of goals and both of them together have been following policies which in fact, in the words of the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), have contributed to the present chaos in international finance.

The Hon. Member suggested that if we took human rights into consideration, we would mess up the business world, that business should not have anything to do with human rights. In fact, the following of that principle, at least in recent years, has boomeranged on the business world in the form of the kinds of debts to which both the Hon. Member and the Minister referred and which now have the international financial community scared.

If the purpose of the IMF and the World Bank is to help undeveloped or developing countries to develop, then that purpose is being very rapidly perverted by the direction taken in some critical decisions by the IMF and the World Bank. And those decisions are being heavily pushed by the chief shareholder, the United States of America, as represented by its government.

One instance of this in recent months was the scandalous case of the loan to South Africa. We all heard the statement today that Canada does not introduce political considerations into the decision to lend money. I will come back to that because that is not regularly and consistently the position taken by our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen). On that occasion, however, that was the principle to which he appealed, that "we do not let our disapproval of apartheid influence our decision as to whether or not we should lend money through the IMF or the World Bank to South Africa". It was argued that by lending that country money we were subsidizing South Africa's war against its neighbour, Namibia. It was said that the money we were giving South Africa in fact replaced money it was spending to conduct a brutal war against the people of Namibia and against all the declarations and decisions of the United Nations, to which Canada was a party. With one hand, Canada says do not fight the people of Namibia. With the other hand, Canada gives the money to do it. But at that time the Minister claimed that was quite acceptable.

Since that time, Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note that there has been a report of the IMF staff which says that even on economic grounds that loan should not have been made. In part the report cited impediments on the geographic mobility of black workers in South Africa as a very serious problem. The study team said in general that this regulatory system of the workers in South Africa is based on non-economic considerations. As an example it cites the fact that the expenditure of money on the education and training of workers is so unbalanced that a white person in South Africa receives 13 times as much money for training as a black person does.

The International Monetary Fund's own staff claimed that on grounds such as that—of which that is only one example—the loan ought not to have been made. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, the IMF staff are arguing on economic grounds. In other words, what the IMF staff itself said in its report is that business cannot be separated from morality. When the black people are so outrageously oppressed, intimidated and robbed, as they are in South Africa, that is bad business. It may make a few people wealthy, but it is bad business from the standpoint of the economic criteria which the IMF and the World Bank are supposedly following.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Canada has the key vote. Without Canada, the United States had only 48 per cent of the votes to put that loan through. The 4 per cent of the votes of Canada brought it to 52 per cent and South Africa received the money with which it is now murdering people in neighbouring

Namibia. This was Canada's application in that case of the principle "We hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil" in regard to the domestic policy of a country. We simply lend it the money if it meets narrow economic criteria. We do not look to see how its conduct may negate the purpose of the loan.

In other cases, however, Canada takes an opposite stand. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to a recent statement made by our Secretary of State for External Affairs in Bangkok on June 27. He said:

—I can assure you that Canada will continue to support ASEAN in opposing Vietnamese challenges to the credentials of the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea—

He further states:

At the same time Canada will not support in either its bilateral programs or through multilateral institutions the provision of economic assistance to Vietnam which would have the effect of subsidizing or rewarding Hanoi's continued military occupation of Cambodia.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when it is a question of a multilateral body lending money to Vietnam, all of a sudden our Secretary of State for External Affairs introduces the question of the policies of the country. Are they engaging in war with a neighbour? If so, do not lend it the money. Whereas a short while before, when it was a question of South Africa engaging in a war with its neighbour, the attitude of the same Government was "Give it the money". In other words,, what we have here is the rankest sort of political favouritism because Canada likes doing business with South Africa and praises its apartheid policy with faint damns. It just quietly says: "Gee, we wish you would be nicer to those poor devils". What Canada likes is its profitable trade relations with South Africa and the profits which Canadian banks make out of South Africa, partly with the help of the IMF and the World Bank. Therefore, Canada is willing to shut its eyes to the continuing war of South Africa against Namibia. Because Canada does not like Vietnam, Canada is willing to become suddenly very prim and judgmental and say: "We could not lend it money because it might use the money to buy guns to use against Kampuchea". That is completely inconsistent.

If one takes the name "Vietnam" out of the Minister's statement and inserts the name "South Africa", one would have a complete reason for refusing to give that loan to South Africa. The Minister surely remembers what he said. The question is whether in future he will attempt to be more consistent on either the one side or the other. That, Mr. Speaker, is a very grave example, considering the many years in which Canada has issued statements of condemnation of apartheid.

There are many other examples also, and I would just like to give two of them. This is not so much an example of the direct policy statement of Canada, but I wish to illustrate the kind of thing which is becoming typical of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund which we are being asked to support with our taxpayers' money.

● (1230)

In the Philippines the World Bank has been busy for a dozen or so years and the IMF is supposedly helping them fix up their economy. In fact, they have been helping to impoverish the vast majority of the Filipino people. In a recent staff report again to the World Bank, it was pointed out that during a period of ten years of martial law when the real wages of Filipino workers dropped 50 per cent from 1971 to 1981, the principal reason was that the World Bank and the IMF had forced the Marcos government to devalue the peso. In other words, the stated goal of the World Bank of improving the living standards of the people in these countries and maintaining high levels of employment and real income was primarily defeated by the World Bank and the IMF.

There are many other examples of what is happening in the Philippines, but I wish now to move to Nicaragua.

Mr. Nickerson: Why don't you?

Mr. Heap: I might do that, Mr. Speaker. It has been suggested some more people go down to Nicaragua. I think they need help against the American army and its friends who would like to make business out of killing Nicaraguans.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Heap: The United States has used every dirty trick it can find to destroy the government of Nicaragua. A recent statement in the *Washington Post*, for example, indicated that, The U.S. will oppose any loan to Nicaragua by the World Bank or the Inter-American Development Bank until the Sandanista government makes major changes in its domestic economic policies.

Mr. Friesen: Like elections.

Mr. Heap: We have just heard from the Hon. Minister that Canada does not interfere with another country's domestic policies. Canada lends money, for example, to Marcos, whether he has elections or not or what kind of elections he may have. Marcos declared himself president without elections for about ten years and Canada supports loans to Marcos through the IMF. But now the U.S. has said it will bar loans to Nicaragua because of its domestic policies, and the question is: Where does Canada stand on that? Do we support the hypocritical policy of the United States or not?

Mr. Shields: No, the hypocritical policies of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Heap: The reaction of the U.S. was to use the IMF to try to force Mexico to cut off its oil shipment agreement with Nicaragua. To its very great credit Mexico, in spite of the difficulties, refused to dishonour its commitment to Nicaragua. I would hope that Canada, whose troubles are not nearly so severe as Mexico's, would show the same courage in standing up to pressure from the U.S.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in Committee of the Whole I will be asking for unanimous consent to waive the rule of notice to move an amendment which would have the effect of asking the

IMF, through our Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), to incorporate into its Articles a statement of principles of human rights. If that were done, it would be quite clear when we lend money that we consider not only the balance sheet in strict accounting terms, but also the balance sheet in terms of human welfare. Will the money be going to build up the country according to the stated purposes of maintenance of high levels of employment and realistic income, or will the money go to a government like the government of Pinochet in Chile, the former government of Somoza in Nicaragua, or the present government in Guatemala or El Salvador? Will the money go to a government which uses the money and its power to destroy the freedom of its people and the living standards of the workers and peasants? Those are human rights questions which were addressed by a subcommittee of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence which recommended in those words I used earlier that this be part of Canada's foreign policy. I will be asking that this House vote according to the words in the report of that Committee to this House. The Government has not seen fit to bring that forward for debate, but I wish to do so.

If Hon. Members wish to deny those words and say that human rights should have nothing to do with Canada's foreign policy, that we will simply go for the big buck no matter how our friends and allies kill and rob to get that buck, then let Members say that, but at their peril. The chaos that the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) referred to in international finance is being fueled by this very policy of saying we do not care how we get the money so long as they repay our banks. That is what has caused riot upon riot upon riot in Manila. That is what is causing growing violence in South Africa. That is what causes the unrest in Central America which all the troops of the United States or its friends would be unable to put down. I am asking that Canada dissociate itself from the corrupt and perverted policy the U.S. has forced on the World Bank and the IMF, and the adoption of the motion I will move in Committee of the Whole would have that effect.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have unanimous consent to ask the Hon. Member just one short question.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) has suggested that by lending money to South Africa we enable them to kill Namibians. I wonder if he is suggesting that if we sell wheat to the Soviet Union on credit we are helping the Soviets to murder Afghans?

Mr. Heap: There are two questions there. One is what we will do with a multilateral lending agency, and what I have asked for is that the two entirely contradictory policies expressed by our Government within the last few months, by saying yes and no in two different cases which are essentially the same, should be brought together on the basis of human rights.

As to the question whether we should sell wheat to the Soviet Union, I leave it to the Hon. Member to discuss that with the constituents in the Canadian Prairies who grow wheat.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I, too, might have consent to ask the Hon. Member for Spadina a question.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Speaker, if I understand the Hon. Member's argument correctly, it is that the World Bank and IMF should not lend money to countries which have, in our opinion, poor human rights records, especially when they use the money or equivalent amounts for military purposes.

What does the Hon. Member think of the situation in India? Surely nothing can be more deplorable, to our way of thinking, than the state of the Untouchables in India and the caste system which still exists. At the same time the government of India has high military expenditures and at times has engaged in open warfare with Pakistan in Bangladesh. My view is that, despite the infringements on human rights in India, I would be quite prepared to see a continuation of the IMF lending to that country. I wonder what the opinion of the Hon. Member is in this particular circumstance?

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, that is a good example to raise. What the IMF and the World Bank profess to be doing is to look at a country and ask, are they trying to improve the bad conditions? A good many of our reports indicate that India is trying to improve the bad conditions the Hon. Member spoke of.

• (1240)

If the Hon. Member is suggesting that we might be standing on weak ground when we refuse Indian money because we treat our aboriginal people perhaps as badly as Indians treat the Untouchables, I would not disagree with the Hon. Member.

I am not asking that an instant list be produced today enumerating which countries we will lend to and which we will not. I am asking for the adoption of a principle which could be used on the basis of information that we would gather for that purpose through the usual government and other sources, but a principle that we would use to try to make such a decision.

The extreme case is the case of South Africa and I understand the Hon. Member's sensitivity on that subject. Canada has clearly condemned the apartheid policy of the government of South Africa and therefore that is a very special case on which the policy of the Canadian Government has foundered.

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

Some Hon. Members: Question.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Corbin in the chair.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order. House in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-168, an Act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (No. 2).

On Clause 1—*Payment of subscriptions out of C.R.F.*

Mr. Heap: Mr. Chairman, I seek unanimous consent to waive the rule of notice in order to move two brief amendments to Bill C-168, an Act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act. The motions are as follows:

That Bill C-168 be amended at page 1, Clause 1, Subclause (1), line 18 by deleting the period and adding the following therefor:

"provided that the Minister of Finance shall request the International Monetary Fund to amend Article I of its Articles so as to incorporate in its purposes the principle of human rights, embracing both the right to a decent material existence, such as access to food, shelter, employment and health care, and civil and political rights which provide the means to give effective expression to the needs and dignity of every person".

The second amendment, Mr. Chairman, deals with the same principle but relates to the second paragraph of the clause. The motion is as follows:

That Bill C-168 be amended at page 2, Clause 1, Subclause (2), line 5 by deleting the period and adding the following therefor:

The words that follow would be the same as those that I have already read in the first motion, Mr. Chairman.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order. The Chair should inform the Committee that, first, unanimous consent is not needed to introduce these amendments at this time. Second, the Chair has some reservations as to the appropriateness of the amendments in terms of the scope of the Bill. In any case, the Chair will give the Hon. Member the benefit of the doubt and the House will have the opportunity to dispose of the amendments in due course.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Chairman, since our Party attempted to submit some amendments yesterday by asking for unanimous consent and were denied that courtesy by Members of the New Democratic Party 24 hours ago, why should we extend that same courtesy to them today?

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order. It is my understanding that unanimous consent was sought yesterday at the report stage and that is an entirely different matter. We are now in Committee of the Whole and it is quite proper for Hon. Members to propose amendments in Committee of the Whole. To begin with, that is what Committee of the Whole is all about. It is an entirely different matter, however, for the Chair to rule on the acceptability or unacceptability of the amendments being proposed.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Chairman, I am quite aware of that but the Hon. Member for Spadina evidently was not aware of that because he is the one who asked for unanimous consent.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected by the Chair and by the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta on the procedural point. I am glad to know that I did not need to seek unanimous consent to have that motion introduced.

I was not present in the House yesterday and I am not aware of the substance of the motion that the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta is concerned about. Therefore, I cannot comment on the grounds on which it may have failed to receive unanimous consent at that different stage. However, I would still hope that Hon. Members would consider the present motions.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: I thought I had made it very clear that unanimous consent is not needed at this stage. It is the Member's prerogative to propose an amendment. In any case, the amendment has been proposed and I will put it to the House. Hon. Members have heard the terms of the amendment.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. With all due respect to the Hon. Member, it is my view that these amendments, by introducing a condition precedent, go well beyond the principle of the Bill. The principle of this particular Bill is merely to increase Canada's contribution under special drawing rights, nothing more and nothing less.

The Hon. Member's amendments could perhaps be attached to a general Bill on the Bretton Woods Agreements and may be in order if they were to find a proper place in the amending Bill. However, I suggest to you, Mr. chairman, that the amendments are well out of order in that they introduce an entirely new principle into the Bill by proposing a condition precedent for any contribution by Canada.

When I say that, I am not attacking the motivation of the Hon. Member because I think that in some cases we might find some sympathy for the amendments. I do say on behalf of the Official Opposition that we would want to give this matter much more mature consideration than we could give it when presented with these amendments at this particular time.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would briefly suggest to you that the amendments are out of order in that they go much beyond the principle of the Bill even under the present rules. I do not accept that second reading is a matter of principle that is set in stone but this goes much beyond a mere amending Bill.

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Chairman, I rise on the same point of order. It would be my submission as well, Mr. Chairman, that the amendments are out of order. I would rather you studied the matter and gave us your ruling as to whether or not they are out of order before we proceed to debate the amendments.

It is my understanding that the Bretton Woods Agreements Act arises out of an international treaty to which Canada was one of the signatories. That treaty to which we are party does

not contemplate the type of restriction being put on our contributions or the type of restriction on the lending of the international agencies dealt with in the treaty that the Hon. Member would now try to have us make. For that reason, I do not think we have it within our power at this moment to amend an international treaty by amending the Bill we have before us today.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Chairman, I rise on the same point of order.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The Hon. Member for Spadina has already spoken on a point of order with respect to the amendments.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Chairman, I have spoken on my motion. Have I spoken on a point of order?

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The Hon. Member for Spadina on a point of order.

● (1250)

Mr. Heap: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the points raised by my two colleagues, I will deal with the second one first. I understand that what we are dealing with involves an international treaty. My motion, therefore, is only to ask that Canada seek such an amendment by the body which administers that treaty, obviously seeking the consent of other parties to that treaty. I hope in that respect it would be in order.

With regard to the point made by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West as to the scope, I would point out that there is no other opportunity even to have this question addressed. This is a question which has arisen over the years in the course of administration and it relates to the fact that more money is being asked because of the chaos to which the Hon. Member for St. John's West referred. Therefore it is appropriate to stop and take stock. I would hope, therefore, that you would find the motion in order.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The Chair has expressed reservations about the appropriateness of the amendments in the first instance and those reservations have been given some credence by the arguments advanced by both the Member for Edmonton West and the Member for Western Arctic. The Chair still maintains reservations about the motion's acceptability in terms of its qualifications which the House is asked to put in the Bill now before the House at second reading.

In any case, the best way to dispose of such a proposal is for the Chair to put the amendments to the House and the House will make the ultimate decision.

Mr. Lambert: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I do not think it is within your competence to accept an amendment on which there is doubt and put it. The unfortunate part is that this incident may be used as a precedent for accepting an amendment which is, in my submission, clearly out of order.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: I suppose that the Chair could always want to take advice on the matter, but I should remind the House that we are under a covering agreement to dispose of all stages of the Bill before one o'clock today.

The Hon. Member for Edmonton West is correct. I suppose the Chair could always rule very strictly and declare the motion out of order, but I would want to provide myself with sufficient argument before ruling definitely one way or the other. It has happened in other cases that the House is always the best and ultimate judge in these matters. Therefore I will ask if the amendments proposed by the Hon. Member for Spadina will carry.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Amendments (Mr. Heap) negatived.

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Chairman, I have a very brief question. Am I to understand that the increase in contributions from each state that is a party to the Bretton Woods Treaty is in the same ratio, or are some countries to be called upon to increase their subscription or contribution in a proportion that is greater than that of other countries?

Mr. MacLaren: Mr. Chairman, a very brief answer to a very brief question. The increases in quotas are, broadly speaking, what the Hon. Member for St. John's West noted. They are an approximately 47.5 per cent increase across the board.

There are however some slight variations. For example, Canada's increased quota is 45 per cent. The variation results from slight adaptations that are made in light of changes in the economic circumstances of individual member countries according to the formula that the IMF uses.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It was agreed that we would commence debate on Bill C-152 at three o'clock this afternoon. That being the case, and in view of the fact that there are Members who will want to participate in that debate but might not be here at this time, could we call it one o'clock?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: We agree to that proposition.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1:00 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

S.O. 21

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

THE LATE FRANK A. ENFIELD, Q.C.

TRIBUTE TO FORMER MEMBER

Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (York-Scarborough): Madam Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 21 to inform the House of the death of the former and first Member for York-Scarborough, Mr. Frank A. Enfield, Q.C.

Frank was educated in Toronto, and graduated from the University of Toronto and Osgoode Hall Law School before joining the RCAF during World War II. Frank served with distinction in the war, rising to the rank of Flight Lieutenant.

After the war Frank was married—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I am very sorry but this kind of statement cannot be made under Standing Order 21. The Hon. Member might want to rise at three o'clock in order to make this type of statement.

* * *

POLITICAL PARTIES

LIBERAL PARTY FUND RAISING DINNER WITH PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Otto Jelinek (Halton): Madam Speaker, it is billed as "An Evening with Pierre Elliott Trudeau" a "one time only occasion" . . . "to meet the man." In fact it is an invitation to a $250 a plate Liberal dinner sent out by the rainmaker himself, Senator Keith Davey.

One can assume that sales of tickets to the 23 per cent of Liberal supporters have been exhausted. In fact, those who have bought tickets are being bussed in, in mini buses. In his wisdom, the Senator is now tapping the 62 per cent who really count. As one who belongs to that majority I was flattered to receive not one but two invitations to this great occasion to hear the man with whom we have grown up for the past 15 years.

Since the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in those 15 years has made more speeches outside Canada than in this House, I briefly considered attending this one time event. However, I understand he is retaining his best lines and announcements for his forthcoming trip to India, Bangladesh, and Kuwait. Besides, I could not find anybody, Liberal, NDP or Conservative, to join me in forking out $250 to save a sinking ship. Instead people in droves have bought tickets to hear Brian Mulroney, Leader of the Opposition and the next Prime Minister of Canada, at a sold out dinner that is planned to take place in Toronto on November 24.

In any event, I wish Senator Davey good luck in his efforts to sell tickets to what should be billed as "PET's Last Stand."

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

ESTABLISHMENT OF HELICOPTER PLANT IN QUEBEC—POSITION OF PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Madam Speaker, on Friday, September 30, I rose in the House under the provisions of the Standing Orders and urged the Leader of the Opposition, who was present at the time, to clarify the position of his party on the anticipated establishment of a Bell Helicopter plant in Quebec. I referred to statements by the Progressive Conservative member for Erie (Mr. Fretz), who objected to the Government of Canada intervening in favour of Quebec in this matter. On October 11, 1983, the Hon. Member for Erie again criticized the Government for encouraging Bell Helicopter to come to Quebec. Now, 26 days later, the Leader of the Opposition has yet to answer the two following questions: first, does the Progressive Conservative Party officially support the establishment of Bell Helicopter in Quebec? Second, if so, what is the Leader of the Opposition going to do about the Hon. Member for Erie? The Members of this House are anxious to know whether the Conservative leader's new job creation policy for Quebec consists in closing down mines and refusing to subsidize new plants.

* * *

[*English*]

FISHERIES

NATIONALIZATION OF EAST COAST OFFSHORE INDUSTRY

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Madam Speaker, the whole of the East Coast fishing industry of Canada has been clobbered by this Government whose actions have been clumsy, careless, confusing, damaging, and divisive. On July 4 the Minister of Fisheries announced that the government was unilaterally going to proceed to take over the offshore trawling industry of Newfoundland. Since then it has taken over the offshore trawling industry of Nova Scotia. The federal Government did not bother to agree on its actions with the provincial Governments or other bodies involved. That was July 4.

Four months later there is still no direction for this new nationalized company. No one knows what is to happen. No one knows what the quotas will be for the new offshore Newfoundland company in 1984-1985. No one knows who is in charge. No one is giving it direction. No one is in a position of authority to set the budget for next year. No one knows anything. There is endless confusion and damage.

In my own district of St. John's West, at the major fish plant at Trepassey, the work of repairing the wharf and the ice shed has been stopped for the last several months. Unless this work recommences immediately, the plant cannot open again in January and the 500 or 600 employees will remain out of work. Not only that, Madam Speaker, but the Government has spent four months fighting its own creature. It owns 48 per

cent of the Canada Development Corporation. It has been battling with that Corporation, and just last Friday agreed to compensate it. It is a disgrace, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT

DIFFICULTIES OF PEOPLE OF SCHEFFERVILLE, P.Q.

Mr. André Maltais (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Madam Speaker, this morning I met with a group of people from Schefferville to talk about the problems still being experienced by the citizens of this northern town. I would like to welcome the Mayor of Schefferville, Mr. Bégin, and the Chairman of the Adjustment Committee, Mr. Forté. Madam Speaker, perhaps the Department of Employment and Immigration, after doing so much for the workers of Schefferville, could ask the Iron Ore Company—and I would have liked to see the Leader of the Opposition in the House today—to sit down at a tripartite conference with the provincial and federal governments, to find a solution for Schefferville businessmen and owners of mobile homes. The people of Schefferville have the impression, and in some cases they are sure, that they have been abandoned by the company, and it is important to settle the problem now, because we can expect further problems on the North Shore with other towns. It is important that the company be held morally and socially responsible and that it meet its obligations to its workers.

* * *

[*English*]

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

W. GIFFORD-JONES FOUNDATION—APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Madam Speaker, all Members of the House will be aware of the continuing debate over the merits of legalizing the medical use of heroin for the relief of terminal cancer pain, and the fact that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) has established an expert advisory committee on the management of severe pain. They will also be aware, I hope, of the important role played by the W. Gifford-Jones Foundation in stimulating the debate that led to the creation of the advisory committee, and the continuing role which this Foundation is playing in the necessary debate which society must experience about the difficult questions which attend the reality of suffering, pain, and death.

The Foundation's advocacy of the legalization of heroin has been a prime mover in bringing this issue to the attention of the public, and in thereby pressuring the experts to consider such decisions as matters of public policy and not just of technical expertise, which is a welcome development.

Recently the Foundation applied for registration as a charity, and was turned down on the grounds that it was political and therefore not eligible. I ask the Government to review that decision by Revenue Canada in the interests of a fully informed public on such issues, and, while it is at it, it could review its entire policy on the granting of charitable status, which, as it stands now, is highly arbitrary, inconsistent, and inadequate when it comes to the appropriate role of churches and other groups, in contributing to public policy debate.

* * *

EXCISE TAX

INCREASE IN TAX ON TOBACCO

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Madam Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Ontario Flue-Cured Tobacco Growers' Marketing Board and many of my constituents to express their strong opposition to the Government's persistence in applying an excessive increase in excise tax on tobacco.

The levy of an excise tax which annually generates its own increase ad valorem is doubly unfair to the poor. Not only is this a regressive tax, but its negative impact becomes more pronounced year by year as its value is increased automatically. If the Government were as deeply concerned and committed to social justice as it purports to be, then surely its six and five guidelines would apply equally to this tax as they do to the wages that must pay for it.

The automatic indexing of this excise tax undermines the fundamental principle calling for parliamentary approval of all tax increases to ensure that people are taxed in a manner that is equitable and fair. If the Government were so principled, I would not have to call the attention of the House to the problem that this tax poses for the many tobacco growers in my constituency. Their views are represented in a letter which I received from Judy Fulop of Tillsonburg, Ontario, in which she states:

● (1410)

The reason for this letter is to protest the manner in which taxes are slapped onto tobacco products. Monique Begin's pretense about caring about peoples' health is a false front and her reasoning for increasing the price to reduce consumption is an underhanded tactic to "rake in" as much tax money as possible. If she really cares and if tobacco really is that dangerous, then it should be banned completely. Why put the industry through a slow death?"

* * *

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

PROVISION AFFECTING BRITISH COLUMBIA COAL LANDS

Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo-Chilcotin): Madam Speaker, I rise to express opposition on behalf of British Columbians, to Clause 62 of Bill C-155, which will give the federal Govern-

ment control of 50,000 acres of valuable coal bearing lands. The Bill before the House directs that the federal Government "may dispose of or otherwise deal with" these lands "in any manner and on any condition" the Government thinks fit.

The Government of B.C. has taken the position of negotiating, rather than demanding the return of these lands. This weak stand fails to reinforce the position of B.C. MPs and could result in the takeover of this valuable resource by none other than Petro-Canada. Section 50 of the Constitution Act, 1982, strengthens and reinforces provincial ownership vis-à-vis natural resources within the boundaries of the Province.

The federal Government has no constitutional right to these coal lands. Unfortunately, the two amendments introduced to the Bill which would have returned ownership of these lands to the Province of B.C., you have deemed beyond the scope of this Bill. In 1982, Canadian grain exports amounted to $6 billion. It is estimated that the value of the B.C. coal lands could be $450 billion. This is the equivalent of 75 years' worth of grain exports.

In view of the above, B.C. Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament demand that the coal lands be returned to the original owner, the Province of British Columbia.

* * *

DISARMAMENT

WOMEN'S DISARMAMENT DAY—PROTEST AGAINST TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Madam Speaker, a few days ago the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was wondering about the lives of Canadians. What kind of people lived here, he asked. Many Canadians wonder about the Prime Minister. They wonder where he really stands on the issue of disarmament. They were disappointed when he gave the go ahead for Cruise missile testing, but they are hopeful that something positive will come out of his disarmament task force.

Today is Women's Disarmament Day, and it is important to note that over 60 per cent of Canadian women oppose testing the Cruise missile. What the women want, and what all peace loving Canadians want, is the Prime Minister to bring his actions into line with his rhetoric.

In Victoria on Saturday hundreds of ordinary Canadians cast ballots calling on the Prime Minister to cancel the Cruise testing agreement and to make Canada a nuclear weapons free zone. They asked me to deliver these ballots in a way that would symbolize the power of public opinion and the desire for peace. I would ask a page to come forward—

Madam Speaker: Order. I would ask the pages not to collect the ballots. The Hon. Member is not allowed to exhibit objects in the House.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SOUTH AFRICA—LIFE EXPECTANCY RATES—CONDEMNATION OF APARTHEID

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the results of a study conducted by Johannesburgs's Witwatersrand University in South Africa. The study has shown that the average life expectancy of that country's 4.6 million whites is 65 years. For the 24.7 million blacks, it is 45 years. The medical experts there have no doubts that the South African apartheid system of so-called "separate development" of the races is a factor in this great difference.

The great gap between the quality of life of blacks and whites in South Africa is clearly shown in the infant mortality rate, which is 21.6 per thousand among whites and 123.9 among blacks in towns, and between 200 and 300 for blacks in the rural areas of that country. The segregation of medical staff and patients means that there is one doctor for every 330 whites, but only one for every 91,000 blacks.

Because of these awesome disparities, I would urge the Government of Canada seriously to consider opposing all future International Monetary Fund loans to South Africa until the apartheid system is effectively dismantled. Sweden and Norway have already adopted such a policy, as has the House of Representatives in the United States.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF ROBERT S. McNAMARA, FORMER WORLD BANK PRESIDENT

Madam Speaker: I would like to draw attention to the distinguished presence in our gallery of Mr. Robert S. McNamara, former Secretary of Defense of the United States and former President of the World Bank.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF HON. GREVILLE JANNER, M.P., CHAIRMAN OF COMMONWEALTH JEWISH COUNCIL

Madam Speaker: I also draw attention to the Honourable Greville Janner, Member of Parliament of the British House of Commons and Chairman of the Commonwealth Jewish Council.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—INVASION BY UNITED STATES FORCES

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It relates to the drama that continues to unfold on the island of Grenada. Was the Canadian Government asked for its advice at any stage of the proceedings in preparation for the move on Grenada, either by our Caribbean friends, neighbours and allies, or by the United States of America?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, at seven o'clock yesterday afternoon, or 1900 hours, on Monday, our embassy in Washington was informed by someone from the State Department—the Minister can perhaps give details as to names—of various options that the Americans were examining with a view to ensuring the protection of their nationals in Grenada.

Mr. Mulroney: Madam Speaker, that is an unusual answer. Someone in the embassy was contacted by someone in the State Department, and somebody else can give the names. It is a pretty sad admission as to the role of the Government.

INQUIRY WHETHER ADVICE SOUGHT FROM CANADIAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): We have been trying with questions for a number of days to alert the Government to the vital significance of what was unfolding on Grenada. I repeat my question to the Prime Minister. Was his Government asked for advice or input by the United States of America or any of the Caribbean allies to whose friendship he has made frequent reference?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the answer is no in so far as Caribbean allies are concerned. In so far as the United States administration is concerned, Mr. Motley of the State Department approached Mr. Roy of our embassy in Washington. Mr. Gotlieb having been away at that time, it was Mr. Roy who was approached. Now that I have satisfied the Leader of the Opposition about names, perhaps he can get to the substance of his concerns.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: Madam Speaker, the substance of my concerns may be lost on the Prime Minister, but I can assure him that they are not lost on the Canadian people. I can assure him of that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Inasmuch as the events have transpired, what is the current position of the Prime Minister and the Government with regard to developments in Grenada? Does the Government support the initiative that has been taken, or is it opposed? If so, has such sentiment been conveyed to our NATO allies or Caribbean partners?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, it is clear that the substance of the concerns of the Leader of the Opposition is to ask questions. I am sure that will not be lost on the Canadian people either. He is asking us what concerns we expressed. The Minister expressed them earlier this morning when asked about them. I think I could best repeat his statement to the media. It was that there were American nationals there. The United States was certainly entitled to attempt to protect those nationals. Whether it used the only available means and the proper means to protect them is something that we do not know the answer to, because we are not in possession of the facts.

● (1420)

I understand that Secretary Shultz will be explaining the reasons for the invasion this afternoon and I am prepared to wait to hear the explanation of the American Government on why they found it necessary to invade the island in order to protect their nationals.

In the case of Canada I know we had permission from Grenada to evacuate our nationals. I do not know if, for some reason or another, the Americans did not have that permission from Grenada. I hope we will have the answers.

POSITION OF NEIGHBOURING CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I am surprised that the Prime Minister would want to hear from Secretary Shultz this afternoon. He could have heard from President Reagan this morning, who stated very clearly on television, in the presence of the Prime Minister of Dominica, that the action was taken to ensure the safety of the residents and to maintain the democratic option for the people of Grenada.

In light of this very clear statement by the President and by our Caribbean allies, do the Prime Minister and the Government approve of the action that has been taken, or is the Government in disagreement? The Prime Minister pointed out to the House the other day that he would be guided in his actions in regard to the island of Grenada by what the neighbours wanted to have done. The neighbours have made it very clear what they want to have done, and I want to know whether the Prime Minister generally shares that view.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, in so far as neighbours are concerned I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that I was correcting the statement by him which he was attributing to the Minister of State

for External Relations, who said that we would consult neighbours before deciding whether to extend recognition or not. That is a different matter from an invasion.

The second point is that the Leader of the Opposition quotes President Reagan as having said that they intended to ensure the safety of the Americans there. That is not enough for me to justify or to condemn the action. Were there other ways of ensuring the safety of the Americans there than by proceeding by invasion?

In the case of Canada, as I have said, we had authority from Grenada to take our citizens out. I do not know if the United States was refused that authority or not. If they had the authority to do that, I cannot see any reason for invading to protect their nationals when you can protect them by getting them out. I am in hypothesis here, Madam Speaker. I do not know. Perhaps Secretary Shultz will tell us. If the Leader of the Opposition is satisfied with the bland explanation that invasion was necessary to protect nationals, then he obviously knows more than I do.

I do not know why invasion was necessary. The Leader of the Opposition goes on to quote President Reagan as saying that the invasion was also intended to maintain the democratic system. The Leader of the Opposition said that should suffice for me. Obviously it is sufficient for him. I would ask him what would happen if the United States gave itself authority to invade any country where the democratic system did not exist?

NATURE OF UNITED STATES NOTIFICATION

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is also directed to the Prime Minister who has indicated that they were notified at 1900 hours yesterday. Would the Prime Minister indicate what specifically they were notified of? Was it to be an American rescue operation, or was it in fact the multi-nation entry into Grenada that actually occurred?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, at about seven o'clock last evening Mr. Motley met with Mr. Roy, Minister at the Canadian Embassy in Washington, and outlined a number of options that the American authorities were thinking of in relation to protecting the safety of American nationals in Grenada. Those options largely could be characterized as being of the rescue operation type. There was no indication at that time that an invasion would take place within a matter of hours.

SELECTION OF AIRCRAFT TO FLY CANADIANS TO SAFETY

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question again is for the Prime Minister who will recall that yesterday the Minister of State for External Relations described the preparations that had been made with respect to taking the Canadians that wanted to leave off of the island. In view of that answer yesterday, would the Prime Minister confirm to the House that in fact the aircraft that was secured was a LIAT aircraft and, as matters developed, it turned out it needed the consent of each of the Caribbean Governments that own a piece of that company? When that consent was forthcoming this morning it was too late to take the Canadians off as the invasion was then under way. Would he explain to the House why Canada did not secure a Canadian aircraft, or charter an aircraft to take the Canadians off the island, so that they would be secure and safe, if that was their wish?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member ignores the fact that there were no problems in relation to the utilization of the LIAT aircraft which was already in the area and, therefore, able to be used on relatively short notice, until we were very close to the time scheduled for the flight to Grenada to pick up the Canadians yesterday.

I believe that flight had been scheduled for 2.30. Earlier approval had been received from the office of Prime Minister Tom Adams of Barbados and it was only shortly before the departure time that two or three other countries that share in the ownership of the airline objected to having an airliner, in which they had part ownership, being seen flying into Grenada. By the time it was cleared up with those countries it was too late in the day for the flight to occur. Indeed the crew had dispersed. Obviously this morning was too late. I do not think there were any reasonable grounds to anticipate that that aeroplane would not have been able to be used.

* * *

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

CANADIAN CONTENT PROPOSAL—JAPANESE GOVERNMENT'S POSITION

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry. On Friday last the Minister of Industry, in answering a question asked by me, indicated:

> The Canadian way is the negotiation route, Madam Speaker. We will continue in this direction, but if we are not successful then we might have to take other action.

This was in response to a question with regard to the Government's intention in terms of the implementation of the recommendations of the task force on automotive parts. The Ambassador from Japan has indicated that they do not favour the Government of Canada taking this route, and they have indicated that they will retaliate if Canada moves in that direction. Is the Government presently involved in negotations with the Government of Japan? Is there a deadline for those negotiations? If that deadline is met without the negotiations having been successfully concluded, will the Government of Canada implement those recommendations?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Madam Speaker, as I have indicated on several occasions in this House and other public fora, we are trying to negotiate with the Japanese automobile companies to make a major investment here in Canada as they have in many other indus-

trialized nations around the world. Until such time as we feel we are not making any progress in these negotiations it would be very irresponsible for me to indicate what other possible action the Government of Canada might take.

ALLEN INDUSTRIES—ANNOUNCEMENT OF HAMILTON PLANT CLOSURE

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, on May 12, with regard to another section of the automobile industry, I asked the Minister if he would look into the suggestion that Allen Industries, which is located in the area of Hamilton, was going to move to the United States. He indicated at that point that his ministry officials were on top of it, and that the Minister of Indian Affairs was also on top of it. On top of it they may be. Have any actions been undertaken to stop the most recent announcement of Allen Industries that it is going to close the plant this spring and move out of Canada?

● (1430)

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Madam Speaker, I am not aware of the specific announcement that the Hon. Member is alleging.

Mr. Deans: You are supposed to be on top of it.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—INFORMATION PROVIDED BY UNITED STATES AUTHORITIES

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I might go a little further with the Prime Minister or the Minister of State for International Trade, and ask whether, in the consultations yesterday in New York between the American officials and officials of our embassy there, we were left, formally or informally, with any impression that an action was being contemplated because the United States had reason to believe that the Government or the administration of Grenada was now in the hands of the Soviets or Cubans? Were we given any reason to believe that that might have been the cause of the precipitous action?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member refers to consultations in New York yesterday; I presume he means Washington. According to the reports of the discussions that we have received, there was no mention of the possibility of the Government being in the hands of any foreign country.

Mr. Forrestall: Madam Speaker, the paucity of information is becoming a little puzzling and a little amusing.

ROLE OF CUBANS AND SOVIETS IN GRENADA

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister? Does he have any reason to believe, or did he have any reason to believe over the last eight or ten days that in fact the administration or the Government of Grenada had passed from Grenadians to Cubans or Russians? I ask that question, bearing in mind the very clear reports coming out of Grenada, as recently as an hour ago, of the securing of 30 Russian or Soviet officers for the purpose of facilitating their leaving that island. Is that part of the difficulty?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member would know that since Maurice Bishop took power there had been accusations levelled at him as being the tool of the Cubans and of the Soviets. That accusation had been coming from various quarters including, I believe, some of the Caribbean countries. The Hon. Member knows that was not our view. We thought we should maintain relations with Maurice Bishop and with that Commonwealth country, lest by isolating we forced him precisely to depend exclusively on the Cubans or the Soviets. That is not a new story.

Whether something specific happened in the last ten days to which the Hon. Member may be alluding, I am not aware of any such event.

SAFETY OF CANADIAN CITIZENS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Madam Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister when are we going to get those Canadians who wish to leave, out of Grenada? It had been possible in the last week to make them out by two or three different means.

While he is on his feet can he respond to the humanitarian question posed yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition which respect to extending the protection that Canada can offer to Grenadians who are in Canada on student visas, visitor visas, work permits, or otherwise? Can he give the assurance that these people can feel free to approach Canadian immigration authorities, where necessary, for an extension of their visas or permits until such time as events and conditions in Grenada are normalized?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I am glad that after this lengthy discussion on the events that are occuring in Grenada today, someone has shown some interest in the welfare of the Canadians who are there. I compliment the Hon. Member in this regard.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Regan: I am talking about today. May I say that this is the first question today, since the invasion, that has dealt with the welfare of the Canadians.

Let me say that we are in constant contact with the American task force in Grenada and we are informed, through our contacts, that 25 of the Canadians, the ones who had designated that they wished to leave the island in yesterday's proposed flight, are safely in the Ross Point Inn, some three miles from the town of Bridgetown and away from any fighting or conflict. There are five CUSO young people who are in the Bridgetown area and we have no reason to believe that they are in any particular danger. There are seven to ten other Canadians who have not registered or indicated any desire to leave the island, whose whereabouts throughout the island are not known at this time.

As the situation is clarified later in the day, we think it will be possible to make concrete plans in relation to the removal of those Canadians who wish to leave immediately, since both airfields are now in the hands of the American authorities.

RELATIONS WITH COMMONWEALTH CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. It is fascinating that, now that there is a task force, we can talk to it. We did not have any idea that it was being formed.

Since the Prime Minister indicated yesterday and before that that we had been in conversation with Caribbean countries to try to develop our position, can he please inform the House how it can be that the senior member of the Commonwealth in this hemisphere, Canada, the senior member of the Commonwealth, was not consulted or advised, or in any way involved by the Caribbean countries involved? How can he possibly explain to the House why Jamaica and Barbados did not want to get Canada's advice at any time?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I think the answer to that is rather simple. These countries, as facts show, were determined to support an invasion. They know that Canada is not in the habit of supporting invasions of other countries.

PRIME MINISTER'S PEACE INITIATIVE

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, I thank the Prime Minister for the honesty of his answer. I have a supplementary question because last week the Prime Minister initiated something that I think a lot of Canadians hope will work, and that is an attempt to solve East-West tensions. If the Americans, the Jamaicans, the Barbadians, and our allies in the Caribbean have no trust in the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada, why should Canadians believe that his initiative will work?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: Order, please!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I think the question is very well put. I would certainly say that those Canadians who believe that Canada should have its armies ready to invade islands or other countries, the Governments of which they disagree with, should vote for the Hon. Member and his Party. The others can vote for our Party.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

BANKS AND BANKING

LEVEL OF PRIME INTEREST RATE

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Madam Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. The Minister will know that when you compare interest rates to the rate of inflation, the real cost of borrowing money in Canada is unrealistically high. The banks are now charging 11 per cent prime. The Minister will know that if you compare that with the LIBOR rate or the Eurodollar rate, their rate of interest is considerably less. What effort has the Minister of Finance made, or what effort will he make, to persuade our chartered banks to reduce their prime rate to a more realistic level?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member will be happy to learn that at a certain stage in the last two years our rates were as much as 4 per cent or 5 per cent above U.S. rates, and since July our short-term rates have been below the United States rates by as much as half a point. Over the last two months the prime rate in Canada has been at the same level as in the United States which has a lower rate of inflation than Canada. In the U.S. the latest figure for inflation was 3.7 per cent while our rate was 5 per cent. In practice, therefore, the real interest rates in Canada are 1.3 per cent lower than in the United States.

I would argue with my friend that we have pursued a policy in this country of bringing interest rates down as low as could sensibly be done while still maintaining a reasonable value for our dollar. The record shows that we have done a better job in terms of reducing the real interest rates than the United States.

● (1440)

REQUEST THAT MINISTER PRESS BANKS TO REDUCE RATE

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Madam Speaker, the Minister knows that when the Hon. Member for St. John's West was the Minister of Finance our prime interest rate was 1.5 per cent less than the American prime rate. The Minister knows that the banking system is prepared to lend long term money, one year money, at less than the prime rate. The Minister knows that business depends on prime rates. Why will the Minister not then press the chartered banks to reduce their prime rate to a more realistic level, in order to stimulate employment and get our recovery going again?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, I am afraid the hon. gentleman is living in a world of his

own. Economic recovery in Canada has been very vigorous, as the Hon. Member is well aware. In fact, the growth rate in Canada was 7.5 per cent in the two first quarters of 1983. We are creating jobs in Canada at a faster rate than any other industrialized country, and as far the growth rate is concerned, we are competing directly with the United States, and who knows which of our two countries will have the highest growth rate by the end of the year.

In September, we brought inflation down to 5 per cent, the most substantial drop in any industrialized country during the current year.

All these figures should convince the hon. gentleman that economic recovery in Canada is well on its way and that he should support the Government's efforts.

* * *

[*English*]

CROWN CORPORATIONS

CANADAIR—BUILDING OF RACING YACHT

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Minister in the House responsible for Canadair and ask him if he is aware that Canadair is building a yacht for entry in the 1984 Trans-Atlantic race? Does the Minister sanction this kind of expenditure by a Crown corporation which has just lost over $1.4 billion and is back to the till for another quarter of a billion dollars?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, if I remember correctly, I believe the work was done in partnership with a private company.

[*English*]

LAW SUIT OVER BILLING

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Madam Speaker, the Minister is obviously aware of this issue. In view of the fact that he is aware that the work was done by Canadair for a private company, which was Technique Avant Garde, a company which has taken Canadair to the International Court in a law suit for over $135 million, would the Minister advise the House if there is any chance of Canadair collecting the billing on this yacht? And could he tell us what is the billing to Technique Avant Garde?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, I shall make enquiries and shall be glad to inform the House and the Hon. Member in due course.

[*English*]

THE CHARTER OF RIGHTS

INFRINGEMENT BY ONTARIO PUBLIC SERVICE WAGE LEGISLATION

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. Yesterday the Ontario Supreme Court ruled that those portions of the Ontario public service wage control legislation which prevented employees from negotiating non-monetary clauses, was in violation of the Canadian Constitution and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms within that Constitution. In light of that court decision, is the federal Government willing to change its legislation, Bill C-124, to enable workers to negotiate clauses such as worker safety, technical change, and job security?

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, we have not had an opportunity to study the decision which, I am told, has over 200 pages. We will certainly do that with our legal advisers. However, I would be very surprised if this ruling were not appealed by the Ontario authorities.

WORKERS' RIGHT TO NEGOTIATE NON-MONETARY ISSUES

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, in the judgment, the Ontario Supreme Court said that legislation which is supposed to be regulating pay packages, which also prevents workers from negotiating any other non-monetary clause, is unconstitutional. As part of the Government which brought in the Charter of Rights, does the President of the Treasury Board not feel that workers should have a right to negotiate non-monetary clauses at this time?

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, I repeat that I feel it is premature to say what type of binding precedent that decision is going to be, because I am sure it is going to be appealed. If my Hon. friend would take another look at the Public Service Compensation Restraint Act he will find there is a provision in it for negotiating collectively with the Government on matters both monetary and non-monetary, as long as the six and five framework is accepted.

POSITION OF EMPLOYER

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Madam Speaker, the President of the Treasury Board is right. There is a clause in the federal Government's legislation which allows negotiations, if the employer agrees. However, will the President of the Treasury Board not also admit that only two contracts have been signed under that provision? In other words, the vast majority of workers who fall under the federal jurisdiction have not been allowed to negotiate any non-monetary clauses whatsoever.

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, I believe my hon. friend is mistaken. He is

referring to Section 7 of the Act. I invite the Hon. Member to take a look at Section 16 which allows the Governor in Council to exempt a contract from the coverage of the Act if it accepts the six and five principle. And there have been more than two such contracts, if I am not mistaken.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

INCREASE IN FARM BANKRUPTCIES

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Madam Speaker, despite the fact that the Minister of Finance talks about a glowing economy, 46 more Canadian farmers went bankrupt in September, bringing the total to 333 so far this year. Obviously the year-end total is going to surpass the 1982 total of 410. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he is now prepared to change his tune. To be specific, his response last month to farm bankruptcy statistics was that Canadian farmers were doing all right. In light of these new figures—that 46 more Canadian farmers went bankrupt in September—does the Minister of Agriculture still intend to live in his dream world, or is he now prepared to do something which will help to reverse this trend toward more farm bankruptcies?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Madam Speaker, I know the Hon. Member, from his vast experience, is quite knowledgeable in agriculture. I know some of the areas he supports.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whelan: I do not know whether or not he used that in his campaign, but I would just like to say to the Hon. Member that when he talks about farmers, let him be honest as to what farmers are in difficulty in Canada, why they are in difficulty, and then face the issues as they are presented.

Agriculture in Canada is a joint responsibility between the Provinces and the federal Government. I met the farmers in British Columbia. The Minister of Agriculture of British Columbia is in Europe. As far as I know, he has not met these issues yet.

Mr. Clark (Brandon-Souris): Madam Speaker, the farmers I am most concerned about, I suppose, are the farmers from my own area of Manitoba.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark (Brandon-Souris): But I am also very concerned about the fact that more Canadian farmers are going bankrupt at a time when this man is Minister of Agriculture than at any other time in Canadian history since the 1930s.

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR INCREASED FUNDING

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Madam Speaker, as a supplementary question, why will the Minister of Agriculture not persuade the Minister responsible for fiscal economy, the Minister of Finance, to make more money available through the Farm Credit Corporation so there will be fewer farmers instead of more farmers going bankrupt?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Madam Speaker, I was wrong on where the Hon. Member cultivated farmers. He has obviously cultivated farmers in Manitoba. However, if he wants to check the facts, he will find out that in the Province of Manitoba this Minister of Agriculture is responsible for double the benefits of the present Manitoba Government, and of the previous Government of Manitoba. Therefore, when the Hon. Member is talking about financing the farmers out of difficulty, he should know that we have recently loaned farmers the largest amount of money that we have ever loaned them. He knows, as well as I know, that we cannot always loan them out of their difficulties. It is the marketplace in many instances which is sick and is not giving them returns. His Party's agricultural critic, an Hon. Member from the same Province of Manitoba, said last week, "We do not want hand-outs. We do not want give-aways." The Hon. Member is asking me to do that very thing today in the House of Commons. Let that Party make up its mind what it wants.

* * *

GRAIN

WESTERN GRAIN STABILIZATION PROGRAM—REQUEST FOR PAY-OUT

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Why will the Minister not be honest with the Canadian farmers, quit playing politics with their money and pay out the western grain stabilization program, or come up with a formula which makes it possible to make a pay-out, and also do something about the initial price of grain?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member talks about honesty and playing politics. He certainly should know a lot about both of those things, as far as that goes. I read the record of what he said in the House of Commons last week and it leaves a lot of doubt when you really know what is happening in agriculture in Canada, where the money is coming from and where it is being spent. He says what we should be doing for agriculture in Canada. What did he suggest we should do last week?

● (1450)

Some Hon. Members: Answer the question.

Mr. Whelan: What did he suggest we could do?

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Western Arctic.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION—NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD REPORT

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. He has now had the National Energy Board report on the Northern Canada Power Commission on his desk for the best part of a month. Why will he not release it publicly?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Madam Speaker, the NEB Report has been made known to me in draft form. It is being formally presented to my by the directors today. It seems to me it is hardly courteous to raise the question of public disclosure of a report when the authors themselves have not formally presented it to the Minister yet.

Mr. Nielsen: News travels fast these days.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): He has a buddy on the Board.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

SURREY B.C. PORT OF ENTRY FACILITIES

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works who, in a letter to me last week, indicated that the port of entry facilities on the Pacific Highway in Surrey were not part of the special recovery program. In view of the fact that Transpo '86 is only two and a half years away and those facilities will have to be built to provide security for the Immigration Department as well as the extra customs traffic, why were they not included in that program?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): Madam Speaker, the choice of projects depended on many factors, but certainly we recognize the importance of the facility the Hon. Member has been promoting for some time.

MAINTENANCE OF SECURITY

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that security will be an issue when Transpo '86 is on, with increased immigration and increased customs traffic, has the Minister consulted at all with the Minister of National Revenue or the Minister responsible for immigration to make sure we maintain security at that border crossing point and accommodate the extra flow of customs traffic crossing that area?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): Madam Speaker, if my memory is correct this project was being discussed and planned for before the special recovery program. I think that indicates the importance we attach to it.

GRAIN

WESTERN GRAIN STABILIZATION PROGRAM—POSSIBILITY OF CHANGES

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Madam Speaker, my question is supplementary to that of the very fine Minister for Brandon-Souris—or the Hon. Member for Brandon-Souris. He will be a very fine Minister next year.

Some Hon. Members: Want to bet on that?

Mr. Malone: Madam Speaker, I ask the Minister of Transport what changes are pending with respect to the Western Grain Stabilization Plan regarding the pay-out formula? Are there any changes pending, when will they be announced, and will they trigger a pay-out for 1983?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, that question has been asked in this House on two or three occasions. The answer has not changed. Yes, there is a review. It will be looking at the change in legislation which may be required to move from a five-year to a three-year average. I cannot give the exact time in which any recommendations would be made, because it is the responsibility of the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board to make recommendations to Cabinet.

PAY-OUT ADVOCATED

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Madam Speaker, I can only assume the Minister is saying there will not be a pay-out in 1983. That being the case, and in light of the fact prices for farmers are the same as in 1973 but their input costs have tripled, why do the Minister and his cohorts continue to play Peter Pan politics and patty-cake the farmers with their own money, when in fact there is every reason for a pay-out in 1983?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, if the Hon. Member would spend more time looking at the statute and less time reading nursery rhymes, he would know that in fact it is a legislative requirement that it be carried over a five-year period.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

OFFER OF PARDONS TO SONS OF FREEDOM WOMEN MEMBERS

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. Last week he apparently offered pardons to three women of the Sons of Freedom sect who have been convicted of arson and are now conducting hunger strikes in their B.C. prison, if they promise not to set any more fires. He is quoted as having said that this would not create a precedent. Would the Minister explain to the House and the Canadian people the purpose in offering these par-

dons? Is it only to relieve himself of the dilemma with respect to force feeding?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): No, Madam Speaker, it is not for that purpose. It is because the B.C. Government is making a concerted and very responsible effort to try to bring peace to the Doukhobor community. One of the issues causing considerable tension is the fate of these three prisoners who have been sentenced to terms which will see them released, I believe in all cases, over the next two years. I thought it would be useful for the Province of British Columbia, in negotiations, to have the possibility of these women being put on the street under two conditions: first, to be helpful in bringing peace to the Doukhobor community; second, in a way which would guarantee that no more victims would be created by Doukhobor violence or arson in British Columbia.

I think British Columbia finds the option interesting. I know that active negotiations are under way which may well result in the settlement of a decade long cause of difficulty in the Province of British Columbia, and I would hope that type of initiative might even have the support of the Hon. Member.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Madam Speaker, I hope the Minister will ensure, when he makes reference to this matter, that he refers to the Sons of Freedom sect rather than dealing with the Doukhobors who are not all members of that sect by any means.

REASONS FOR OFFER

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Madam Speaker, why did the Minister make this proposal public? The women in question have not even heard of the proposal. Secondly, why did he take the pardon route as opposed to a form of parole? What does the Solicitor General consider to be the circumstances which must be present before he will pardon someone duly convicted of a crime and still serving a sentence imposed by a judge for that crime?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Madam Speaker, why a pardon and not parole is because I have no control over paroles. They are the independent responsibility, pursuant to statute, of the Members of the Parole Board and they have special statutory considerations that apply. I approached the chairman of the Parole Board because some of the cases had been before the Board. Brian Smith, the Attorney General of British Columbia, invited me to do that to see whether these cases could be heard. According to the Parole Board, it was not an appropriate way of dealing with it.

Pardons, on the other hand, are available in residual types of cases where the normal types of considerations applicable to parole are not present. A pardon is a long-standing historic matter of Royal prerogative and it should only be applied in very special circumstances. I thought these were the very types of circumstances in which the use of a pardon might be of interest to the Province of British Columbia.

MULTICULTURALISM

FUNDING OF NATIVE FRIENDSHIP CENTRES

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. On May 30 last he and the Secretary of State, with great fanfare, made an announcement on increasing the funding for the Native Friendship Centres across Canada. To date those centres have not got this increased funding. As late as yesterday they went out on strike at the centres. Can the Minister bring us up to date on what he is doing about assuring the funding he and the Secretary of State promised on May 30?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is quite right. On behalf of the Secretary of State I made an announcement in eastern Canada while the Minister responsible, namely, the Secretary of State, was making an announcement in western Canada. Because he is the Minister responsible I think it would be appropriate if my colleague, the Secretary of State, specifically answered the question.

PROMISES OF FUNDING

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Madam Speaker, will the Secretary of State answer the question? While he is at it, will he not give us the same promises he has been giving for the last six months to the native centres, and not producing?

• (1500)

Hon. Serge Joyal (Secretary of State): Madam Speaker, I am glad to repeat to the Hon. Member that, in response to a similar question from a representative of the New Democratic Party last week, I mentioned that the policy that was announced in the month of May would remain as the policy of the Government. I said that it is a good policy and that by the end of this week I would be in a position to make sure that the requests that had been put forward by the representatives of the National Association of Friendship Centres would be met.

* * *

PETITION

MR. ANGUISH—CALL FOR PASSAGE OF BILL C-678

Madam Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a petition presented by the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) on Monday, October 24, meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

LAW REFORM COMMISSION

TABLING OF REPORT ON EUTHANASIA AND REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to lay upon the Table of the House in both official languages a copy of the Report of the Law Reform Commission entitled "Euthanasia, Aiding Suicide and Cessation of Treatment". I would ask that the report be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

* * *

PETITIONS

MR. ANGUISH—CALL FOR PASSAGE OF BILL C-678

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, today I have the pleasure of presenting a petition which is signed by residents of Île à la Crosse, Saskatchewan, a community in The Battlefords-Meadow Lake constituency. The petition comes from an area of Saskatchewan which the petitioners describe in a letter to me as being: "An area involved both in the production of uranium and the proposed testing of nuclear capable weapons. Both activities take place on lands formerly and rightfully used for fish and fur by Métis and Indian people".

The petition, Madam Speaker, calls upon Parliament to recognize that the Cruise missile testing in Canada escalates the nuclear arms race and to debate and pass Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone.

MR. FULTON—TESTING OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Madam Speaker, I have two petitions to present to the House. The first petition is from 11 petitioners who are principally residents of British Columbia and are concerned about nuclear disarmament, particularly on the Queen Charlotte Islands. They are concerned that Masset on Graham Island is a first order target due to the presence of submarine tracking military operations. The petitioners ask that the House stop the production, promotion and sales of Candu nuclear reactors and prevent the storage, positioning or testing of nuclear weapons on Canadian soil or in Canadian waters and that Canada take a leadership role in world disarmament.

MR. FULTON—OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Madam Speaker, the second petition also comes from some of my constituents who are concerned about the lifting of the moratorium on West Coast oil exploration. They ask for the disallowance of any offshore oil and gas development until aboriginal claims have been negotiated and that the Government include outstanding native claimants as active participants to any federal-provincial negotiations concerning ownership, revenue sharing, environmental standards and all other matters dealing with the ocean, its resources and their development.

MR. PARKER—RIDING OF KOOTENAY EAST-REVELSTOKE

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Madam Speaker, today I have the honour to present a petition from over 300 residents of the community of Revelstoke in my riding of Kootenay East-Revelstoke. Last spring, the Electoral Boundaries Commission recommended that this community be severed from the riding of Kootenay East-Revelstoke and added to the riding of Kootenay West. Unfortunately, the commission held no hearings in the community of Revelstoke to allow people to have a chance to make their views known. This decision came as a complete surprise to them.

The citizens of Revelstoke feel that this decision ignores the many things Revelstoke has in common with the other areas included in the riding of Kootenay East-Revelstoke. These people request Parliament to permit them and their community to remain within the riding of Kootenay East-Revelstoke.

* * * *

Madam Speaker: Motions. May I again ask Hon. Members who have the intention of moving their motions to rise so that I may call their names?

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, we are prepared to make the same exception today as we did yesterday on the understanding that no precedent will be set.

Madam Speaker: That was understood yesterday.

Mr. Nielsen: It is understood every day.

Madam Speaker: My memory is not that bad!

* * *

THE LATE FRANK A. ENFIELD

TRIBUTES TO FORMER MEMBER

Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (York-Scarborough): Madam Speaker, I believe I have the consent of the House Leaders to make a brief statement. I have discussed this matter with the House Leader for the Conservative Party who at this time is on his feet. Perhaps he could indicate that he has agreed that I might make a brief statement. In addition, I have discussed this with the House Leader of the New Democratic Party and I understand he consents as well.

Madam Speaker: Is there consent to allow the Hon. Member to make a statement?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Order Paper Questions

Mr. Cosgrove: Madam Speaker, I wish to inform the House of the death of the former and first Member for York-Scarborough, Mr. Frank A. Enfield, Q.C. Frank was educated in Toronto and graduated from the University of Toronto at Osgoode Hall. He joined the RCAF during World War II and served with distinction, rising to the rank of Flight Lieutenant.

After the war, Mr. Enfield was married, began a law practice and in 1949 was elected to the Scarborough Board of Education as a trustee. He held that post until he was elected to this House in 1953. Coincidentally, Madam Speaker, I moved to York-Scarborough in that year and observed first-hand that Mr. Enfield was admired and respected in his community.

The riding that he represented 30 years ago was the largest in Canada. It remains the largest riding in Canada today. Frank approached this heavy responsibility with personal warmth, with a quick smile and with wit. He will be missed by all of those who had contact with him and I know that all Hon. Members, Madam Speaker, will join with me in sympathizing with his family and his friends.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I rise to associate this Party with the remarks made by the Hon. Member. This is a task which the Hon. Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) was going to perform, but in his absence I feel that I am perhaps best qualified to do so since it was in 1957 that I first entered the House and made the acquaintance of Mr. Enfield.

I do personally as well as on behalf of my Party join in the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Member in view of the background of the late Frank Enfield in the RCAF and his distinguished service on the part of his country in that force. We would also like to extend the sympathies of Members of this Party to those who have survived Mr. Enfield.

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Madam Speaker, on behalf of my Leader and Members of my Party, I would like to associate our Party with the remarks that have already been made about Frank Enfield, the former Member for York-Scarborough. We would also like to extend our condolences to members of his family.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, today question No. 4,992 will be answered.

[*Text*]

CANADIAN HYDROGRAPHIC SERVICE ADVERTISING PAMPHLET

Question No. 4,992—**Mr. Siddon:**

1. How many copies of the Canadian Hydrographic Service advertising pamphlet (Catalogue No. Fs 23-24/1982E ISBN O-662-12063-9) were printed?

2. What was the total cost of printing the pamphlet in (a) French (b) English?

3. What was the target audience for the brochure?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): 1. There were 81,750 English and 30,000 French copies printed.

2. The total cost was $8,845.94 for the French version, $20,424.29 for the English version.

3. The target audience for this brochure was the general public including senior personnel in industry and government, users of nautical charts and CHS data, students, the fishing and transportation industries.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, if question No. 4,873 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

Madam Speaker: The question mentioned by the Parliamentary Secretary has been answered. Is it the pleasure of the House that question No. 4,873 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

IMPORTATION OF TOBACCO

Question No. 4,873—**Mr. Bradley:**

1. What was the total poundage of tobacco imported in (a) 1981 (b) 1982 and, by year, what was the breakdown in poundage and types of tobacco?

2. What is the forecasted poundage of tobacco importation for 1983 and what is the breakdown of poundage and types in the forecast?

3. In relation to the different types of tobacco imported in the fiscal year 1981-82, what were the tariff regulations in effect?

4. In relation to the different types of tobacco anticipated to be imported in 1983, what are the tariffs to be imposed?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Evans: I suggest, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Madam Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT, 1983

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Monday, October 24, 1983, consideration of Bill C-152, an Act respecting the organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates; and Motions Nos. 2 and 8 (Mr. Lambert).

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I was saying yesterday at six o'clock that Motion No. 2 which stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) concerning Clause 5 of Bill C-132 reads: "A Minister of State for External Relations shall". If the Hon. Member wishes the motion to remain with the word "shall" included rather than the word "may", then of course there is no possible way we could support this motion.

● (1510)

The original Clause 5 states that a Minister for External Relations may be appointed by commission under the Great Seal to assist the Minister. While I agree that it should be a Minister of State for all the reasons that I gave yesterday, my own feeling and that of my Party is that there should not be and there need not be such a Minister at all.

As a result of the motion by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West stating that a Minister for External Relations "shall" be appointed, rather than "may", he is making it obligatory for the Government to appoint such a Minister, as is the case in Clause 4 respecting a Minister for International Trade. Clause 4 states that a Minister for International Trade "shall" be appointed, so that the Government has no choice but to appoint a Minister for International Trade. We do not want to see that same obligation with respect to the Minister for External Relations. That is why I said yesterday that I thought the Hon. Member had inadvertently made a mistake and used the word "shall" instead of the world "may". Apparently he wants to continue using the word "shall".

Our Party does not see any reason why there should be a new Minister called the Minister for External Relations. As many Members of the Official Opposition pointed out yesterday, it is in fact even more ludicrous than including the Minister for International Trade, because at least the duties of that Minister are specified in the Act. I agree with the Hon. Member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley) that the Minister does not have his own departmental structure under him, but nevertheless a working relationship has already developed between the Deputy Minister of International trade and the Minister for International Trade. I am sure the Hon. Member for Don Valley West would agree. But in the case of the Minister for External Relations, that relationship does not even exist.

The third Deputy Minister in the department which is provided for in Clause 9 under Subclause (2) is the Deputy Minister for Political Affairs. When one examines the chart, one can see that there is not a solid or dotted line from the position of Deputy Minister for Political Affairs to anyone at the ministerial level. Although the officials to whom I have talked agree that there should be a dotted line between the position of Deputy Minister for International Trade and the Minister, there will be no line at all with respect to the Minister of External Relations. Therefore that Minister is really in limbo under this incredible reorganization. There has already been appointed a Minister for External Relations, the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Lapointe). The present Minister of State for External Relations is the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Carleton (Mr. Pepin). Judging by the problems they have experienced in the House and elsewhere so far, it is quite clear that in the case of the Hon. Member for Charlevoix, he was not clear, and in the case of the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Carleton he is not clear, about the functions of the Minister for External Relations.

I have already stated that I do see some logic for including the Minister for International Trade—although I would have preferred the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to remain as it was—but I see no logic in having a Minister for External Relations. When I asked the committee why it was necessary, one reason suggested was that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) was a very busy person since he was also Deputy Prime Minister and had many other duties. I could not help but recall that when the Secretary of State for External Affairs held that portfolio a few years ago, he was also a Deputy Prime Minister and had many duties to perform. At that time he did not need an assistant called the Minister for External Relations. We are all aware that this Minister has no functions whatsoever described in the Act itself. Clause 11 outlines the powers, duties and functions of the Minister, that is to say the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Clause 12 outlines the duties of the Minister for International Trade. The duties or powers of the Minister for External Relations are not delineated anywhere in the Act.

I suggest that when students of political science and public administration look at the Act and indeed the departmental chart to try to determine the functions of the new Minister for External Relations and a totally unconnected Deputy Minister for Political Affairs, they will be entirely baffled as is, indeed, the Government and the present Minister for External Relations.

At least the Government stated in Clause 5 that a Minister for External Relations may be appointed and was not insisting that there always be a Minister for External Relations. I suspect that after the present incumbent moves on to the other place or wherever, the Government may realize that it will not need to fill this post and for that reason has used the word "may".

Again, I would urge the Official Opposition—after what I thought was an inadvertent mistake—to change the word in Motion No. 2 from "shall", as it is now, to the word "may".

As I have already indicated, we could not possibly support a motion which would make it obligatory for the Government to appoint a Minister for External Relations when we do not believe there is any need to have such a Minister at all.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to spend a few minutes speaking on this Bill because I want to reiterate what a disappointment this Bill is. I was the External Affairs critic when this Bill originally came before the House. It is the greatest illustration of the uselessness of royal commission reports of any piece of legislation that I have ever seen in my life.

Why do I say that? Because we had a Royal Commission on Conditions of Foreign Service. I have the report here in my hand. It reported to the Government in the fall of 1981, I believe November. The report was made public in December. The Royal Commissioner was Miss McDougall who was asked by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to study the foreign service. She reported on October 21, 1981.

In January, 1982, just a couple of months after this Royal Commissioner reported, the Government ignored her report completely and all of her findings and entered into the most complex, complicated amalgamation of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce with the Department of External Affairs that has ever been undertaken. It flew in the face of what she recommended. For example, her recommendation, which was never carried out, was that:

> The Royal Commission Report be tabled in the House of Commons and referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence; that one year from the date of reference the Department of External Affairs and the central agencies involved report back to the Committee on the steps that have been taken with respect to the recommendations; and that the Committee deal with the report as a separate item on the parliamentary agenda and not as part of the consideration of the Estimates.

● (1520)

That was never done. It was completely ignored. There has never been a report, either to this House or to the External Affairs Committee, on what has happened to the recommendations of this report.

In the report the Commissioner found our foreign service to be in a very serious state. Let me read what she reported as found at page 261:

> That there has been a failure of management in, and of, the foreign service is patent: there is a fragmentation of managerial authority and responsibility in Ottawa and at posts and a level of mistrust and competition between various foreign service elements that robs the service of effectiveness.
>
> There is across the service confusion about role and function, uncertainty about careers, an inflexibility and pettiness in administration that is destructive of morale and esprit de corps. There is in Ottawa, and to a lesser degree at posts, a preoccupation with internal procedure and process at the expense of operations that erodes purpose, obscures objectives and frustrates policy.

Those were her findings. What does the Government do in the light of that? It entirely preoccupies itself with procedure and process. Instead of dealing with the evils and weaknesses which the Commissioner found to exist, the Government went ahead and increased the confusion and it obscured the objectives even further. The Government frustrated policy and eroded purpose by starting an immense and complicated amalgamation of other departments with the Department of External Affairs.

The Government did not deal with the problems found by the Royal Commisioner. Miss McDougall went on to say at page 261:

> The failure of management in the foreign service is not so much the failure of individuals as it is the failure of system.

The Government then takes the system and makes it 100 times worse, this system which the Commissioner investigated and which she found to be so deficient. That is why I, for one, have no intention of supporting this legislation. It is a monstrosity. It is monstrous for the Government to cast aside that report. Miss McDougall was never consulted by the Prime Minister as far as I know after she brought in that report. The Prime Minister who appointed her never consulted her. I asked her that question in the External Affairs Committee. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) never spoke with her or even received the report, or did any of the other characters of the triumvirate, the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin) and the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan). None of them saw the commissioner after she presented this report. They went ahead with this monumental piece of ineptitude, this monstrosity, this bureaucratic nightmare in January, 1982 which is still not completed today. At the Pearson Building the fighting is still going on as to who controls what, who has what floor space, how much floor space and all the rest of it.

Here was a finding on the management of the foreign service completely ignored by the Government. What was the purpose of this whole reorganization, which did not deal with the evils or the conditions that Miss McDougall found to exist? Let me make one more reference to the report. At page 85 we find:

> Misunderstanding of the foreign service role is not particularly an "Ottawa" problem either. What is a problem in Ottawa is an apparent inability to balance the two elements in the foreign service role and to use the foreign service effectively.

On the next page we find:

> On the operations side, there is little sense at the posts that Ottawa really knows or cares what goes on there on a day-to-day basis—and there is little to be heard in Ottawa to dispel that belief.

Out in the field they do not think that Ottawa knows or cares what is going on or that anyone is listening. Does the Government do something to attempt to deal with that problem? Not at all. It makes the problem ten times worse by undertaking monumental and confusing restructuring. Whenever the Government does not know what to do, whenever the Government has no clear sense of purpose, whenever it does not have any clear policy, that is what it does and we have seen a complete failure of the Government's foreign policy today. We have seen it manifested in this House today. Canada is supposed to be a leading country with connections with the Caribbean—our tremendous Commonwealth Caribbean connections—yet it is ignored by the six countries of the eastern Caribbean which, together with the United States, invaded Grenada during the last 24 hours. Canada was not even

warned in advance by any of those countries we have assisted, Mr. Speaker.

What a positive testimonial to the complete and utter bankruptcy and failure of Canadian foreign policy! The Prime Minister of this country puts himself up to be the great connector. He is going to be the great peacemaker. He was going to resolve East-West tensions. He is going to get the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. together. But our own great ally, President Reagan and his government, does not even inform the Prime Minister of the actions they are going to take in the Commonwealth Caribbean, in our backyard, before they go ahead and take those actions. Why not? Because they have no trust.

Mr. Evans: Order. That is not relevant. This is report stage.

Mr. Crosbie: The Parliamentary Secretary over there is croaking that I am not relevant. He can cease croaking. Nothing could be more relevant. This is what comes of ignoring the—

Mr. Evans: This is report stage.

Mr. Crosbie: I do not care what stage it is. It is important that this be said and that it be reported.

We have the ultimate proof today of the failure of the Canadian foreign service, and we know that neither the United States nor the Commonwealth Caribbean countries, Jamaica and Barbados, trust our Prime Minister. They do not even ask him for his advice. They do not ask him to join them in the actions they have decided to take. He is a washout as far as they are concerned.

The Government is not serious and the Prime Minister is not serious when he has a Royal Commission undertake this kind of task and then ignores completely the report brought in.

Mr. McDermid: It is put on a shelf to collect dust.

Mr. Crosbie: Yes. Now we have another one. We have the Macdonald Commission. There are ten people on that Commission. There was only one on the one I have referred to, Miss McDougall. On the Macdonald Commission there are ten people the Government can ignore—perhaps it is 12—except big Donald Macdonald. Of course, the Government is not going to ignore him. The Government is hoping to do something with poor Donald. Why have a Royal Commission if that is the way it is treated?

Not only am I opposed to this Bill because it is a monumental flop, a travesty, but I am opposed to it because of what the Government has done to the Department of External Affairs, how the Government has crushed it and how in 20 years it has become almost beyond laughing at. Its stature in the world is laughable because of the abysmal kind of leadership it has. I am opposed to this Bill because of what the Government has done with DREE, Mr. Speaker.

The Prime Minister said on January 12, 1982, when he announced the reorganization of these Government departments, that he was going to establish a new Ministry of State for Economic and Regional Development. He was going to replace DREE by a Department for Regional and Industrial Expansion. It is "I" before "E". He is going to change DREE to DRIE. He said: "The long-standing priority of assisting the disadvantaged regions of Canada is as high as before". That is a complete falsehood. I say at this report stage that it is a complete and utter falsehood and, if told deliberately, would be in the category of a complete lie.

What has the Government done with assisting the disadvantaged regions of Canada? While they are drowning, the Prime Minister and the Government steps on their heads to help them drown. They do not put out their hands to help them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but his time has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): While I am on my feet, I did listen attentively, as I usually do, to the Hon. Member's remarks. After checking in some detail the contents of the amendment and its relationship to the Bill, I must say that the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) did depart extensively from the amendment.

It is too late now for me to ask him to undo what he has said, but I caution Members who will be recognized next to please adhere to the standard practice of relevancy in addressing their remarks to the amendments presented by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

Mr. Crosbie: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I apologize.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): I rise to make a short contribution to the debate, Mr. Speaker. I should say, and I think you would agree with me, that while the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) may not in parliamentary terms always be relevant, he is informative, always useful and always entertaining. I am sure that is why Members opposite chose not to rise to their feet and ask you to rule on his relevancy. That probably should have preceded any ruling made by yourself. I only want to respond to the comments made by the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) who asked why we have this form of amendment. It is for two reasons.

• (1530)

The points I want to make briefly are that the reasons we prefer the term Minister of State to the suggestion that the Minister be a full Minister are very similar to those I made in the intervention I made yesterday with regard to the Minister of State for International Trade. The Parliamentary Secretary nods his head and grins slightly. We do not need to repeat at

length the argument that changing the title of Minister of State to that of Minister is not done for an international reason. It is strictly an internal reason in terms of increasing the number of Parliamentary Secretaries that can be created.

Here we have a case that one might describe with irony as equity. The decision was made that since the Minister of State for International Trade was to be a Minister, I suspect somebody decided that equity meant that the Minister for International Affairs ought to be a Minister and not a Minister of State. In fact, that creates another Parliamentary Secretary for the Government to appoint. I suspect that is the real reason behind this change.

The amendment as we have moved it is in form the same as the amendment with regard to the proposal to change the title of the Minister of International Trade to that of a Minister of State. In both cases we have used the word "shall", in other words that the appointment must be made.

There is a technical reason for that. As I indicated yesterday, Ministers of State may be appointed by the Prime Minister without reference to any piece of legislation under the Ministers of State Act. In this case, the proposal was to create a Minister of External Relations without a Department to administer. In fact, if you moved an amendment to say there may be a Minister of State for International Relations, there would be no necessity to move that amendment. In fact, Mr. Speaker, you would have ruled that that was a deletion. Certainly this was true in committee, that that would in effect have been a deletion since there is no authority required in the law to appoint a Minister of State. That authority exists in the Ministers of State Act. Therefore, the only form of amendment that could bring it to the floor is an amendment that there shall be a Minister of State for International Relations.

The arguments of some on the question of whether it is an absolute necessity that there shall be one are most interesting. I am here to say as the shadow Cabinet spokesman for the Minister of State for International Relations that I believe the post is absolutely essential and that Canada's foreign relations are best assisted by spreading the load. One of my colleagues tells me not to push that too far. I will not.

I believe that the ideal circumstance would be to create a situation in which we got to the resolution and simply said that we believe there should or may be a Minister of State for International Relations. The only way to put any pressure on the Government to agree to that decision was to move that amendment.

I do not really believe the Government is likely to agree to that. As I said earlier, its chief intent in all of this is to increase the number of Parliamentary Secretaries. That seems to be its clear intention. We will return to that when we get to the amendments on Clause 25. I only wanted to respond to the Hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam as to her understanding about why the amendment has been moved in the form that it has been moved.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I would like to come back to the problem that has been created by this Bill. I am going to invent another word. I used one yesterday which was a little heavy. I will transform it into a verb. What they are trying to do is to "tricephalize" the Department of External Affairs. When it was operating with a Secretary of State for External Affairs as the principal and only Minister, Canada stood high in the eyes of the world as having a coherent, reputable and eminently reasonable foreign policy stance around the world. Some time around 1966, 1967 or 1968, a whole shift in that stance occurred.

I have just recently seen the latest volume of one of the most outstanding of Canada's foreign service officers, Mr. Charles Ritchie. This occurs in the book. I cannot give the exact words, but it goes like this. In his first interview with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), he was asked whether the Department of External Affairs was a necessary function of Government. Coupling that with the attitude which this Prime Minister has about the role that he himself could play, ought to play and intended to play on the world scene, I can understand that question. It was never difficult to answer. It was one of those impudent sort of questions which the Prime Minister would, I suspect, take a great deal of delight in asking.

I do not know whether he was satisfied with the answer given to him by Mr. Ritchie, but following very shortly after that man's appearance as the Prime Minister of Canada, a sequence of shifts, turns, contortions, twists and manipulations of the Department of External Affairs occurred. First, consultants were called in to examine the organization of the Department. I see a Member shaking his head. I was in the Department of External Affairs and I experienced that.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The only reason I was shaking my head as the Hon. Member was referring to me was that the Hon. Member's comments were about the history and evolution of the Department of External Affairs. We have before us now two motions. Those motions refer specifically to the establishment of a position called a Minister for External Relations. Certainly the Hon. Member's comments would be very appropriate at third reading stage when we are talking about the final discussion of the philosophy of the Bill. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you rule on the relevancy of those comments as they pertain specifically to the two motions before us for consideration at report stage.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order! The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans) seems to be raising a valid point. The Chair was listening carefully to the comments of the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro), and I also thought the Hon. Member's remarks were rather general in scope. However, the Chair prefers to give the Hon. Member who has the floor the benefit of the doubt, and perhaps he could inform the House in what way his remarks are related to the two amendments being considered.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, since we are discussing the matter of appointing two additional ministers to

the Department of External Affairs, I think this justifies the comments I just made.

● (1540)

[*English*]

We have now before us the notion that the Department of External Affairs is not properly organized and it needs two more Ministers. Here we are suggesting there be Ministers of State. I served for some 25 years in the Department of External Affairs and I think I know something about it.

There can be only one Minister responsible for that Department in the eyes of Canada and in the eyes of the world. It is the designation of those particular Cabinet Ministers that we now have before us. I think we have to remind ourselves that it is very likely to be no more than an ego trip on the part of the possible holders of those fancy titles to be designated the Minister for External Relations or the Minister for International Trade, as the case may be. We are talking about both of them.

In international parlance, one Minister must speak for a Department or the Government with respect to the affairs of his Department. Here we are talking about three Ministers being authorized to speak on behalf of their Department on the domestic or foreign stage. That is why I felt that it was appropriate that I should describe the whole sequence of transformations and mish-mash that have been imposed on the Department of External Affairs.

I suspect that there are other designs, perhaps even to abolish the Department, but the only explanation I can think of for proposing this as the logical sequence beyond all the other proposals that were made is to destroy the morale of the Department of External Affairs. In that Department you have a group of officers who were loyal proudly up to a point in time. I was mentioning that point in time when I started to list the manner in which they were being demoralized, first by introduction of managerial studies of one kind or another. What happened? Those who examined the Department of External Affairs found it was a nice Department to work in, so in the reorganization of the Department, they wanted to make a place for themselves. They knew damn all about External Affairs but they wanted to get a little piece of that action. They wanted to be in because it was a prestigious Department. Rightly so. Therefore, on two or three occasions that occurred. Each time there was a re-examination of the Department's organization, whether on geographical lines, on functional lines or a mixture of the two, the examining consultant managed to infiltrate and leave behind a number of those who were assigned the job of examining it.

These people are professionals. They are trained very carefully. They have to be because they represent Canada abroad. And then the notion of collective bargaining for tradesmen is introduced into the whole operation of the Department of External Affairs. That was unsettling. Then you have budgeting by objective. Instead of reporting on what they were supposed to be reporting on, they have to spend an unusually large amount of time trying to analyse the requests that they were getting from Ottawa to do their budgeting on objectives. I think the expression that was used was "budgeting by objectives".

Then there is the integration of the clerical staff of all services abroad; immigration, trade and so on. They were taken into the Department of External Affairs, swelling the clerical staff personnel and leaving the trade officers, immigration officers and what have you without clerical staff under their direction. Then you have the integration and reclassification of the trade and immigration officers and the recommendations of the McDougall Commission which verbalized the confusion and distress of the foreign service officers of that professional staff.

And now capping it all we have the attempt to tricephalize, as I call it, this Department.

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

Some Hon. Members: Question.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): All those in favour, will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): All those opposed, will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): In my opinion the nays have it. The motion is defeated.

Motions Nos. 2 and 8 (Mr. Lambert) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Before proceeding to the next grouping, the Chair should perhaps remind Hon. Members that Motions Nos. 4, 5 and 6 were grouped for debate. The affirmative to Motion No. 6 would dispose of Motions Nos. 4 and 5. In the case of a negative vote on No. 6, the Chair would put the question on Motions Nos. 4 and 5 separately.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West) moved:

Motion No. 4

That Bill C-152 be amended in Clause 25

(*a*) by striking out lines 24 to 28 at page 10; and

(*b*) by striking out lines 34 to 40 at page 10.

Motion No. 5

That Bill C-152 be amended in Clause 25 by striking out lines 29 to 33 at page 10.

Motion No. 6

That Bill C-152 be amended by deleting Clause 25.

He said: This is possibly the more controversial portion of the amendment of this particular Bill. What it purports to do is to create more Parliamentary Secretaries in the House of Commons and in the Senate. No Minister appeared today to explain the rationale of the Government in this regard. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans) offered his opinions, but of course he was handicapped by his position. In this context of the Canadian Parliament, Parliamentary Secretaries are not given the authority of the Minister at the time of discussing a Bill before a committee. I have known that for over 26 years. I started my parliamentary life as a Parliamentary Assistant. In those days one's presence was tolerated but one's voice was not to be heard except to accept a question on behalf of one's Minister. Subsequently, the quality of the men who occupied the positions of Parliamentary Assistants, and then Parliamentary Secretaries, was such that they overshadowed their Ministers. That was the chief drawback to Parliamentary Secretaries. If they overshadowed their Ministers they were sent on trips to the North Pole.

● (1550)

I hope that the Parliamentary Secretary or someone speaking on behalf of the Government will explain clearly the rationale for having Parliamentary Secretaries in the other place. Is it a reflection that the two or three Members from the other place who are presently Ministers in the Cabinet, one of them for Social Development, another as Government Leader in the Senate and a third responsible for the Wheat Board, want someone appointed who will relate more to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) say, or perhaps External Affairs? I do not know what the choice will be.

Apparently there are to be at least two more Parliamentary Secretaries in the House of Commons, one for External Relations and one for International Trade. At the present time there is one Parliamentary Secretary without a Minister. According to Wednesday's *Hansard* there is a Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Mines, although that position is defunct. No reason has been given for this.

One can ask, as I did yesterday, if this Bill is an attempt to bring a closer score to the game. At the present time there are 35 Ministers and 27 Parliamentary Secretaries and if my count is correct, with somewhere between four and six more we will have a tie football game—a nip at the post on behalf of Cabinet, before the Parliament comes to an end.

I do not believe this standard rotation once a year is necessary. It is almost a distribution of an additional $10,000 to some 25 to 28 Members of Parliament on the Government side, some of whom, quite frankly, do not earn one-tenth of it because they are not assigned any duties by their Minister. Quite often the Minister does not require a Parliamentary Secretary because there are no duties that the Minister cannot cover. Those are the problems of the limited scope of one Department compared to another.

There are constituencies in various Provinces where the population is such that they do not require what you would call a full time Member of Parliament even, as well as all the support staff that is accorded to that Member, compared to some of the more populous constituencies like Mississauga North. I sympathize with Members like the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher). There are counterparts on the Opposition side where the population of a constituency far exceeds the average and a Member is hard put to give the same degree of service simply because he cannot get the facilities. He is told that his standard issue is so much and he is paid the same amount as the man who represents less than half the number of people he does. That is one of our problems.

The Minister of Finance, for instance, receives the same salary as the Minister from the smallest Department of Government. I think there is a very strong case to be made about the present number of Cabinet Ministers. How they can put together a coherent policy with a group of 35, is beyond me. Years ago I was in a Cabinet of 25, and at times we felt it was difficult to get a consensus and to get our work going unless the chairman was a very draconian person and cut that discussion off by even one or two minutes per Minister should they claim the right to speak. Funnily enough, just as in the House, If there is not a time limitation on debate, everybody decides he is going to have the same amount of time. Administratively, this cannot be done as there is just too much work to get through.

Instead of having a reduction we are now getting an expansion. With six more Parliamentary Secretaries—the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council indicates the number is four but I think at a stretch we could get a fifth one—it means $40,000 in additional salaries and an additional secretary assigned to each Parliamentary Secretary. Of course, the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council does not get an additional salary because there is no Department, it is an office and the Minister is the Government House Leader. All that is required, Mr. Speaker, is an office in the parliamentary building. That is all.

● (1600)

Therefore, I would strongly urge Hon. Members to vote in favour of my amendment, because we do not see that need for additional Parliamentary Secretaries.

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, in a sense there are two aspects of this motion which are of particular significance. The first is that it refuses the power to create four additional Parliamentary Secretaries. The second, of course, is that it says that the appointment of Parliamentary Secretaries should be from the House of Commons only and should not include Senators. The New Democratic Party has long been in favour of both these points, particularly the latter, of course.

What I find particularly discouraging is that in committee, the then Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Hon. Member for Shefford (Mr. Lapierre), told the Hon. Members in the Conservative and New Democratic Parties that he would undertake to talk with

the House Leader and others on the Government side because he felt there was a disposition—I do not want to put words in his mouth, and one can read the committee minutes and see exactly what he said—on the Government side to at least remove that part of Clause 25 which would allow for the appointment of Parliamentary Secretaries from the other place. Although he could not, of course, promise anything, he did make us all feel that we need not push and keep pressing the matter in committee because we might find that when the Bill finally came to the House for report stage, the Government itself would have decided at least to remove that part of Clause 25 which allowed Parliamentary Secretaries to be appointed from the Senate. Indeed, it might decide to put that part in as it was originally. Either the Hon. Member did not do that, or he tried and was unsuccessful. However, it did cause many of us to discontinue to press the matter too strongly in committee.

I feel I speak for most of us who were on the Miscellaneous Estimates Committee when Bill C-152 was before it when I say we really did expect that to happen, given the degree of opposition, not only on the part of the two Opposition Parties, but also on the part of a number of Government backbenchers, to the idea of appointing Parliamentary Secretaries from the Senate.

The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) was present on behalf of the Government, and I have forgotten his capacity.

An Hon. Member: Something minor.

Miss Jewett: Something minor. However, he made a rather incredible argument that one of these days the Senate would be reformed and it might even become a partially elected body. In that case, it would be desirable to have Parliamentary Secretaries appointed from the Senate as well as the House of Commons. That was the argument of the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre in supporting the proposal of the Government. Several members of the Committee pointed out to him that it would be time enough to address the issue of the appointment of Parliamentary Secretaries from the Senate after it had been reformed—and we have no guarantee whatsoever that it will be reformed or, preferably, abolished. They said also that until there is such a guarantee—in fact, until such reforms are in place—we should not be giving any consideration whatsoever to appointing Parliamentary Secretaries from that body. The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre said that that was a good point. That was his main argument for defending a policy of appointing Parliamentary Secretaries from the Senate. Then, when we suggest to him that it will be time enough after the Senate is reformed, he agrees that is a good point. So I cannot for the life of me understand why the backbenchers on the Government side did not persuade the Government to withdraw that part of Clause 25 of the Bill.

I do not know if other members of the Committee feel the same way, but I almost feel a little cheated by the Government on this issue. I feel that we were really made to feel that the Government would certainly reconsider this favourably. However, it did not.

I agree with other Hon. Members that the increase by four of the number of Parliamentary Secretaries is totally unnecessary. As has already been pointed out, we have far too large a Cabinet now for the efficient operation of Government. We do not need any further Parliamentary Secretaries. My mind boggles when I think of the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin), about whom I was talking a little earlier this afternoon, now being eligible for a Parliamentary Secretary because he is a Minister and not a Minister of State. None of us can figure out—nor can the Minister, for that matter—what the role of the Minister is. What are his powers, his functions? Nothing is in the Bill about that whatsoever. The former Minister, the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Lapointe), could not figure out entirely what he was doing when he was Minister of State for External Relations. In fact, I have it on excellent authority that he went on bended knees to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and said, "Put me somewhere where I will know what it is I am supposed to do". I have that on excellent authority.

Mr. Lapointe (Charlevoix): That is not true.

Miss Jewett: He did. His mind boggled also, Mr. Speaker, when he realized that he would also be entitled to a Parliamentary Secretary. He did not know what he was doing himself, but he would have to explain to a Parliamentary Secretary what the Parliamentary Secretary should be doing. So the Prime Minister kindly obliged and moved him on to a job where he has a little better delineation of his workload. To think that the Hon. Member might have had a Parliamentary Secretary from the Senate, the mind boggles even more. That, perhaps, was one reason why the clause which includes the Senate was left in, because they figured they did not know either what the Minister should do, and since people do not expect Senators to do all that much, perhaps it should be left in the Bill that Parliamentary Secretaries can be appointed from the Senate so the Minister of External Relations could have a Parliamentary Secretary who does not know what his function is.

Although we are concerned about the growth in the number of Parliamentary Secretaries, and that is why we support this motion, we are, as I mentioned earlier, particularly concerned about drawing Parliamentary Secretaries from an appointed body. It is simply not good enough to say that perhaps one day that body will be reformed and will become elected, or partly elected, as the main reason for drawing Parliamentary Secretaries from the Senate. I hope that perhaps some of the multitude sitting across the way wish to speak on this motion and wish to give it their support. I have a number of friends still on that side of the House and I would wager my last dollar that the vast majority of them would prefer to keep our institution as democratic as possible and would prefer, therefore, to have Parliamentary Secretaries drawn from the democratically elected body of this country, that is, the House of Commons.

● (1610)

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on behalf of my colleague on this amendment as well. I think it ties in directly with the previous amendments put forward, Motions Nos. 2 and 3, I believe they were, in connection with the nomenclature and whether it be a Minister or Minister of State. They are all linked together and the intent is to increase the number of Parliamentary Secretaries. This is a very simple change but I think there is some significance to it and that is what I wish to address my remarks to.

We are looking at the thin edge of the wedge here because, as others have pointed out, there is no control at all on the number of Ministers of State we can have. We have seen as part of Bill C-152 that as the number of Ministers of State increases, so can the number of Parliamentary Secretaries. During this Parliament there have been three new Ministers of State created, the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. MacLaren), the Minister of State for Mines, and now the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin). That will give us three Ministers plus three Parliamentary Secretaries in the global effort in external affairs. On the other side of this Government reorganization Bill we have three more Ministers and possibly three more Parliamentary Secretaries being created. This leads me to think that there is a very real danger of looseness at the top of these particular Departments when you have six people who are in a very loose way responsible for different elements of the administration.

What concerns me, and I addressed this in part in my remarks on second reading, is that there needs to be a very tight administration of these Departments in order to ensure proper linkage, for example, between the trade effort and the industrial policy effort. I said earlier that the philosophies of the two Departments being merged were different. One was creating jobs, regional development, and the other was trying to take advantage of excellence in Canadian industry in order to capitalize on trade opportunities internationally. Given the merger, there is a possibility those two very worth-while objectives will be submerged, with the result that the over-all effort will be much less effective than it had been under two separate Departments.

We see the same problem in the Department of External Affairs with the trade function. There must be a very close relationship between the trade function and external affairs and the industrial development function in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Those two functions have been together, I submit, because of past relationships or friendships amongst the individuals who have worked together in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. But as the two are split and as time passes and people move on to other jobs, we will not have those personal relationships. For that reason there should be a very clear and tight administration from the top. Once we lose that, as will happen if we have three Ministers and three Parliamentary Secretaries, then we have lost that very valuable link which is critically important in capitalizing on trade opportunities in very difficult and competitive international markets.

Let me ask another question, Mr. Speaker, relating to the three amendments of my colleague. Why do we need to have Senators as Parliamentary Secretaries? I have not heard this addressed properly by Hon. Members opposite. I might say that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lumley), who is a very critical element of this particular legislation, has yet to speak, and we have only 90 minutes of debate left. I asked the Minister as he was leaving the House today when we would get his side, his understanding of how he was going to address the problems Members have brought forward in a very constructive way in debate on this legislation. He said, "Not today. I am sorry, I cannot do it today". We have to have these answers, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have some understanding of how this enormous reorganization of the two Departments will affect us as Members of Parliament, affect the private sector, and what sort of policy will come forward in the coming months.

To get back to my point concerning the Senators, what has brought the Government to the point of expanding Parliamentary Secretaries to include Senators? Do we need all that help in the Senate? I am not aware myself, Mr. Speaker, of the Senators being run off their feet with activity. In fact, one of the concerns expressed by some Senators is that the Government has not involved the Senate to the extent necessary to keep them as busy as they would like to be. I am sure there are other Senators, particularly from the other side, who would be a little upset that I am encouraging a greater degree of activity there, but are we to infer from what the Parliamentary Secretary said that this is a very integral part of Senate reform and the Senate must be brought into the process to a greater extent?

Mr. Epp: Who said that?

Mr. Wilson: The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans). This must be viewed as part of parliamentary reform.

Mr. Evans: I said it could be.

Mr. Wilson: He says it could be. Why are we jumping the gun? Why is it necessary to throw another $10,000 into the path of the Senators? Surely putting them in the trough until age 75 is good enough. Do we have to give them another $10,000 or whatever it is to keep them happy? Are they not happy enough now with that sinecure for the next 20, 30 or 40 years of their lives? I would have thought that a Senate seat was enough. Maybe the Parliamentary Secretary can take us into his confidence and tell us about some of the problems Liberal patronage is having these days as the Liberals look at the 62 per cent figure in the polls. Maybe that is the problem, they have to pack some of these things in a little more tightly before the end of this Parliament.

Let me make just one final point concerning the signal this conveys to people outside of Parliament. Why do we have to broaden the number of Parliamentary Secretaries to include

the Senate and pay people additional money for carrying on these services? We have been told this is a Government of restraint, but surely that is not so, given the way it is throwing money around. It is not a big amount of money. We are not going to go broke because of the expenditure of that amount of money. We are broke already and we have to demonstrate to Canadians that we in the Houses of Parliament are serious about the problems that we are facing with the size of the Government deficit. This is just one more signal that is being conveyed to Canadians to demonstrate that this is not a Government of restraint and it is not a Government which takes seriously in any way at all the very important financial problems that we in the country are facing.

● (1620)

I call upon Hon. Members opposite, and particularly the backbenchers, to support us. We now have the opportunity to vote on an element of the Bill that is not very significant to Government reorganization as such but is only a sideline to that reorganization. A vote against that will not cause the reorganization to stop in its tracks. We know that the Government must force this Government Organization Act through. It has been in operation for 18 months now, and we cannot turn back the clock. Decisions have already been made, and we expect that. However, this is one point on which backbenchers can demonstrate their independence from the Government. They can demonstrate to the Government their dissatisfaction with the example set of increasing the size of the trough for the Party in power, and they can also demonstrate to the people of Canada that at least the backbench, if not the Government, takes very seriously the question of Government restraint.

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important amendment and a very important issue which is now before the House and it is one which disturbs me a great deal. The way I approach an amendment of this nature, Mr. Speaker, is to first ask why the changes have been proposed. We Progressive Conservatives very much believe in change but we believe philosophically that there must be a demonstrated reason for that change. We do not believe in change simply for the sake of change.

When I ask myself why this particular proposal has been made, I find it very difficult to find a convincing answer. It has been suggested, of course, that there should be more Parliamentary Secretaries and that those Parliamentary Secretaries should in some cases be selected from the Senate. Looking at the question in those terms, any reason I can find for the Government having proposed this legislation is rather unconvincing. Why do we need more Parliamentary Secretaries? There has been no real evidence presented as to the need for more Parliamentary Secretaries in terms of workload.

One cannot help but think that this proposal represents some sort of boondoggle on the part of the Government. More Parliamentary Secretaries would mean more opportunities to reward faithful Party supporters either within this House or within the other. It therefore seems to me that more Parliamentary Secretaries would enable the Government and the Cabinet to keep the backbench in line.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if one were to be Machiavellian, one could see that it would be useful for the Government to distribute more patronage at a time when the Gallup poll shows that there are reasons for concern on the other side of the House and at a time when we are led to believe that there is dissatisfaction within the ranks and therefore a need for more goodies to be distributed. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that reason is an inadequate one for proposing a change. The possibility that such a reason may exist is one reason why we on this side of the House would oppose this particular measure.

I am particularly concerned, Mr. Speaker, by the suggestion that Senators should be eligible for appointment as Parliamentary Secretaries because I can see no reason for that proposal. Surely none of us would contend that the Senators themselves need the additional stipend of some $10,000. Surely we do not believe that there is such a lack of talent on the other side of the House that they must go to the Senate to find people to fill these positions should the positions be created. Surely we do not believe that this proposal in itself will somehow make the Senate a more viable institution than it is now.

At the Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, we expressed the opinion that perhaps if the Senate were reformed, there would be some legitimate reason for making this proposal. If it is reformed, then it might well be appropriate for this measure to be introduced in the House. Prior to that reform taking place, I can see no logical explanation whatsoever for this proposal to be made at this time.

It has been suggested that we are only speaking about four Parliamentary Secretaries and therefore, it has been suggested, we are only speaking about the expenditure of some $40,000. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very important point which must be addressed. In the minds of many Canadians, $40,000 is a great deal of money. It may not be very much money when it is compared to the size of the deficit that the Government has incurred to this point in time. However, to the unemployed Canadian, $40,000 is a great deal of money.

We read in the papers that the various Ministers on that side of the House are searching through their budgets in an attempt to find money to deal with unemployment. There has been some suggestion that if they can find this money, they will direct it toward youth unemployment. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government is serious about its concern for the unemployed youth, it now has the opportunity to withdraw this particular measure and support the amendment which is before the House, which will prohibit this expenditure of $40,000. That in itself would be a step in the right direction.

This morning I spoke to a young lady who was in great distress. She told me that she had $86.19 left to her name. She was searching for employment and she was searching for a place to live. For someone in that particular position—and unfortunately there are too many who are in that position today—the unnecessary expenditure of $40,000 is a shame,

and it is an irresponsible act about which all Members of the House should feel very, very concerned.

We on this side of the House believe in economy whether it be of a huge sum of money or of a smaller sum of money, and we advocate that this amendment is a very small step but a significant step in that direction. We also believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have a responsibility to our constituents to try to achieve smaller rather than bigger Government. During the course of the recent byelection in Brandon-Souris, I knocked on many doors and stood on many doorsteps. Many people expressed the opinion to me that Government had grown to such an extent that it was largely out of control. I would therefore oppose the addition of four Parliamentary Secretaries for that reason, Mr. Speaker, if for no other reason.

It seems to me that this measure to provide for the addition of Parliamentary Secretaries and the eligibility of Senators, if it is passed, denies the concept of responsible Government as I understand it. As I see the function of the other place at this point in time, prior to the reform which we hope will occur, it is really an institution of a sober second voice which may perform a very useful function in terms of operating at committee stage and the like but does not really play a role in responsible Government as most of us understand that principle.

Responsible Government as we understand it means that members of the executive should essentially and primarily be Members of this House and they should be accountable to Members of this House. It is very important, therefore, that the principal players in the Government be selected from the House. I can see no reason why we should make Members of the other House eligible for appointments of this kind as Parliamentary Secretaries. In fact, according to my studies, it would be a negation of the principles of responsible Government.

I would urge Members of the House, including Members opposite, to accept this amendment. Surely there must be some Members opposite who feel a bit uncomfortable about a proposal which suggests that somehow there are too few Members of the House of Commons to fill the positions of Parliamentary Secretaries. They must also feel uncomfortable with the expenditure of unnecessary funds in a time of high unemployment and a time of high deficit. I would urge them, therefore, to take this opportunity to negate a small but very important part of this Bill by accepting the amendment which is before the House which would negate the principle of an increased number of Parliamentary Secretaries and negate the idea that Senators should be eligible for appointment to such positions.

● (1630)

We do not need more Parliamentary Secretaries at this time. We do not need an additional expenditure of $40,000 of a frivolous nature. Very decisively, we do not need Senators to be appointed to these positions. Those who were appointed to the Senate were appointed perhaps for dubious reasons but for a well established purpose. I suggest that they carry on with their task, and I think that we in this House should carry on with our task. We do not need this proposal, and I urge Members of the House to support the amendment and negate the Government proposal.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I join the debate in support of the amendments that are now before us regarding Parliamentary Secretaries. I do not know whether the Members opposite have recently looked at the Wednesday edition of *Hansard* where the list of the Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries appears. If they were to do so, there is no doubt a good number of them would be very pleased to see their names figuring there.

In order to set this debate in some sort of context, I would like to begin my remarks by drawing the attention of the House to the fact that, as those of us in the House know and perhaps some who are watching these proceedings may not know, every Wednesday *Hansard* lists at the back the names and attachments of the Ministry and the Parliamentary Secretaries. There are 35 members of the Ministry in the latest Wednesday edition of *Hansard* on October 19. There will be another list issued tomorrow, and perhaps there may even be 36 Ministers listed. There are 27 Parliamentary Secretaries. We are now being asked in this legislation before us, if it passes without the amendment, to create the power to designate additional Parliamentary Secretaries, which would make approximately 31 or 32. There is almost a race between the Ministry and the Parliamentary Secretaries. While the Ministry is keeping just ahead of the Parliamentary Secretaries, if we are not careful, the Parliamentary Secretaries might very well overtake the Ministers. However, I hope that at least some of the machinery being used in the Privy Council office will enable those who designate Parliamentary Secretaries to realize that any Minister should not have more than one Parliamentary Secretary.

I noticed that no one from the opposite side rises to enter into this debate. I suspect it is probably because they would like to feel that they might be included in one list or the other. Perhaps it is a stage in the direction toward a minister to become a Parliamentary Secretary and learn the procedures in the Department. To the best of my knowledge, Members of the Government have every facility to do that without being Parliamentary Secretaries. Whenever a Parliamentary Secretary rises in his place to answer a question in the absence of a Minister, the answer is almost invariably, "I will take notice of that question and get back to the Member." That is what Parliamentary Secretaries do, as far as this House is concerned. I think we might as well have a little button on the desk where the Minister sits and, if he is away, his seat mate could just press the button and the tape recorder would say, "In the absence of the Minister I will take notice of this question and report back to the Member." That would serve an equally good purpose because we do not get the answer to the question when the Minister is not there.

In fact, I wonder whether Parliamentary Secretaries should even be entitled to reply to questions on the floor of the House. Presumably they have some duties back in their Departments.

Perhaps when the Minister cannot get away, the Parliamentary Secretary addresses a meeting of the Liberal Association in a certain riding or the Chamber of Commerce or the Kiwanis. But that is hardly the sort of duty that fits the Parliamentary Secretary title. The Parliamentary Secretary should have a role in Parliament but does not. However, we are still being asked to authorize the Government to appoint additional Parliamentary Secretaries.

To this point we have been discussing Ministers of State and trying to transform them into Ministers. I believe it is rather interesting to note that in this list which I mentioned at the beginning of my discussion, there are ten Ministers of State within those 35 Ministries, of whom three have Parliamentary Secretaries. One is the Minister of State for Economic Development and the Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Johnston). He has a Parliamentary Secretary. Another is the Minister of State for Multiculturalism (Mr. Collenette), who also has a Parliamentary Secretary. The third is the Minister of State for Small Businesses and Tourism (Mr. Smith). That makes three Ministers of State who have Parliamentary Secretaries.

What about the other seven? They do not have Parliamentary Secretaries, and perhaps that is one of the purposes of this legislation, to put them in a position to designate a Parliamentary Secretary, although I believe it is within the prerogative of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to decide which of the backbenchers is the most deserving to be designated as a Parliamentary Secretary to a Minister.

There is one Minister in particular, the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. MacLaren), who is the last Member on the list of precedence. In many respects, he serves as the left or right hand of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde). He is a glorified Parliamentary Secretary, in a sense, who can travel about the country to speak at the meetings of the chamber of commerce and other organizations with the cachet of the Minister of State.

It strikes me as being most peculiar that some Ministers are anxious to have Parliamentary Secretaries. I guess it is the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin) and the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan) who seem to be anxious to have Parliamentary Secretaries. If the Minister of State for the Canadian Wheat Board wanted to have a Parliamentary Secretary, I wonder if legislation could be forthcoming, once the Government gets this particular legislation through, and it would use its majority to get Parliamentary Secretaries for everyone including the Minister responsible for the Wheat Board and the Minister of State for Social Development, both of whom sit in the other place. It would be a justification to have a spokesman here, but I should not mention that because someone might favour that notion to designate a Parliamentary Secretary here to speak for the Minister of State who sits in the other place. I suspect that if someone has that idea and will pass it along, the result will be that we will have more Parliamentary Secretaries. But, with all due respect, that would make a great deal more sense than some of the idiocy that is in this particular legislation by creating another couple, at least two, more Parliamentary Secretaries in the area of external affairs, external relations or foreign trade or whatever you want to call it. I just lost a title for the Department for which I once worked.

• (1640)

I leave that thought with some backbenchers who are rather anxious or feel neglected that they might want to use this notion to be spokesmen for the absent Ministers or Ministers of State,—those Ministers who do not sit in the House and cannot be questioned. But let me warn any such Parliamentary Secretaries. They had better have some answers and not say, like a broken record, "I will take notice of the question and I will get back to the Member at a suitable opportunity in the future." That is not good enough. A Parliamentary Secretary must have a definable role to play, and I think he should play it honourably and not use the title for the perks. I am sure there are perks. There are financial perks attached to the Parliamentary Secretary status. We are now in times of restraint, restraint of six and five that we hear about, which we now see on the stationery of the Minister. Here we are suggesting that there be not a six and five increase in the Members' emolument by creating him Minister of State, but that it be considerably more than that. I leave it at that with those notions. I think it is a spurious operation. I do hope that we can get some backbone into Members on the opposite side to approve the amendments which have been put by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, along with other Members of my Party I wish to support the amendments put forward by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), that would eliminate those conditions of the Bill which provide that Parliamentary Secretaries can be appointed from the Senate and which increase the number of Parliamentary Secretaries that can be appointed.

We are not opposed in principle to the idea of Parliamentary Secretaries. The principle, I suppose, is a reasonable one in that these Members of Parliament should be able to increase government accountability to the House of Commons, to the elected representatives. They should be able to answer in the House for the Minister when the Minister is not present. It seems reasonable that, up to a point, Parliamentary Secretaries can serve a useful function in that way. Also, being a Parliamentary Secretary serves as a training school for future Ministers. We recognize that, with the heavy load on certain key Ministries, there is difficulty of access. Theoretically, the Parliamentary Secretary can help improve that access and can serve as something of a troubleshooter for the Minister. I know, for example, that one of the former Parliamentary Secretaries to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro) did an excellent job in representing the minister in very difficult situations in which Indian people found themselves across the nation. He represented the Minister, helped in negotiations and reached certain agreements in good faith. Yet, when he came back and tried to implement

some of those agreements, he found out he had to buck the Department, that the Minister was not willing to stand behind him and that he lacked the political clout to implement the agreements in which he had entered in good faith.

Even where a Parliamentary Secretary acts in an effective way as a troubleshooter, we see the situation is often a fraudulent one. It increases the appearance of accountability and increases the appearance of access to Government but in many cases it lacks effective substance.

While we recognize there is some justification for appointing Parliamentary Secretaries to key Ministries, Ministries where there is a heavy workload involved, we oppose the idea that this can be used to justify a Parliamentary Secretary for every Minister, including junior Ministers who report to senior Ministers. It is almost as though having a Parliamentary Secretary for some of these junior Ministers is the equivalent to having the key to the executive washroom.

We oppose the appointment of an increased number of Parliamentary Secretaries. We see this as opening the way for more patronage. This Government has a sorry record on the whole question of patronage. If I were in the Government, I would be trying to cut down the appearance of patronage rather than going along with the situation like this, one through which most Canadians will see and which will be recognized as an increase of patronage. Of course, patronage is the only method the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has for keeping his caucus in line. Perhaps he needs a little more of it at the present time as his unpopularity grows by leaps and bounds.

We believe in difficult times the Government should begin to count the cost of Government. Instead of magnifying that cost and enlarging the size of Government in areas where it is absolutely unnecessary, the Government should begin to show a little bit of restraint. In our Party we believe that restraint has to begin with Government itself rather than its being a method of loading repression on ordinary people. We believe the Government itself should begin to exemplify that spirit of restraint. We certainly do not see it in any proposal that would increase the number of Parliamentary Secretaries.

Our Party is particularly opposed to the idea that Senate appointees could become Parliamentary Secretaries. We know, and all Members of this House know, that the Senate is already the greatest source and goal for Government patronage that we have in Canada. We only need to look at some of the recent appointments to see where the Prime Minister has appointed his personal cronies to the Senate. I suppose we should be thankful in our Party that he chose to appoint the former Member for Spadina to make way for the present Member, but apart from that we have not seen much to commend in Senate appointees.

The Senate as a source for Parliamentary Secretaries is completely unacceptable to our Party. The Senate is an unelected body and an unrepresentative body, a body that is completely out of touch with the thinking of ordinary Canadians. Perhaps the best illustration of that is the most unfortunate case that we saw when the Senate was considering the constitutional accord and Conservative Senator Donohue made racist comments about Canadian Indian people. Although the Senator was a Conservative, even other members of the Senate from the Liberal Party did not feel it incumbent upon them to speak out against this because they thought it was more important to maintain the kind of comfy old boys' tradition than to condemn that kind of racist, bigoted attitude. That is the sort of people we have in the Senate. I say, we do not want them as Parliamentary Secretaries.

We say we do not need any increase in the number of Parliamentary Secretaries. We are not opposed to the basic principle of having some Parliamentary Secretaries, but the number should not be increased at the present time. We are absolutely opposed to the principle of piling patronage on top of patronage and appointing Parliamentary Secretaries from the Senate.

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak very long. As I mentioned before in my two earlier interjections, I have quite strong views about Clause 25 of the Bill. I do not think it will take a long speech to explain them. I maintain that, for reasons I do not fully comprehend, the ancient and important tradition of the Parliamentary Secretary, whose origins are in the British House, has been substantially and, in my view, outrageously eroded in the last dozen years. It has been eroded primarily by a decision taken by the current Government to make a Parliamentary Secretary an almost automatic appointment. The current practice is that Parliamentary Secretaries are appointed on a rotational basis for a term not to exceed a total of two years. A consequence is that every Member of the backbench of the current Government, if he arrived here, for example, ten years ago, can at some point reasonably expect to become a Parliamentary Secretary, automatically, regardless of merit or ability. That is a shame.

• (1650)

The best tradition for Parliamentary Secretaries was that at any given time when you have a Ministry—this Ministry has 35 Ministers and it will be 36 if we get a new Minister of Mines—it is not unreasonable to assume that the Government of the day, of whatever Party, may need to look down the road for the potential replacement of perhaps half a dozen or a dozen Ministers. In fact, in the history of this Parliament, the largest shuffle of a Cabinet ever held removed six Ministers. That was the largest elimination of Ministers conducted in a shuffle.

Mr. Lambert: Other than by election.

Mr. Bosley: Yes, and the next election will potentially remove quite a few Ministers from office. However, that is a different subject for a different day.

Any Government that wants to be in a sensible management position of the country's affairs should attempt to train and prepare newer Members of Parliament, men and women, for office potentially as a Minister. If the maximum number to be replaced at any one time is to be six, which is our history, it

might be reasonable to say that the maximum we should be training at any one time, as a reasonable choice for the Prime Minister, is between 18 and 20. That would be three times the maximum number ever promoted at one time. It would be equally reasonable to pursue the old tradition—in fact, at one time it was pursued by the Liberals—that when a Parliamentary Secretary is appointed, that is the purpose of the appointment. Those named as Parliamentary Secretary would be looked at as potential future Cabinet Minsiters. For years that was understood.

When the practice changed to become an automatic, routine, by rote appointment, which was for a maximum of two years, every Member of the backbench could then expect to be appointed a Parliamentary Secretary, receive the extra money and then pass on to something else, usually not being a Parliamentary Secretary. That was the end of it. In my view, that seriously eroded the value of the institution of Parliamentary Secretaries. It turned it into a partisan plum appointment, not what it should be, which is the development of successor Ministers.

There is now a capacity for 27 Parliamentary Secretaries. The Government claims the capacity should be 31. To show the ludicrousness of this portion as clearly as I can, it is to say that the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who has a Parliamentary Secretary, is to get two Ministers to assist him because he needs help. The present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) may need help on another level, but in an administrative parliamentary way he needs two Ministers or Ministers of State to assist him. It does not seem right to argue that, having given him two new Ministers, you have to create the potential for two Parliamentary Secretaries.

It is administratively impossible to argue that we need to go from a Minister with a Parliamentary Secretary to three Ministers with three Parliamentary Secretaries. Nobody in his right mind could believe that the workload has tripled. That in a nutshell is my view of the lunacy of the proposal to increase the number of Parliamentary Secretaries.

It should also be clear to the House that there is nothing in the law that prevents the Government or the Prime Minister from appointing Parliamentary Secretaries to any Minister at any time in any number. All the law stipulates is a maximum number of Parliamentary Secretaries. If you read *Hansard*, you find that two or three Ministers of State today have Parliamentary Secretaries. While they do not count in creating the total, it has been deemed necessary to give them assistance given their workload. That is an honourable tradition.

Not long ago, in Great Britain I met with the Parliamentary Secretary to the equivalent of our Secretary of State for External Affairs, who is at the same time the Parliamentary Secretary to one of the Ministers of State. Their equivalent to our Secretary of State for External Affairs has three Parliamentary Secretaries cross appointed, even though there are not many Parliamentary Secretaries. That is an application of resources to a work-load problem. It is fair and reasonable.

If the Prime Minister thought it were necessary, he could in law appoint all 27 of the existing Parliamentary Secretaries to himself, if he thought he needed the help. Of the 27 he could appoint three to the Minister of Finance. Never have we seen the people involved used in that way by this Government. Nobody has come to the House to say that the Minister does not have a Parliamentary Secretary and needs one. All they have said is "We have 27 and we are now arguing that we need 31". Nobody has put that argument here or in committee.

It is quite clear that the objective of the Bill is simply to increase the number. There was no justification given to us in terms of workload or time demands to increase the number of people who shall receive extra pay in the House of Commons. Frankly, as a taxpayer and a citizen, I find that offensive.

On the Senate question, I differ to some degree with other Members of my Party. I am not as offended by the idea that a Member of the Senate could or should be a Parliamentary Secretary, to be perfectly honest. We should speak on these questions as Parliamentarians. I can be persuaded, if necessary, that the Government of the day may believe that it needs to present its case more adequately in the Senate than it is presenting it. It could argue that the Deputy Leader or Leader in the Senate, who does not have a Parliamentary Secretary, should perhaps have one.

The only way to approach this issue is to say that if the argument being made to defend the increase in numbers is a workload issue, then show us the workload. It has never been shown to Members of the House of Commons or the committee. As someone who believes that our Party will soon be the Government and believes that we will be faced with the issue of how many Parliamentary Secretaries we will appoint—in fact I was past Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister in the Clark Government—I say there is no justification for an increase in the number of Parliamentary Secretaries. I urge the Government to reconsider its decision that for some reason we always need more and more Ministers of the Crown and Parliamentary Secretaries without ever at least justifying that recommendation to spend more of the public's money in this way. That at least ought to be defended on a workload basis.

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to speak in favour of the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) which would have the effect of deleting Clause 25 from the Bill before us. That would mean that the law respecting the appointment and pay of Parliamentary Secretaries would remain as it is now. The Government would still have the opportunity to appoint Parliamentary Secretaries to each and any Minister up to a certain maximum. I think that the present law is quite suitable for their purposes and will prove quite suitable for our purposes when we form the Government in the near future.

● (1700)

First, I want to deal with a minor item in Clause 25(3). I am not clear as to what exactly this means. It says:

A Parliamentary Secretary shall be appointed to hold office for a period not exceeding 12 months from the date of his appointment—

It does not really say whether or not that person can be re-appointed at the expiration of the 12 months' period. In certain instances I would deem it desirable that a re-appointment should be made, even for a short time. If, for instance, there was a piece of legislation that was going through the House and committee which the Parliamentary Secretary had been involved with for some time, it might be desirable that he or she should stay on as Parliamentary Secretary until that legislation had been completed. Sometimes when I look at the dearth of talent opposite I think it would be absolutely essential, if they want Parliamentary Secretaries of any worth at all, that some of them be eligible for re-appointment.

I would like to make a few comments on Parliamentary Secretaries in general. The Hon. Member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley) gave a very good discussion on the historical role of Parliamentary Secretaries. I would be inclined to agree with him that a certain amount of degeneration in the institution has taken place over the last few years. In the appointment of Parliamentary Secretaries by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) the main objective has been to provide something for backbenchers to do. I know this is a problem. As a backbencher, especially on the Government side, the requirement always is that you should sit down and keep quiet and not do very much. We see that in operation this afternoon. It is necessary that you give people something to do, let them see their name in *Hansard* once in a while even if it is only on the list of Parliamentary Secretaries that is published each Wednesday. When you have a large majority, as we expect we will have in a few months from now, the problem of finding adequate duties for the backbenchers will become even worse. I know that we will have to face the same problem.

The workload on Parliamentary Secretaries would depend on several factors. In my observation, because I have never been fortunate enough to experience having been a Parliamentary Secretary, it depends primarily on the parliamentary workload of the Minister at any point in time. If there is a number of Bills, especially complex Bills, going through the House then the Parliamentary Secretary finds himself with something useful and worth-while to do. The personal relationship between the Minister and his or her Parliamentary Secretary is important. I have observed that some Ministers have been quite willing to delegate considerable authority and give their Parliamentary Secretary responsibilities, whereas others have not been willing to do so.

When I look over the past years of the present Government, I find that the experience with Parliamentary Secretaries has not been anything to write home about. There have been three Parliamentary Secretaries who have, in my opinion, done a good and worth-while job and have earned a pay cheque. I am pleased that one of the Hon. Members is with us. The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans), in my opinion, worked very hard, as he had to do, when he was Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, the present Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen). He certainly had a lot of explaining to do to Canadians at that time. I am sure it did not come easily to him, but I compliment him for his work.

Also, I want to give honourable mention to two gentlemen who are not here. One of them is now the Minister of State for Finance (Mr. MacLaren). I look back to the time when he was Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources at the time the Minister was pushing the national energy policy, Bill C-48, through the House. I disagreed with both the Minister and his Parliamentary Secretary on the contents of the national energy policy, and especially of Bill C-48, but I have to compliment the Parliamentary Secretary for the way in which he conducted his task and discharged his responsibilities. I wish he had not performed as well as he did. We might not have been saddled with the national energy policy as we know it today. The third Hon. Member opposite whom I want to single out for a special compliment is the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher) while he was Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Finance. If Clause 25 is enacted as we have it, it would not be possible to make that type of appointment because Parliamentary Secretaries could be appointed only to Ministers of State who had an actual Ministry. I do not think it would be possible to appoint a Parliamentary Secretary to the present Secretary of State for Finance (Mr. MacLaren).

The Hon. Member for Mississauga North did an exemplary job when he was Parliamentary Secretary to the Hon. Member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Cosgrove). It is unfortunate that the Hon. Member for York-Scarborough, when he was Minister, knew very little about his portfolio. I do not think he had had any experience previously in the responsibilities for financial institutions. If we on this side wanted to know anything about the particular Bill in question, we found it very useful to approach his Parliamentary Secretary.

Generally speaking, the present system we have with Parliamentary Secretaries is a mechanism for allowing the Prime Minister of the day to keep his backbenchers in line. To a certain extent it is an exercise in patronage and trains them in the art of patronage. I have seen Parliamentary Secretaries flying all around the country handing out cheques, when the Minister was not available. Some of the Parliamentary Secretaries do a good and necessary job, but in general they are a superfluous species. I suggest that if Parliamentary Secretaries are appointed to the Ministers of State responsible for Economic Development, Social Development and Science and Technology, as contemplated in this Bill, they would certainly come under the heading of superfluous Parliamentary Secretaries.

I see you are indicating that my time has expired, Mr. Speaker. Therefore, I will not burden you with the rest of the revelations I was about to make in this regard.

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

Mr. Lambert: As a result of consultation in the usual way, an agreement has been reached. I have consulted the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett). I would ask the House for unanimous consent to withdraw my Motions Nos. 4 and 6. We would take the feel of the House on

Motion No. 5, and then the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans) would make a proposal regarding amendment No. 9 which is also by agreement. Then there is a form of amendment which has been screened for drafting by the Department of Justice. It will represent the consensus of the House to increase the number of Parliamentary Secretaries by four but it eliminates any question of appointments in the other place. To that extent we have agreed.

• (1710)

The House will then move to third reading, there will be a few remarks at that stage and then we hope we can see the clock at six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) to withdraw Motions Nos. 4 and 6?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 4 and Motion No. 6 (Mr. Lambert) withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 5. All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed to the motion, please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Mr. Lambert: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion negatived on division.

Motion No. 5 (Mr. Lambert) negatived.

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council) moved:

That Bill C-152 be amended in Schedule I by adding immediately after item 4 thereof, the following item:

"5. Canagrex Act 1980-81-82-83, c. 152

Paragraph 4(3)(*c*) is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(*c*) one from the Department of External Affairs.""

and by renumbering the subsequent items accordingly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Evans) agreed to.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if you sought the unanimous consent of the House you would find that there is a disposition to allow me to waive notice and, at report stage, introduce the following motion:

That clause 25 of Bill C-152 be amended by striking out lines 21 to 40 on page 10 and substituting the following:

1978-79, c. 13, s. 31

"25. Subsection 2(2) of the Parliamentary Secretaries Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Maximum number

"(2) There shall not be appointed more Parliamentary Secretaries than the number of Ministers who hold offices for which salaries are provided in sections 4 and 5 of the Salaries Act." "

The purpose of this, as the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) had indicated, is to allow for the increase in the number of Parliamentary Secretaries, as the Government has asked. It would reflect the view of the House that appointments to the post of Parliamentary Secretary occur only from the ranks of Members of the House of Commons and not from the other place.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion, please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Motion (Mr. Evans) agreed to.

Hon. Monique Bégin (for Mr. Trudeau) moved that the Bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the Bill be read the third time? Pursuant to Order made Monday, October 24, 1983, now.

Hon. Monique Bégin (for Mr. Trudeau) moved that the Bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If there is unanimous consent, we would agree that this motion be adopted without debate and that we call it six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is the understanding of the Chair that two Hon. Members wish to be recognized for brief statements at this point. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans) and the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) wish to be recognized.

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I had prepared a text for third reading but I think we have heard a great deal today. During report stage comments were made that were really third reading speeches. We heard remarks to the effect that certain Members of the Opposition felt that this was an unnecessary change to Government organization. I would strongly disagree with that. I think the reorganization is very seriously needed.

The Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) referred to certain difficulties, and the Hon. Member for

Annapolis Valley-Hants (Mr. Nowlan) raised the issue of a morale problem in the Department of External Affairs and the problem of conflicts in the line of command. Part of that derived from the fact that the trade function was reporting to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the consular function was reporting to the Department of External Affairs, so there was a crossing of lines of communication.

One of the major features of the reorganization is that the trade function is put with the consular function so that the entire External Affairs operation reports through the Department of External Affairs. That cleans up the line of command and makes trade representations much more effective in the field since they will be under one administration. It is a step forward.

The other feature is that the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was established to enhance regional economic opportunity in the country. Over the years we found that the Minister of DREE became one voice among many in trying to advance the cause of regional expansion. By reorganizing the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion into the new Department of Regional Industrial Expansion, the regional aspect of the Government policy becomes integral to Government economic policy. As a result of this Bill, every Minister becomes responsible for bringing to the attention of Cabinet items and issues related to regional expansion.

It is terribly important, if we agree about regional expansion—which the Government does—that it be a prime focus of all Government policies. The placement of federal officers in each of the regions of the country to focus all Government programs, what is best for that region of the country, into a regional expansion mode, I believe is terribly important. That happens as a result of this Bill.

● (1720)

These are the matters brought forward as well as the changes to the Ministries, and the Parliamentary Secretaries from the Senate. However, the much more fundamental features of this Bill deal with cleaning up the lines of command in the External Affairs field so that the external thrust deals with the trade aspect as well as the external relations aspect, and it is all under one head, one line of command, and Regional Economic Expansion becomes an integral part of the economic policy of the Government and not simply a separate Department which tries to fight on its own for resources among the competing demands from other Ministries in the economic area. These features will, I think, set up two very important functions for internal economic development and expansion with clear lines of command and clear authority, and set up an external affairs operation which is clear again, under one set of command, one line of authority which deals with trade and external relations as an integrated package. I believe this is a very good Bill, a Bill which is long overdue.

I thank Hon. Members opposite for the co-operation they have shown in pushing forward the debate and making adjustments as we saw necessary, and coming to agreement in the way this House of Commons should operate all the time. I am proud to stand and speak on third reading.

I will close by saying that, as a result of the changes we have made in Bill C-152, Canadians will certainly have the kinds of mechanisms in place to further the economic development goals of the country and to put a new face and new thrust on our external relations.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite so sanguine as the Parliamentary Secretary is about all the good points in this Bill. He talked about clearing up the difficulties of cross-communication between the counsellor and trade sections of the Department in the foreign missions abroad, and that this Bill now will square that away and there will be straight linear connections. Perhaps he could tell us what they did with the immigration part which has been hooked onto External Affairs? This provides out of the foreign missions, shall we say, an immediate 90 degree turn to the right, because it comes back to Ottawa and then must go from External Affairs over to Employment and Immigration. I hope we can get that particular matter cleared up.

There is another matter I am concerned about. I trust I can get the ear of the Parliamentary Secretary at this stage. Perhaps he could tell us whatever happened to the proposed amendments which were coming in from the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lumley) whereby he agreed—in the words of my colleague for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson)—that the word "Expansion" in much less attractive than the word "Development". All these amendments were to be brought in. I saw the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion running back and forth as though consultations were going on, and I fully expected the Parliamentary Secretary would come in with those amendments which were necessary. It may be that in Part II of the Bill, which deals with that particular matter, there are too many references to regional industrial expansion, so people could not make the necessary amendments, shall we say, in the style which was appropriate. In any event, I am sure my colleague for Etobicoke Centre will be most disappointed. If they have agreed not to bring it forward at this time, so be it.

There is something I would like to say with regard to Parliamentary Secretaries. I could not agree more with what has been said by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley). I do not believe that Parliamentary Secretaries should be rotated on the basis of the calender, because that means that everyone is being given a crack at an extra $10,000 for two years. Some do not even earn 10 per cent of it, others will put in a fair day's work. That is because of the vagaries of the Minister to whom they are responsible. May I say, however, that it certainly does not provide the same training ground as is required in the British House of Commons where Parliamentary Secretaries may be shifted. What it does do is to conceal from people in certain constituencies that their Member has been tried and found wanting. In other words, this is the cover-up report, shall we say, from the teacher which says, "Well, Johnny is a reasonable student. Even though he is not able to read as well as he should, and he

cannot calculate, I think he is a good boy." That is about all that happens when a person is retired after two years' service. No one is rated. I do not feel that should be so.

This is serious business. We pile onto the legislative side a remarkable additional expense, and for what? It is not for greater glory. Everyone has become a former Parliamentary Secretary, even though they did not do any work to earn it. To that extent, I can only say that I only hope this Bill will be looked at again in the future and that future Prime Ministers will be much more rigorous, first of all, in their choice of Parliamentary Secretaries. This House only requires about eight or ten Parliamentary Secretaries, who should be rotated. In fact, some of them might be in a particular position for nearly three years, because if one is going to replace a promising individual, it may take that long to do so. In October of every year we have seen Members from various constituencies who personally have what it takes to do a job. The next day we see them shunted to the back row because of a whim of someone who wants a total change. This is nonsense. I feel we can do a great deal better.

I do not want to force a vote on third reading, so all I will say in conclusion is that I will let this Bill go through on division.

• (1730)

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, we also will agree to the Bill going through on division, not because we support it—indeed it is almost as much a dog's breakfast as it was when it first emerged well over a year ago—but rather because the Government reorganization to which it refers is pretty much a fait accompli and we realize there is not going to be any chance of getting any major changes now.

The Government offered only one change, and I am glad to see that it did, namely that a clause which would have allowed Parliamentary Secretaries to be chosen from the other place is no longer in the Bill. Other than that it has done very little, either to elucidate upon the Bill in the House or committee, or try to come up with some suggestions to get a stronger, better and more understood reorganization. It remains, particularly the part relating to the Department of External Affairs, a baffling outline of what looked clearly to most of us to be the creation of unnecessary Ministers and deputies, and about the only time I was not able to get any collaboration from the Conservatives on our criticisms of the Bill was when I could not persuade the Hon. Member for Don Valley West (Mr. Bosley)—

Mr. Bosley: I explained it all.

Miss Jewett: —to join me in lambasting this new portfolio, the Minister for External Relations. I would have thought he would agree with me entirely that it was totally unnecessary.

Mr. Bosley: Oh, no.

Miss Jewett: We have no idea what the Minister does. The former Minister, the Hon. Member for Charlevoix (Mr. Lapointe), laughingly admitted himself that he had no idea what that Minister for External Relations was going to do, and I could not get the Hon. Member for Don Valley West to support me on this because he is the putative Minister, or he thinks he is the putative Minister, if that is the word—

Mr. Prud'homme: Yes, but watch how you pronounce it.

Miss Jewett: —should the day ever come, heaven forfend, that the Tories form the Government. Otherwise we did agree on a good number of the matters but we were unable to persuade the Government to try to bring more enlightenment and clarification to this Government reorganization Bill, particularly the part relating to the Department of External Affairs. The main reasons for the Government not wanting to provide greater clarity and efficiency is that it got a marvellous idea, particularly on the reorganization of the Department of External Affairs along with an incredible chart which accompanies it, that for every single young person in this country who was applying to become a foreign service officer in that Department or a trade commissioner, or a combination of the two, the Government realized you need to have the toughest possible qualifying examination, and it could think of nothing tougher than to ask all these students who are going to apply to explain the organization of the Department of External Affairs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Forrestall: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Carried on division.

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

Mr. Pinard: I do not have my glasses, Mr. Speaker. I think it is six o'clock, and if you call it six o'clock we will agree.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being 6 p.m. this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 5.35 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 26, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

• (1405)

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—CONDEMNATION OF INVASION BY UNITED STATES FORCES

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East): Madam Speaker, while we were truly shocked by the bloody coup d'état in Grenada two weeks ago and would have supported reasonable international action to deal with that situation, we can in no way approve of the action taken yesterday by the United States Government in invading that small country. There is no doubt that the invasion of Grenada by United States marines is a clear violation of international law, the United Nations Charter and, in effect, constitutes an act of war against Grenada.

If the United States' action was taken solely to protect and evacuate United States citizens after less extreme alternatives were attempted, then there could be some justification. This does not seem to be the case. It is significant that the United States did not even discuss its true plans with Canada, despite the fact that Canada is the senior Commonwealth nation in America.

The other reason given by the United States was to restore democratic institutions. While that is a noble intention, it is hard to believe, since many of the Governments supported by the United States in Central America, the Caribbean, and Latin America, are military dictatorships. If the United States is sincerely interested in restoring democracy in Latin America, will it now invade Chile?

The United States action in Grenada must be condemned, Madam Speaker, not only because it is a violation of international law but also because it allows for the settlement of disputes by force rather than by peaceful means.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

POLITICAL PARTIES

INVITATION TO LIBERAL PARTY FUND RAISING DINNER—MR. TAYLOR SENDS HIS REGRETS

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, would you believe it, Senator Keith Davey sent me—yes, me—a personal letter. He thinks I am a Liberal. I am angry, enraged, furious, indignant, fuming, incensed, boiling, maddened, irritated, galled, offended, umbraged, miffed, nauseated, outraged, riled, envenomed, soured, wounded, vitiated, debased, peeved, nettled, defiled, annoyed, smeared, chafed, rasped, triturated, abrased, furcated, defiled, stained, soiled, blemished, stunned, bewildered, puzzled, befuddled, bemuddled, confounded, mystified, perplexed, baffled, baited, devilled, lured, decoyed, vulgarized, debased, and insulted.

The Senator wants me to send him $250 for a ticket for a dinner with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I am beseeched, entreated, adjured, implored, pleaded, supplicated, obsecrated, obtested, solicited, tintinnabulated, blandished, wheedled, blarneyed, inveigled, blubbered, bothered, buttered, cajoled, wheedled, and coaxed to attend.

It made me disconsolate, inconsolable, unconsolable, comfortless, forlorn, heartsick, soul sick, heartsore, heartbroken, and dejected. I coughed, wheezed, hawked, expectorated, vomited, and puked. In plain English, Madam Speaker, will you tell the Senator that I will not be attending the dinner because I am a Tory.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NICARAGUA—THREAT OF INVASION—CALL FOR CONDEMNATION OF UNITED STATES POLICIES

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Madam Speaker, yesterday Xabier Gorostiaga from Nicaragua visited with several Members of this House to explain the present situation in his country. He is responsible for the creation of the Nicaraguan Institute for Social and Economic Research. He explained to us that during the year 1980 the economy of Nicaragua had progressed by 10 per cent, by 6 per cent in 1981, that there was a bad year in 1982 because of the floods, but that it recovered again by 4 per cent in the first semester of 1983.

He wanted to tell the people of Canada about the fear he has of an invasion which could possibly follow the same model as that which took place in Grenada yesterday. Yesterday's invasion violates international law and contravenes the Charter of the United Nations. At the same time, he spoke of the fear of the Nicaraguan people because this is the time of year when

their economy, based on cotton, sugar and coffee, is in the most extreme danger. It can easily be destroyed by guerrilla action. There is already a CIA army in Nicaragua for that very purpose.

I call upon the Government of Canada and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to condemn the policies of the United States in that region of the world, and to look seriously at the peace proposal that was given by the Minister of External Affairs for Nicaragua to the Americans last Thursday, which was blatantly thrown out on Friday. Otherwise, that part of the world could become a new Vietnam, a regional war.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ECONOMY

NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM—IMPACT ON SAGUENAY-LAC-SAINT-JEAN REGION

Mr. Pierre Gimaïel (Lac-Saint-Jean): Madam Speaker, about ten days ago, the newspaper *Le Soleil* published an article confirming that Alcan had sent written notice to Gaz Inter-Cité Québec Inc. of its firm intention of purchasing several hundred million cubic metres of gas over the coming years. Madam Speaker, I am delighted with this decision, especially since it means that from $230 to $240 million will be invested, in addition to what the Canadian Government is already doing for the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area to develop the economy during the coming year. The Company has already sent an application to the Canadian Government and, more specifically, to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien), for the release of necessary funding for construction of a section of the gas pipeline that is vital to our economy. Once again, I want to point out to the people in my riding and in the region generally that natural gas is coming to Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean because a national energy program was established by the Canadian Government and by the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) when he was Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, to develop our economy and attract investment for the creation of permanent jobs in our region, with the objective of helping resource regions like ours to achieve the kind of infrastructure that will help us take advantage of our full development potential in the years to come.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

POLITICAL PARTIES

FORMER NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY CANDIDATE'S SUPPORT FOR PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Madam Speaker, Mr. James Stark of Operation Dismantle spoke at White Rock on Thanksgiving Day. He said, among other things, of the Leader of the Official Opposition:

> . . . I really don't want to prejudge him, but I think we are actually better off with Trudeau than with Mulroney, and that's saying something. However—and I am saying this everywhere and I want to be very clear about this—I vote NDP. I was an NDP candidate.

There it is, Madam Speaker. Finally someone who has been an official spokesman for the New Democratic Party has come out of the closet. We have known for some time that the marriage between the New Democratic Party and the Liberals was consummated in secret. Now the vows have been pronounced in public. It is refreshing to hear at least one member of the NDP who is not ashamed of his marriage partner.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF EXECUTIVES

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Madam Speaker, on Monday of this week the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) made an announcement describing the plans of the Government for the future of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Both the vagueness of the document and the failure of the Minister and the President of the CBC to clarify the goals of the Corporation, and the means of achieving those goals, have led to a questioning of the intentions of the Government in this matter.

Indications are that 500 production level employees of the Corporation will be laid off because the Minister has stated new programming must be paid for by "increased efficiencies", which is a euphemism for lay-offs. While we were asked to accept employment cuts so new production can get rolling, six new vice-presidents have been appointed in the CBC, and the Minister and the Presdident of the CBC propose to create a new and undoubtedly well-paid position of chairperson of the board. Production level firings and increases in executive levels only reinforce the growing bureaucraticism and centralization within the CBC. Production and programming decisions increasingly are made in Ottawa, which is isolated from production centres.

If the Corporation is to improve service to Canadians, produce exciting and stimulating drama, and meet its objectives, where is the money to come from? The Minister sets out a mandate for the Corporation without providing the means to bring it about. The Minister, since his announcement Monday, has been absent from the House. He is unavailable to answer the questions of the Opposition on his plans for the CBC.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE—IMPACT ON QUEBEC'S NORTH SHORE REGION

Mr. André Maltais (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Madam Speaker, last week, the magazine *La semaine,* in its October 22 issue, published the following headline:

Sept-Îles, a dying town

Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that the impression given by the press is false, because Sept-Îles is not dying. It has serious problems, like the town of Port Cartier, except that its problems are directly connected with the iron ore issue, and at the present time, thanks to the Canadian Government and the establishment of the National Harbours Board at Sept-Îles, which is working on setting up a German aluminum refinery in the region, we feel that future developments on the North Shore will be successful. Similarly, the federal Government is working very hard to support the Province of Quebec in reopening the Rayonier Québec plant at Port Cartier. Madam Speaker, I think it is important to set the record straight about the North Shore. Sept-Îles is not just the Iron Ore Company, there are other companies, including Wabush Mines which is doing very good work. In fisheries there has been a tremendous expansion during the past season, and the federal Government has invested around $40 million in the region in the past year. All of this has been done to provide a proper infrastructure and to diversify. I felt it was important to point this out, I hope the Leader of the Opposition agrees with the Member for Manicouagan.

* * *

● (1415)

[*English*]

CANADA POST CORPORATION

LACK OF SERVICE IN NORTHERN COMMUNITIES

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Madam Speaker, just think what it must be like to live in a community which is only accessible by air and is 100 miles or more from the nearest post office. Although I raised this question several times in the House of Commons, and local post office employees are doing everything they can, people in such communities are still stymied by senior post office bureaucrats from the south.

In villages where there are no banks it is especially important that post office services should include CODs and the issuing of money orders. Nahanni Butte, Trout Lake, and Jean Marie River have no post office. Lac La Marte and Rae Lakes have no post office even though the combined population is over 500 and they are served by a regularly scheduled air line. It would be easy to establish contract post offices in such locations, as has been done in similar places. People in the north have an equal right to proper postal services, and they are thoroughly disgusted with a Liberal Government which completely neglects their interests.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—ARRANGEMENTS FOR EVACUATION OF CANADIAN CITIZENS

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for International Trade who answered questions yesterday with respect to the Grenadian situation. Will the Minister confirm, or otherwise, a recent Canadian Press story which stated permission had been denied to Canada to send a plane to evacuate Canadian national from the island of Grenada? Would he also indicate whether all Canadians on the island are safe?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, the national Defence Forces of Canada have a 707 on the ground at Barbados ready to evacuate Canadian nationals who wish to leave the island of Grenada at the earliest point they can get permission from the occupation authorities to land on the island. However, there has now arisen the complication that the condition of the airport may not be such as to receive a plane of the 707 type. Within the next two hours a Hercules aircraft will be departing Canada to be available to airlift Canadian nationals, the Hercules being able to land on the type of runway presently in use on Grenada.

The Americans have not given clearance up to this point in time. They said they were giving priority to military aircraft because of their concern with the conflict which is still under way, and military needs of that type. I have, within the past half hour, met with the United States Ambassador to Canada and requested that he make arrangements on a most urgent basis for permission for a Canadian aircraft to land on Grenada to remove our nationals.

SAFETY OF CANADIAN CITIZENS

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, I would like the Minister to assure the House that all Canadians are safe to this point. Would he also explain to the House the Government's slowness, its lethargy, in getting Canadians off that island, bearing in mind that up until Monday 12 days had elapsed from the time Prime Minister Bishop was deposed, five days had elapsed from the time he was slaughtered along with three other Cabinet Ministers, and why could the Government

not have had the 707 in place earlier to remove these Canadians and ensure their safety?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, if the Hon. Member's memory goes back as far as yesterday, he will know that his Leader and others were referring to the state of great confusion on the island in those preceding days. We encountered difficulties in obtaining clearance for an aircraft to go in, but we did obtain it eventually from the Grenadian authorities late on Sunday. As the Hon. Member knows, if he was in the House yesterday, we at that time had available an aircraft of a local airline, but there were difficulties in obtaining the necessary permission from all of the islands which participate in the ownership of that airline.

● (1420)

If the invasion had not intervened, our 707 aircraft would have attempted to go in yesterday morning. If one were to look at the situation in relation to the nationals of other countries, I think that one would find that Canada reacted in a very thorough manner in relation to the protection of our nationals and, during those days of confusion, managed to remain in contact with them.

As to their present safety, we have been in contact with all Canadian nationals known to be on the island, although we have not had contact since late yesterday with five of them who are in the town of St. George's. We have no reason to believe that they are in any danger.

Mr. Stevens: Madam Speaker, in the explanation given by the Minister of State for the failure to remove Canadians, he overlooked the fact that he was certainly warned about it by this side. My Leader and my colleagues made 18 separate interventions expressing our concern for the safety of the Canadians and asking about the position of the Canadian Government on this matter, all prior to Monday night.

CANADIAN POSITION ON INVASION

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, would the Minister now indicate if he is finally in the process of sending a note to Washington stating Canada's position with respect to the entry of the Caribbean nations and the United States onto the island of Grenada? Second, if he has that note available, would he now table it?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member refers to a note. What I specifically did was I called the American ambassador. As I indicated earlier, His Excellency met with me earlier this afternoon. At that time I outlined in detail a number of Canada's concerns in relation to the military intervention in Grenada, and also in relation to the question of the evacuation of Canadian personnel.

MINISTER'S STATEMENT ON INVASION

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the same Minister. The Minister is reported to have said yesterday that he believes the invasion of the island of Grenada is, in his mind, comparable to, or the same as, the invasion of the Falkland Islands. Could the Minister please tell the House whether that is in fact true, and how he could possibly in any way compare those two events?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I regret that the Hon. Member may want to twist around my words on a matter of such importance in the international sphere, for political reasons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Regan: What I said yesterday, and what I would repeat gladly, is that it does appear to me that military intervention into another country should only be taken, if at all, after the widest possible consultation among the other countries involved because of the danger of subjective values leading to a wrongful conclusion as to the degree of justification involved. I used as an example military interventions such as those which occurred by Argentina into the Falkland Islands, and in various other parts of the world in the last few years, albeit of a different character, or of different degrees of justification in our eyes. Nevertheless, the very fact of military intervention into sovereign nations carries with it the danger of increasing world tension, and is a movement toward the possibility of war.

GOVERNMENT'S UNDERSTANDING OF SITUATION

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, since the Minister refuses to say that there are differences between the two, I would ask him the following question. In the view of the Canadian Government, how much would a government in the Caribbean have to be deposed; how much of the intervention would have to be sponsored by other nations; how much trouble would Canadians have to be in before the Government of Canada would face the fact that there is a difference between the deposition of a parliamentary government, the intervention in that country by Argentina, and the shooting of the leaders of a country, to take over and operate a régime that appears in international terms to have desperate consequences for the people of that country? When will we in Canada understand the difference?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, what we have said in relation to the invasion of Grenada is that we do not have available to us the grounds that would seem to justify that action. I would only say to the Hon. Member, as we have said already, that there may well be good justification that the United States has not disclosed as yet. But the Hon. Member is indeed dealing with a tricky area when he says that internal turmoil will be, in itself, sufficient justification for other countries unilaterally,

without consultation with broadly based international fora, to undertake a military intervention of this type.

● (1425)

COMPARISON WITH ARGENTINE INVASION OF FALKLAND ISLANDS

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, when the Minister says that the invasion of the Malvinas by Argentina is in any way comparable, can he not understand the degree to which he is making it very difficult for others to consult Canada because, when Ministers of the Crown say that, they believe that Canada is proving that it is not trustworthy in the western hemisphere?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, there are two things that I would have to say to the Hon. Member. I am sure that he does not want to justify actions by the Soviet Union, but the question of internal political strife was exactly what existed in Poland when the Soviet Union wrongfully decided that it was justified to move into that country, and elsewhere.

Let me add that the fact the Hon. Member must keep in mind is that the position that Canada is taking on the American military intervention in Grenada is one that is strikingly similar to the position of the United Kingdom, which is a Government for which I think the Hon. Member has some feeling, if not for ours, and it is indeed mild compared to the position that has been taken by Mexico, Trinidad, and all of the South American countries.

REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER CONDEMN INVASION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It has everything to do with the position the Government is taking on this issue. Considering that the invasion of an independent country in the Commonwealth by forces led by the United States of America not only contravenes international law but violates Article II of the United Nations Charter, will he now join with other national leaders in the world who believe we ought to use peaceful means to resolve difficult problems, and condemn this act of violence in a forthright way?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, that is the substance of the message I understand was conveyed to the United States Ambassador by the Minister of State, the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, and which is being conveyed in Washington today by our officials meeting in the State Department.

POSITION OF CANADIAN GOVERNMENT

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, just for perfect clarification, as I heard the Minister answer a minute ago, he said that he conveyed to the Ambassador of the United States certain "concerns" of the Government of Canada about this invasion of Grenada. I would like the Prime Minister to be very specific with the House so that we can send a message around the world on this invasion, which the Prime Minister knows can set off tensions not only in the Caribbean but all over. Is he now prepared to say in the House that the Government of Canada categorically opposes this invasion of Grenada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the language used by the Minister, as I understand it, was that Canada regretted the action, the military intervention. The Minister restated what I said in the House yesterday, that unless we had information which showed that this action was necessary to protect and rescue American nationals, and unless there was no other way of doing it, then the intervention would seem unjustified.

Yesterday, I indicated that we thought we might get that information from Secretary Shultz's statement yesterday afternoon. I feel that he did not give any such explanation that they had to invade in order to protect their nationals. Indeed, it seems to me that the reason invoked by the United States and the other Caribbean nations involved is that they wanted a different sort of Government there. It was not so much a question of protecting nationals as it was of ensuring a Government which was compatible with their views as to how a Government should operate. If there is no further explanation than that, I think we would quite clearly say the actions were unjustified.

● (1430)

NICARAGUA—POSSIBILITY OF INVASION BY UNITED STATES AND ALLIES

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, the evidence is clearly out. In *The New York Times* it has been reported that U.S. envoys who went to Grenada on the weekend were assured there would be no problems for American citizens. We have since learned, also from the same source, that the invasion was being planned in midweek, last week, by the United States of America.

Because of the very serious regional implications, is the Prime Minister aware that in recent weeks the United States re-established CONDECA, a Spanish acronym for Central American Defence Council, which includes Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and the United States? Is the Prime Minister aware that the U.S. just recently reconstituted this organization? Is the Prime Minister not concerned that the violent action that has been initiated by the United States in recent days against Grenada will simply be a forerunner of a similar kind of group action taken by CONDECA against the people of Nicaragua?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Madam Speaker. I have not heard of the reconstitution of this group, nor do I share the apprehensions of the Hon. Member. I think the facts, as we know them about Grenada, have led us to make the statement I have just made. I would not want to speculate on a hypothetical situation in Nicaragua or elsewhere.

Oral Questions

SYRIA—ROLE IN LEBANON—MINISTER'S STATEMENT

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister and it also deals with exernal affairs. Last Wednesday and Thursday the Secretary of State for External Affairs was in Damascus, Syria, where he gave a press interview in which he had some surprising things to say about Syria and its role in Lebanon. Among other things, the Secretary of State was quoted as saying:

Syria, like Canada, wants Lebanon to be sovereign and independent.

Is it the view of the Government that that is why Syria, along with 5,000 Soviet troops, is occupying the Beka'a Valley in eastern Lebanon? Is it the view of the Government that Syria is playing a useful role and that the Syrians are there in eastern Lebanon because they want Lebanon to be sovereign and independent?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I believe the comments made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in Syria last week, when accurately read, are consistent with the policy which the Canadian Government has taken, and the rhetorical conclusions that the Hon. Member reaches are not justified by his position.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Andre: Madam Speaker, I will be glad to send the Minister the quotes of his senior Minister's statement.

PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): My supplementary question is for the Prime Minister because it deals with government policy. The Secretary of State for External Affairs was also quoted as saying that Canada has authorized the establishment of official contacts with the PLO and that the PLO had a role to play in the peace negotiations. Can the Prime Minister tell the House when Canada officially recognized the PLO and can he indicate which faction of the PLO, that which supported by Syria, or that under the leadership of Arafat? Can the Prime Minister tell the House whether he feels that the PLO has a role to play in discussions on the sovereignty and independence of Lebanon?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member's question is not based on his premises. He asks when have we recognized the PLO. The answer is we have not recognized the PLO.

[*Translation*]

FORTHCOMING COMMONWEALTH CONFERENCE IN INDIA—POSSIBLE CANADIAN PROPOSAL FOR GRENADIAN POLITICAL STABILITY

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency-Orléans): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. As a member of the Commonwealth, Canada has a special relationship with Grenada and with the other Caribbean countries that took part in the U.S. military intervention in that country.

Considering this common membership in the Commonwealth, could the Right Hon. Prime Minister inform the House whether Canada, possibly in consultation with Great Britain, intends to take advantage of the next conference of Commonwealth countries to be held in India next month and which the Prime Minister will attend, to submit to co-members proposals aimed at restoring political stability in Grenada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, we shall certainly be discussing the situation in Grenada at the next Commonwealth conference. I believe I have already indicated that it was discussed at the last Commonwealth conference, that is, at the Melbourne Summit in 1981, and also at the regional summit held in St-Lucia at the beginning of 1983. We shall certainly be discussing this subject again in November.

[*English*]

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for St. John's West.

Mr. Crosbie: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans who was here, but he is like the Scarlet Pimpernel. I presume he is behind the curtains somewhere. I would like to wait for him to come back, if you do not mind.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT IN YOUTH JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS

Mr. Gerry St. Germain (Mission-Port Moody): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. The Minister knows that a healthy private sector is the key to the establishment of long-term jobs for Canadians. However, this past weekend the Minister was reported as saying that he doubts the private sector would be interested in a co-operative program with Government to hire young Canadians in these economic conditions. What does the Minister feel has to be done to facilitate recovery in the private sector so that the private sector would be willing to participate in co-operative programs to hire young Canadians? What are the Minister's plans to achieve private sector involvement in long-term job establishment?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): No, Madam Speaker, what I said this weekend was that we have not had as strong a take up as we had expected in some of our industrial training and skills development programs. The reason for that has been the reluctance of some employers to take on young people as trainees given the overhead costs involved, even though there is substantial support or contribution coming from the federal Government to

encourage that to happen. I believe, as the recovery from the recession continues and strengthens, we will see in the next year that the private sector will be more and more eager to take up the possibilities which those plans envisaged. I expect, therefore, that we will be able to overcome the problem which I described is the one we had last year.

As for the impact of economic recovery, that is a question which I and the Minister of Finance have dealt with in the House on frequent occasions. If the hon. gentleman is more specific in his supplementary, I will try to give him a response.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF GOVERNMENT PLANS

Mr. Gerry St. Germain (Mission-Port Moody): Madam Speaker, my supplementary is for the same Minister. The Minister knows that the Government has discouraged private sector job creation, and we cannot depend solely on the spillover from the American economic recovery. What are the Government's plans for working with the private sector on the establishment of long-term jobs, and I mean in definitive terms? Why does the Ministry seem to be waiting for a Speech From the Throne to announce those plans?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Again, Madam Speaker, the assumption of the Hon. Member's question is entirely mistaken. The kind of tax changes which were proposed by my colleague, the Minister of Finance, in his last budget were expressly designed to provide assistance to the private sector in creating jobs. What we do wish to have is a co-operative partnership with the private sector in creating jobs. That is also the premise which we have followed in using, for instance, Section 38 of the Unemployment Insurance Act, to work with the private sector and in using unemployment insurance funds to create jobs through the private sector which will be of long-term benefit to the economy.

In the hon. gentleman's own Province, I could say there are a variety of projects which we have developed, for instance, those under the Employment Bridging Assistance Program which was directed to co-operation with the private sector to create jobs, but the rug was pulled out from underneath those programs by his provincial Government. I wish the Hon. Member would speak to his provincial Government about that.

GOVERNMENT POSITION ON ACHIEVEMENT OF FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. He will know that yesterday the Bank of Montreal suggested the possibility of full employment in Canada was millions of years away and predicted the likelihood of unemployment reaching at least 15 per cent by the end of this decade. Countries such as Austria, Sweden, Norway, and even Japan, have managed to obtain full employment. These countries are highly competitive with us and are highly productive. Why is Canada unable to do the same as they have done?

• (1440)

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, it is difficult to respond to that question with a short reply. I am not responsible for the Bank of Montreal's assessment. There are a whole variety of assessments of what is likely to happen in the future in relation to employment, and there are a whole host of definitions of what constitutes full employment. It is not particularly useful to have rhetorical quibbles over what constitutes full employment. That does not provide any better basis for action than setting objectives in terms of job creation and expenditure programs.

To simplify very much the substance of the reply to the Hon. Member's specific question, I suggest that the most appropriate way to answer the question he posed is to look at the growth of the labour force in those countries which he described. He will find that it is very different from the rate of labour growth in Canada.

Mr. Riis: We on this side certainly have no difficulty defining full employment. It means that every man and woman in the country who is able to work has full employment. I do not think that is very mysterious at all.

REQUEST FOR MASSIVE STIMULATION OF ECONOMY

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shushwap): Japan has full employment because of a co-operative approach to its economy. It has a planned economy, a low inflation rate, and low interest rates. However, it realizes that a very difficult winter is coming. Japan has just announced a massive stimulation program for its economy.

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Riis: The same situation will exist in our country in the winter months—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the Hon. Member could describe the situation in Japan on some other occasion. For the time being, we would appreciate a question.

Mr. Riis: Madam Speaker, why is the Minister not taking similar steps in our country to provide massive stimulation to the economy in order to make Canada's winter a little less bleak for Canadians?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, I do not know where the Hon. Member has been. Quite clearly we have had stimulation.

Some Hon. Members: Where? Where?

Mr. Roberts: Given the levels of deficit we are experiencing at the present time, that constitutes an extraordinary stimulation of the Canadian economy. The bringing forward of the Special Recovery Program of $2.5 billion of construction expenditure, and of the NEED Program in Employment and Immigration, constitutes the kind of stimulation that creates

jobs in the Canadian economy. If one were to limit oneself to the description in the Hon. Member's question, one would have to say that Japan is following our example, not leading it.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM

FUNDING OF NATIVE FRIENDSHIP CENTRES

Hon. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. As he knows, he made an announcement of a change in programs for migrating Indians. Until now the new program announced in the spring has not had the financing it needs to come into place. When will the Secretary of State be able to get his program through Treasury Board so that new programs can come into place in Native Friendship Centres across Canada?

Hon. Serge Joyal (Secretary of State): Madam Speaker, I am happy to inform the Hon. Member and the House that the points which have to be dealt with to ensure that the announcement made in the month of May could be implemented were dealt with yesterday, due in particular to the intervention of the Hon. President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance. It is my intention to write today to all Centres across Canada to inform them that the announcement made in May will be fully honoured and implemented by the Government of Canada.

* * *

FISHERIES

FUTURE OF RESTRUCTURED NEWFOUNDLAND FISHING COMPANY

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. On July 4 the Minister announced the take-over of the Newfoundland offshore trawler fishery, with the jobs and livelihoods of thousands of plant workers, trawler fishermen and inshore fishermen at stake. Four months have passed since then, and the Government has spent its time fighting with the Newfoundland Government and the shareholders of those companies, and sales have been lost to the United States.

When will action be taken to put someone in charge of this new company? When will there be some central direction so that decisions can be made on the budget for 1984? When will there be decisions on fish quotas for that new company? When will decisions be made on refitting trawlers for northern fishing, and refitting the fish plant at Trepassey so that it can reopen? In other words, when will action be taken to start operations, because everything is at a standstill in that area at the moment?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Madam Speaker, I am really surprised, for a Member representing Newfoundland, that he is one of the few people who is not aware of what is going on. Mr. Peckford signed an agreement which he hailed as being the most important bilateral agreement signed by Newfoundland since it joined Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. De Bané: That was done under the leadership of the Prime Minister. Today Mr. Peckford and I announced that all the legal action taken by CDC has been resolved to the mutual satisfaction of both Governments. As to the question of the appointment of the new presidency of the company, both Governments are working closely together on a short list of names which we will put before our two Cabinets. Finally, I am happy to tell the Hon. Member that I have every confidence the new company will be in operation starting with the next fishing season, that is, January 1, 1984.

Mr. Crosbie: I never asked what agreements were signed. I asked what action was being taken. I know that there are 500 people out of work at Trepassey, 400 people out of work at Fermeuse, and hundreds more out of work these last four months while the Minister fiddled around retrofitting agreements.

REQUEST FOR ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMPANY PLANS

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister when the plant at Trepassey will be put into operation. When will there be a managing director of this new operation? When will it be financed? When will he tell them what are their fish quotas so that they can use their trawler fleet next year? In other words, when will people start to work, or are they to lose all hope altogether? I know what is happening in Newfoundland. It is not the dream world the Minister is occupying up here in Ottawa.

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member is definitely an unguided missile.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. De Bané: When he accuses me of fiddling around, actually he is accusing Premier Peckford of fiddling around because Mr. Peckford is now working very solidly with the federal Government on that issue.

As to the question of fishing quotas, I am happy to tell the Hon. Member that I have said publicly we will give the new company a five-year enterprise allocation so that it will know for five years ahead what will be its fishing allocations.

Mr. Crosbie: When? When will they know?

Mr. De Bané: When? When I receive—

Mr. Crosbie: They are out of work in Fermeuse, Trepassey, and in other places.

Madam Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. De Bané: All the participants in the fishery in St. John's were there to prepare their consultative reports to the Minister of Fisheries. I will not jeopardize the consultative process wherein all participants have their say. The Minister of Fisheries, with the provincial Minister of Fisheries, will be making a decision on time for the new fishing season.

Mr. Crosbie: These are your decisions.

Mr. De Bané: I think it is time the Hon. Member realizes that Newfoundlanders are fed up with a guy playing politics with Newfoundland's most vital industry.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: Come down and run there, and you will see.

FUTURE OF INDEPENDENT FISHING COMPANIES

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Madam Speaker, I, too, wish to direct a question to the Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. When he nationalized the "big five" in Atlantic Canada, in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, he actually made sacrificial lambs of the 200 or more independent operators who survived the Government's mismanagement of the fisheries. Since the spokesman for the independents stated that the Government-created monster could destroy the life investment of private operators and thousands of jobs in Atlantic Canada, will the Minister take steps to see that the independents are involved in the Government-controlled company's negotiations on wage settlements, on fish prices, on quota arrangements, and on fishing zones?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Madam Speaker, I am sure the Hon. Member remembers that the Premier of Nova Scotia, when he gave his joint press conference with me, took pains to emphasize that we were not talking about nationalization. We are talking of a company with several shareholders because that company is on the stock market, as you know. It will continue to be publicly traded. The creditors will sit on the board. No civil servant will be part of it, certainly not from my Department, precisely not to put the Department in a position of conflict of interest.

• (1450)

Second, I have the greatest sympathy for our dynamic private entrepreneurs in Atlantic Canada, particularly in Nova Scotia. I can give them the assurance that while that company will be run as a commercial business and will have to compete in the marketplace, it will be looked at by the Department in exactly the same way as others. I can give the firmest assurances on that to our dynamic private sector in Atlantic Canada.

REQUEST THAT AUDITOR GENERAL EXAMINE BOOKS OF RESTRUCTURED COMPANY

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Madam Speaker, when the federal Government owns 60 per cent of the stock in this restructured company, the provincial Government owns 25 per cent, and the Bank of Nova Scotia owns 15 per cent, that, in my view, is nationalization. That is what we face.

The Minister's deputy has stated publicly that the restructured company has no set policy on profit margins. Will the Government permit the Auditor General of Canada to examine the books of this new Government-supported company annually? How will the Government of Canada inject its $75 million into the Province of Newfoundland and its $90 million into the Province of Nova Scotia? When will the Government release its secret agreement with the Bank of Nova Scotia?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Madam Speaker, in response to the first part of the question, I am surprised that the Hon. Member puts the Bank of Nova Scotia in the public sector. This is quite a stretching of reality.

As for the other questions, I can say to the Hon. Member that I take notice of two or three specific inquiries that he made and I will answer him as quickly as possible. I want to assure the Hon. Member that that company will have to be run as a commercial business. If a Government ever wants to destroy a corporate decision of that company it will have to pay the full cost of it. That company will have to compete in the marketplace and not be permitted to count on unlimited funds. It should make its services available to the private sector which would like to use them for marketing or other purposes. I do not see that company as an unfair competitor. If that were so, then the remaining independent sector would have legitimate grounds for grievance.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILD WELFARE

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Canadian Indians appearing before the United Nations working group on indigenous people protested child welfare practices that led to apprehension of their children, their placement in non-Indian homes, and their eventual assimilation. In response the Government indicated that it was now transferring responsibility to Indian communities for their own child welfare. In light of these facts why has the Minister disallowed recent band by-laws that would have recognized the bands' responsibility for child welfare in their own jurisdiction?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Madam Speaker, as the Hon. Member has quite accurately stated, we have moved very significantly in three or four Provinces toward entering into agreements with the Indian people and the Provinces for turning over welfare services to Indians so that there will not be Indian children put with non-Indian families any longer.

With reference to some by-laws that Indian bands may have passed, I have no choice. If independent legal advice indicates

that a by-law is in contravention of the Indian Act, then I have to obey the law of Parliament as it stands, irrespective of what I may think of it. I think the Hon. Member knows that I think the Indian Act is very much outdated, as I am sure does he.

ROLE OF PROVINCES

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Madam Speaker, the Paul Band in Alberta objects to the Department's attempt to push it into a tri-partite agreement with the Province of Alberta regarding child welfare. Does the Minister not recognize that Indian people want to develop their own child welfare models rather than being forced into the assimilationist apprehension model followed by the different Provinces? Will he now extend to these Bands the right to control their own child welfare instead of trying to extend provincial jurisdiction to Indian reserves?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Madam Speaker, in all of the agreements signed so far it is not a question of extending provincial jurisdiction to Indian reserves which has been the motivation behind the federal Government and the Indian people signing agreements with the Province. The Provinces have indicated they are prepared to lend expertise to the Indian people at their request in order to run services, hire Indian personnel and, in many cases, be supportive financially. It is not a question of forcing the Province or the Indian people. It is a question of three parties entering into an agreement voluntarily.

As far as Alberta is concerned, it is not a question of forcing the Indian people to do anything. If they do not want to sign the agreement, they do not have to sign it. We then bilaterally have to endeavour to do the best we can to attain the same objective. In most cases it was the Indian leadership itself that wanted the Province involved for the reasons I have stated.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

LABOUR DISPUTE AT TÉLÉ-MÉTROPOLE IN QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jacques Oliver (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour.

The Minister is aware that for more than ten months there has been a very serious labour dispute at Télé-Métropole, a major television station in Quebec. Could the Minister inform the House, first of all, whether following negotiations or meetings with the union or the Company, the Minister would be willing to appoint a special mediator, if both parties were agreeable to finding someone who could resolve this conflict?

Second, would the Minister also be willing to make a commitment to the effect that, as soon as he receives the consent of both parties, he will appoint a special representative and settle a conflict that has gone on far too long?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Labour): Madam Speaker, two of my departmental officials have already intervened in this conflict with a view to reaching agreement between the parties concerned. First Mr. Saint-Hilaire, as conciliator and then Mr. Drouin, as mediator. Obviously, if both parties feel that appointing a special mediator or a special investigator would be useful I would be glad to appoint such a person. However, I want to be sure that both parties agree that this is what they want and that the appointment will be useful in helping this matter progress towards a final settlement.

* * *

[*English*]

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

UREA FORMALDEHYDE FOAM INSULATION—TERMINATION OF REMOVAL PROGRAM

Mr. G. M. Gurbin (Bruce-Grey): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Government's program to assist people who have urea formaldehyde in their homes terminated as of September 30. Does the Minister feel that this program has fully met the needs of Canadians who have urea formaldehyde in their homes, and is she aware of any difficulties within the program?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Madam Speaker, there are always difficulties within a program but, by and large, we have dealt with most of these problems very fairly. We treat each case that comes to our attention on a case by case basis. The $5,000 grant has met the needs of most of those home owners who have been faced with the problem. The latest figure indicates that an average figure of $4,900-odd is the submission. it is very close to the $5,000 mark that we have offered to home owners.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

Mr. G. M. Gurbin (Bruce-Grey): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same Minister. The CHRP Program has been discontinued and can no longer assist home owners. In rural areas the contractors in many cases have not been able to make proper estimations and there have been some real difficulties in getting registered contractors. In view of this, is the Minister considering extending the Program beyond the September 30 date, or would she consider some special measures that would allow people to co-operate in some way in order to make the $5,000 grant more effective?

● (1500)

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Madam Speaker, no, we do not intend to open up the deadline, which was September 30, but we intend to honour all those submissions made in time for the September 30 deadline.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Hon. Member that we have a urea formaldehyde advisory committee with which we are working very closely. A number of problems have been brought to its attention, which are then discussed and possible solutions investigated. The committee is open to discussion and advice. In those areas where there are problems we offer the services of this committee, which then works with us and the Urea Formaldehyde Centre.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Madam Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petitions presented by Hon. Members on Tuesday, October 25, 1983, meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I should like to designate tomorrow as an Opposition day, this being subject to change.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITION

MR. KEEPER—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Madam Speaker, I have a petition from about 1,000 residents in my constituency who state that on February 10, and April 21, 1983, the Canadian and U.S. Governments concluded weapons testing agreements that paved the way for testing the unarmed Cruise missile in Canada; that the technological capability of the Cruise missile clearly makes it a weapon for fighting a nuclear war and not for deterring such a war; that the Cruise missile is being tested for deployment in western Europe, which would further escalate the nuclear arms race, and that such escalation poses the most grave and immediate threat to world peace and the survival of humanity. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to demonstrate its commitment to suffocation of the arms race by refusing to permit testing of the Cruise missile in Canada.

Madam Speaker, 1,000 members of my constituency have signed this petition of concern with regard to testing the Cruise missile but I must point out that there were 12 constituents who were in favour of the testing.

Motions

INTEREST ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING TERM OF MORTGAGES

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-693, an Act to amend the Interest Act.

Some Hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Madam Speaker, the purpose of this important Bill is to permit the renegotiation of any residential mortgage of a term of one year or more, as opposed to the present five-year requirement. Thousands of Burnaby home owners are trapped in very high interest mortgages which banks and trust companies are refusing to renegotiate now that interest rates have dropped. This Bill would require that these financial institutions use some of their recent record profits to prevent home owners from being locked into these exorbitant interest rates.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Madam Speaker: Motions.

An Hon. Member: A point of order—

Mr. Mazankowski: A point of order.

Madam Speaker: The Minister of Transport.

Mr. Axworthy: Madam Speaker, I move—

Mr. Mazankowski: A point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: A point of order.

Mr. Epp: A point of order.

Mr. McKnight: A point of order.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): I move:

That the Hon. Member for Yukon be now heard, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Pinard: A point of order.

An Hon. Member: There is a motion on the floor.

Mr. Pinard: A point of order.

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker, with due respect, you are aware that I may raise a point of order before the Chair puts the motion, which it has not yet done. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) had already started to speak when the Member opposite was recognized on a point of order, and consequently, he is out of order and does not have the right to move his motion at this time.

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: The motion must be put, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: I am really consulting to find out whether the Hon. Minister had already said "Madam Speaker".

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: Obviously if he had already said Madam Speaker, he already had the floor legitimately.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, the record will show that regardless of what you may or may not have seen the President of the Privy Council do or not do, the Chair clearly recognized, and was heard by Members to have recognized, the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: The Hon. Member for Vegreville then, at the invitation of the Speaker, rose and put his motion. I suggest—

An Hon. Member: On a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: I suggest, Madam Speaker, that the Chair has no alternative now than to put that motion without further debate. To those who say that it cannot be done on a point of order, I say it can only be done on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, what happened is that the Chair recognized the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) under the item Motions. The Minister started to speak under this item. He said: Madam Speaker. Then someone on the other side, and this is the sequence of events, asked to be recognized on a point of order. The Chair had no choice but to recognize the Hon. Member to find out what he wanted, but you then realized that he was proposing a motion to give the floor to another Member, which is out of order, because the Minister of Transport had started to speak. It was therefore normal for the Chair to recognize the Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), but the Chair was correct in not putting the motion, because the Minister of Transport had started to speak, and considering the nature of the motion, it was out of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Deans: Madam Speaker, I have been watching the proceedings very carefully. I distinctly heard the Hon. Member for Vegreville shout, "Point of order" as the Minister was rising.

Madam Speaker: I think Hon. Members will recognize that the important point is whether the Hon. Minister was in possession of the floor. The indication that he would be in possession of the floor, as I stated earlier, was whether he had uttered the words, Madam Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Madam Speaker: In these particular circumstances it is obvious that when a Member is in possession of the floor he cannot at that time be interrupted on a point of order where a motion is—

An Hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Madam Speaker: I certainly gave him the floor not knowing what the point of order was.

A point of order whereby a motion is offered that another Hon. Member be now heard, cannot be entertained once another Member legitimately is in possession of the floor.

I could entertain a point of order on something else, but in this particular case I cannot entertain the point of order.

* * *

• (1510)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

ALLOCATION OF TIME TO CONSIDER REPORT AND THIRD READING STAGES OF BILL C-155

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport) moved:

That in relation to Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain, and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, two sitting days shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and one day shall be allotted to the third reading of the Bill; and

That, 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided by Government business on those days, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question then necessary in order to dispose of the stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

He said: Madam Speaker—

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Axworthy: Madam Speaker, I would like to thank Hon. Members for their gracious welcome to this motion.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Axworthy: The fact of the matter is that we have now been examining the matter of the Crow rate for over two and one half years.

Mr. Smith: Right on.

Mr. Axworthy: This Parliament has been seized of the matter since last spring. On second reading, over 97 speakers had the opportunity to express their point of view.

Mr. Taylor: We do not want to hear the snake from Winnipeg.

Mr. Axworthy: We then had three solid months of committee hearings at which time over 200 representations were heard. At that point in time, Madam Speaker, the Government allowed an additional two weeks beyond the allotted time in which that committee could go through every single amend-

ment proposed, give it full examination, and decide upon that amendment.

Mr. Smith: Hear, hear!

Mr. Axworthy: On report stage, Madam Speaker, there have been over 78 different speeches presented. We have consented to a wide number of amendments. The fact of the matter is that during all that time, at report stage, rather than dealing with the matter according to the proper etiquette—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Axworthy: —and proper orders of debate, Hon. Members of the Opposition proceeded simply to filibuster that Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Axworthy: Instead of acting in the spirit of positive, constructive proposals to make the position of the western farmer better and more effective—

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Axworthy: —all we got is the kind of howling and yowling—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): May we have order in the House, please.

An Hon. Member: That's disorder over there.

Mr. Axworthy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Let's go to the people.

Mr. Axworthy: I feel it is important for all Hon. Members who are seriously engaged in this debate to recognize that there should be a degree of order prevailing so that this House can proceed with the business of dealing with the important amendments, of dealing with the necessary and essential legislation which we provided.

The one thing that Hon. Members of the Opposition do not want to recognize is that this is the single most important economic initiative which has taken place in this decade.

Mr. Smith: Right on!

Mr. Axworthy: This Government is building a second railway across western Canada—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Axworthy: —to move our grain, to move our potash, to move our coal.

I hear the Hon. Member from British Columbia yelping and I see him jumping in his seat. I want him to go back and tell his constituents that he opposed the Crow. We want them to hear that he opposed the Crow.

Mr. Huntington: I am in much better shape than you are. You will not come back here.

Mr. Axworthy: Because, Mr. Speaker, in that Province alone over $5 billion of benefits will accrue to that Province.

Mr. Fennell: That is absolute nonsense!

Mr. Axworthy: There is a Member of Parliament standing in his—

Mr. Taylor: Communist, that is all you are, Communist.

An Hon. Member: Sit down!

An Hon. Member: Wait until the voters get hold of you, Lloyd.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, they just want to talk about the—

Some Hon. Members: Sit down!

Some Hon. Members: Order!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please.

Mr. Taylor: Turn the microphones off. We do not want to hear you.

Mr. Axworthy: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other reason why it is very important that this Bill pass is that it is quite clear that the number of major construction projects which are standing in the wings waiting to occur in Alberta, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba—

An Hon. Member: Order!

Mr. Taylor: That is nonsense.

Mr. Axworthy: —which will provide for the proper capacity to move to export those major goods of western Canada, will stand in abeyance unless this Bill is passed, Mr. Speaker. The future of economic growth and over 300,000 jobs which Canadians are waiting for will be standing in abeyance. How long have we heard from Members of the Opposition, since we have been back in session, that the issue is jobs, jobs jobs? I would like to know why they are howling in their seats today against a measure which will bring forward—

Mr. Taylor: We do not like your sneaky, dirty tricks, that is why.

Mr. Axworthy: —over 300,000 of those jobs.

Mr. Smith: That is right.

Mr. Huntington: That is nonsense. We are not standing in the way.

Mr. Axworthy: I would like them to stand up in the House and explain to Canadians why they are trying to frustrate the will of the House, to frustrate the proper Parliamentary proce-

dures, to frustrate the proper courtesies of introducing a Bill, and why they are standing in the way of over 300,000 jobs being created in this country.

An Hon. Member: We are not standing in the way.

Mr. Axworthy: That is important, Mr. Speaker. They will have to answer for that some day. They are going to answer for their hypocrisy, their contradictions, their flip-flopping and their jumping around.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Axworthy: That Party will have to answer for the fact that it does do not believe—

Mr. Taylor: You are a snake.

Mr. Axworthy: It does not believe in creating jobs in this country. Otherwise those Hon. Members would be standing in their places and saying to the Minister of Transport of the Government, "Get on with the job and get the Bill passed."

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Axworthy: Let me also point out, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of this debate, this Government has at all times responded with the utmost flexibility, responsiveness and willingness—

Some Hon. Members: Oh!

Mr. Taylor: Snake!

Mr. Axworthy: —to accept amendments and changes to alter proposals. Some 20 amendments were accepted from the opposition during committee stage alone. We accepted amendments during report stage. We did that on the grounds that we want to put in place—

Mr. Taylor: Tell it to Moscow. Canadians do not want to hear your communistic talk.

Mr. Axworthy: —a statute which will provide a good and effective transportation system for western Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I believe that we demonstrated our good faith and our willingness to act in a spirit of co-operation. I believe we have shown that we came to this House willing to construct in a positive way the kind of legislation which will allow the western rail to begin to grow and expand. All we ask for, Mr. Speaker, is one small iota of willingness from the other side to at least allow the proper parliamentary procedures to continue. But all we have faced from the time we brought that report in the House was various acts of filibuster, frustration and obstruction to the parliamentary procedure. We were faced with a form of parliamentary guerrilla warfare, of parliamentary blackmail. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, we had to bring in time allocation. We cannot allow a Bill which is so important to the economy of this country—

Mr. Taylor: You cannot allow it? That is more Communism.

Mr. Axworthy: —which is so important to the farmers of western Canada to move their grain and products to market, and which is so important to the men and women across this country who want to go to work—

Mr. Taylor: More Communism.

Mr. Axworthy: —which is important to the steel industry in Trenton, Nova Scotia, and to the steel industry in Hamilton and to the people who make locomotives in London, and which, above all, is most important to the farmers, suppliers and producers in western Canada who know full well that within a year or two, unless that capacity is in place, their grain cannot move to market and we will not be able to sell our produce to a world which is willing to pay the price. That is the point of the motion we have brought forward today, Mr. Speaker. We must get on with the proper business of the House and allow Parliament to decide on an issue which carries with it much of the future growth of western Canada, and with it the future economic growth of the entire country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1520)

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a very sad day for Parliament.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: The actions of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) today only prove that there is no room for reasonableness, constructive criticism and the offering of positive alternatives. This House has been treated to the most extreme exercise in trickery. What is in essence happening here is that the elected representatives of western Canada are being ignored, they are being denied the opportunity to have their views debated and put forward on a very major issue. What this amounts to is an exercise in taxation without representation.

I really regret what the Minister has done today. The position of this Party has been one of constructive criticism. We have offered alternatives, tried to improve the Bill and seek out reasonable solutions. But the Minister is so skittish about his own Bill that he has to move closure. He will not allow the alternatives to be debated. The interpretation in western Canada can only be that this Government is engaging in another attack upon the West. First of all, this Government does not have a mandate to dismantle the Crow take system. It was not an election issue. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said time and time again that the Government would not proceed on any measure to dismantle the Crow unless there was a consensus in western Canada. I humbly submit to you,

Mr. Speaker, that there is not a consensus in western Canada, certainly not for the proposals outlined in this Bill. There is no support from any corner of the agricultural community or any agricultural organization. The grain producers do not support it. The livestock producers do not support it. The commodity producers do not support it. Every farm organization has found fault with this Bill.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the livestock and commodity groups have really been sucked in by this Government. They too were betrayed. They worked toward developing a realistic and comprehensive approach which would serve the broader interests of agriculture in western Canada, and the Government pulled the rug out from under them. So the Government really has no friends and no support out there whatsoever. I repeat, there is no consensus that this Bill should be proceeded with, yet the Government is hell-bent on forging ahead.

Let us look at the history. After two days' debate on second reading, the Government moved time allocation. In the committee stage it put on an artificial time limit. We worked day and night—it was the most rigorous exercise committee Members have ever gone through. Here we have an opportunity to debate some of the positive alternatives advanced by our Party, and that is being denied. What is so sad is that we are dealing here with a western issue, one which affects the lives of every person who lives in western Canada. It is more than simply a freight rate issue. It goes to the very economic and social fabric of western Canada. And here we have a Government with no membership in the House from rural western Canada. This issue is really being resolved by a centrally dominated Government. I say to you, Sir, that it is only going to cause further alienation, division and disharmony, and it will increase the strains on Confederation.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how much more can this country stand? We have gone through a number of very, very contentious and controversial issues. But nothing has been handled with the callous contempt with which the Government has handled this issue. It surely has a blatant disregard for western Canada. Rather than working toward a solution, the Government decided to use force. We have offered a proposal which would ensure the retention of the existing statutory rate until the review process is completed. The Government obviously has some misgivings about this legislation, but it insists on forging ahead. We said, "Back off, wait a little while, do your analysis before you strangle the producers of western Canada with these enormous increases in freight rates". But no, it decided to move.

Members opposite suggest they are acting in the best interests of the country because they are being stubborn. If this Government believes that through stubbornness it is demonstrating strength, I can tell you that we view it somewhat differently in western Canada. If the Government believes it is demonstrating leadership through confrontation, I can tell you as well that we view that in another context. It is that kind of stubbornness and confrontation which has divided our country and destroyed our economy. We have seen it in the Constitution, in the National Energy Program and now we see it in the Crow. Those are three areas in which the Government has engaged singularly in an all-out attack on western Canada.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that we in our Party have tried to work toward a positive and satisfactory solution. We have opposed and we have proposed. We have offered alternatives. We have listened to the evidence before the committee, listened to farm groups and we have offered alternative proposals. We did it in committee and again in the House. But we are very saddened by the fact that we have not been able to debate the alternative proposals we believe would go a long way toward improving this Bill. We have not even had a chance to debate the Government's own amendments in committee or in the House. Moving closure before the Government has a chance to debate its own amendments is to me, totally ridiculous and incomprehensible. We can only conclude, Sir, that it does not have the necessary confidence to defend its own proposals. Members opposite do not have any confidence in this Bill because they know it cannot withstand the critical test of debate. If the Government is so skittish and paranoid about this issue, why does it not go to the people and call an election?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, my suggestion is that rather than this Government's moving closure it should dissolve the House and call an election and let the people decide. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen):

That the Orders of the Day be now read.

Mr. Evans: That is out of order.

Mr. Nielsen: It is not. Mr. Speaker, if there is any—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Is the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker if there is any doubt in the mind of the Chair as to the acceptability and regularity of that motion, I would like to speak to it before any ruling is made.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Chair finds the motion in order. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): All those in favour of the motion, will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): All those opposed, will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Call in the Members.

• (1710)

And the division bells having been rung:

Madam Speaker: Order, please. It now being 5.12 p.m., under the provision of Standing Order 82, the two hours since the commencement of the proceedings on the motion now before the House have expired. Accordingly, under the terms of the Standing Order, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put every question necessary to dispose of the motion. The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I thought you would be seeking advice from Members prior to putting the question.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: I am still prepared to listen to advice. That is why I recognized the Hon. Member; I thought he had some advice to give me.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, the Chair was faced, of course, with a problem in the interpretation of Standing Order 82. Since that Standing Order found its way into our rule book, this is the first time upon which an occasion has arisen where we are confronted with a situation of voting on a procedure established under Standing Order 82 with a dilatory motion, which the Chair has described so often, in front of it, namely the motion put by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski).

That was brought about, with no intention whatsoever of reflecting on the actions of the Chair, by the process of this afternoon when at the same time the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) rose, the Hon. Member for Vegreville rose, and I rose. It came to the application of Standing Order 33 which sets forth:

> When two or more Members rise to speak, the Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his or her place; but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now heard", or "do now speak", which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

I have had the opportunity during the interval prior to 5.12 p.m. to examine the "blues". What transpired was that the Minister of Transport had risen in his place and the Chair recognized the Minister of Transport. The Minister of Transport got so far as to say "I move". That is where it stopped. Then the Hon. Member for Vegreville, who was on his feet at the time—

• (1720)

Mr. Mazankowski: Before.

Mr. Nielsen: Let us be fair and say that we were all on our feet at the same time. He then sought recognition and he was recognized by the Chair. He had the opportunity of putting the full text of his motion. That appears clearly on the tapes and on the "blues". We, of course, believe that at that point the Chair was boxed in, as I submitted before, but the Chair has made a contrary ruling. That has brought on this dilemma with which the Chair is now confronted.

This all stems from the application of Standing Order 82. Without reading the entire Standing Order, the last sentence—and this deals of course with the motion made by the Minister of Transport for the allocation of time—on page 87 reads:

> Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon—

That is on the motion of the Minister of Transport.

> —the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

Two matters arise here that should be taken into consideration in deciding whether we are in the right time frame in taking this vote. I intend to support my submission that the vote should be taken at six o'clock rather than at 5.12 with my submissions to the Chair.

If we were only confronted with the motion of the Minister there would be no problem, because there can be no question that during the time the bells were ringing the clock was running and the debate would have terminated at 5.12, two hours after the proceedings had commenced. Normally, had debate continued, at the end of that two hours there would have been a 15-minute bell and the vote would have been taken. But here we had, in front of the motion for time allocation made by the Minister, a dilatory motion.

The two points I have to make with respect to Standing Order 82 have to do with the interpretation of the word "motion" where it is referred to in the final sentence of Standing Order 82—"to dispose of the said motion", namely the motion made by the Minister of Transport. The other point I have to make has to do with the interpretation of the word "proceedings". I will be contending and supporting it by authorities that the word "proceedings" in effect means debate.

To deal with the first question with respect to the interpretation of the words "to dispose of the said motion", I submit that the obligation of the Chair under Standing Order 82 is to put every question necessary to dispose of the motion of the Minister of Transport, and I contend that in the ordinary case that would be done two hours after the debate had commenced by the initiative of the Minister of Transport. However, in this case we had an intervening proceeding, namely a dilatory motion, a motion which the Chair has so often ruled is a dilatory motion, in front of the motion of the Minister of Transport. That led me to the interpretation of this Standing Order and, in the absence of any precedent whatsoever with respect to the interpretation of these particular circumstances, to the conclusion that the dilatory motion could only be disposed of regularly by waiting until six o'clock. Then, based on the precedents the Chair has repeatedly set in defining

dilatory motions and their effect, that would have called the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville up at six o'clock, at which time that motion would have been disposed of, and the debate having been deemed to have been over at 5.12 on the motion of the Minister of Transport, the vote on the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville would be immediately followed by a vote on the motion of the Minister of Transport. That all hinges on what interpretation the Chair chooses to place on the word "proceedings".

I contend, in the context in which that word is used in Standing Order 82, that the word "proceedings" can only mean one thing, and that is debate; and that debate can only mean one thing, and that is debate on the motion put by the Minister of Transport.

The other interpretation, of course, which can be placed on it is that included in the interpretation of the word "proceedings" is the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville. Because Standing Order 82 never contemplated a situation such as this, it is my respectful submission that that would be a distortion not only of the literal wording of Standing Order 82 but also the intent of Standing Order 82.

In Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, we find no specific reference to "proceedings" and its definition, but we find a reference to "Incidental Interruption to Proceedings" at page 228, which sets forth the following under paragraph XIV:

> Incidental Interruption to Proceedings.
>
> Besides such interruptions of business as are prescribed by the rules of the house, such as private bills at 8 o'clock on Tuesdays and Fridays, or by a member, after due notice, rising to move a closure of debate, or by some special order, the time for a consideration of which has been reached, the proceedings of the house may be interrupted by a question of privilege or of order which calls for the immediate interposition of the house, by occasions of sudden disorder in the house and proceedings occasioned thereby, or by a message from the governor-general requiring the attendance of the house in the Senate. When the cause of the interruption has ceased or the proceedings thereon have been disposed of, the debate or business in hand is resumed at the point where the interruption had occurred.

My submission is that such an interruption occurred in the proceedings triggered by the Minister of Transport in the form of the motion made by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. Therefore, I cite that paragraph in support of my contention that his motion should have been disposed of at six o'clock rather than now, and then we would have proceeded with the motion made by the Minister of Transport.

One further submission I wish to cite in order to support these submissions to the Chair—regardless of what happens here tonight vis-à-vis the vote, it is going to happen; but I hate to see a bad precedent sitting on the books with respect to the timing—from the Eighteenth Edition of Erskine May. I do not believe the wording has been altered in the more recent Nineteenth Edition. At page 84 of the Eighteenth Edition, the meaning of the term "proceedings in Parliament" is set forth. Allow me, Madam Speaker, to cite at some length from that precedent:

> The meaning of the term "proceedings in Parliament."—
>
> The primary meaning, as a technical parliamentary term, of "proceedings" (which it had at least as early as the seventeenth century) is some formal action, usually a decision, taken by the House in its collective capacity. This is naturally extended to the forms of business in which the House takes action, and the whole process, the principal part of which is debate, by which it reaches a decision.

● (1730)

I cite that particular passage from that precedent, Madam Speaker, to support my submission that "proceedings" as used in Standing Order 82 means debate and that the two terms are interchangeable and exclusively so. The citation goes on:

> An individual Member takes part in a proceeding usually by speech, but also by various recognized kinds of formal action, such as voting, giving notice of a motion, etc.—

I could write the words in there "a motion to proceed to Orders of the Day", such as that made by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. I again quote:

> —or presenting a petition or a report from a Committee, most of such actions being time-saving substitutes for speaking.

One might question the veracity of that observation, Madam Speaker. I quote:

> Officers of the House take part in its proceedings principally by carrying out its orders, general or particular.

And so the precedent goes. My submission is—I am having difficulty, even with the assistance of the public address system, overcoming the murmurs opposite. I am sure they would not want to see a bad precedent put on the books any more than we would. The time is being—

Madam Speaker: Order.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, the time is being very usefully spent and I am very happy that the Chair and its officers want to hear these submissions for the purpose of coming to decisions in the future with respect to this kind of situation.

The submission that I am making is that the term "proceedings" used in Standing Order 82 is limited to debate and that the question on the motion put by the Minister of Transport should have been put after the time for the lapsing, according to the Chair's own numerous rulings, on the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

It is, in my submission, more logical to interpret Standing Order 82 to have meant that we should have returned here at six o'clock, had the bells rung that long, for the purpose of voting on the motion put by the Hon. Member for Vegreville, and then immediately thereafter have proceeded with the motion of the Minister of Transport. However, it may not be necessary for the Chair to come to a conclusion which might—I do not suggest it will, but if my submission are accepted I could use that term—set an improper precedent.

If the question were now to be called on the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville, it is going to take us 10 to 15 minutes to record the division. The Chair will then be obliged to call the motion of the Minister of Transport. The yeas and

nays having been heard, the bells are then limited to 15 minutes and that will take us to six o'clock.

May I suggest to the Chair that, this argument having been made, it is not necessary to make any firm decision at this point as to the regularity or propriety of having come back here at 5.12. I know that the Chair has been advised and is convinced that it is right in having done so, but the Chair does not have to adopt that position in view of the time and may leave this question open for a later decision rather than having a questionable precedent on our books.

I make that submission sincerely since it is not necessary to come to the kind of conclusion which I anticipate the Chair might do if we still had two hours or more to go.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I should like to disprove some of the allegations the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has just made. After I have completed my remarks, he may not have to rely on the bell ringing for an additional 15 minutes and calling Hon. Members for a vote to reach 6 p.m., the time for the adjournment of the House. I wish to indicate to the House that there is in Beauchesne's 5th Edition a single citation which disproves the point the Hon. Member for Yukon has been trying to make concerning the definition of proceedings or délibérations.

Before coming to that particular citation in Beauchesne's which clearly states that proceedings include the holding of a vote and the voting procedure, I should like to return, for the information of the Hon. Member, to the previous course of events. About 3.12 p.m., you recognized the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) under the item *Motions* and not on a point of order. He rose under the item *Motions* and was about to start his remarks, and as was indicated by the Hon. Member for Yukon himself, the Minister of Transport had had time to say "I move—" I submit that was enough to stop any Hon. Member of the House from moving a motion under Standing Order 33 which provides that when several Hon. Members rise at the same time, one of them may rise and suggest that some other Hon. Member be heard.

You were perfectly aware of Citation 302, which appears at page 99 of Beauchesne's 5th Edition and which reads:

(2) A motion that a Member "be now heard" must be moved before the Member recognized has begun speaking.

That is clear, Madam Speaker, and justification enough for you to say after a while to the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) that his point of order was unacceptable. Still, since he had called your attention to raise a point of order, it was only logical that you listen to his point of order. That is why you had to interrupt the Minister of Transport who had begun speaking, even though he had not gone very far, he had said at least two or three words, but indeed you had to know the nature of the point of order which the Hon. Member was trying to raise. When he moved his motion, you were then in a position to realize that he was moving a motion pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 33. I raised my objection and drew your attention to the fact that the Minister of Transport had begun speaking. You remembered Beauchesne's Citation 302 and said to the Hon. Member for Vegreville: "I cannot entertain your motion because, according to parliamentary procedure experts and past practices, it is out of order". You made your ruling on that, and I do not think that the Hon. Member for Yukon wanted to challenge or question your ruling when he referred to those facts. However, we have to go back to those facts to understand where we stand now.

Therefore the debate on the motion under Standing Order 82 began at 2.12 p.m. Standing Order 82 concludes as follows:

—two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

The word "proceedings" is used.

It seems quite clear to me that you have made the proper decision. The Standing Orders are quite specific and bind the Speaker who "shall" put an end to the proceedings. We have to ask ourselves, since the Hon. Member for Vegreville had subsequently moved that the House proceed to the orders of the day, if calling in the members must be considered part of the proceedings. The answer to that question, Madam Speaker, is found in the fifth edition of Beauchesne. First, citation 251, at page 85, I quote:

Motions, amendments, references to committees, and the three readings of bills come under the term of "proceedings in Parliament". They are the means used to the end that a matter may be considered and disposed of by the House. The word "proceeding" is derived from the verb "to proceed" which means "to advance" or "to carry on a series of actions". Members take part in the proceedings usually by making speeches; however, many proceedings take place without any debate.

In view of the late hour, I spare you the rest of the quote. But there is another quote in Beauchesne that is still more specific it supports and confirms my point, and it refutes that made by my learned colleague from Yukon. It is found at page 91, citation 284, paragraph (2), bottom half of the page. It is short but precise. I quote:

It has never been understood in the House of Commons that the word "proceedings" covered speeches; it is not applied to arguments but it covers such things as utterances bearing directly on making motions, moving amendments, presenting reports, putting the questions, answering questions placed on the Order Paper, voting, naming a Member; it is construed as relating to procedure and not to debates.

● (1740)

Therefore, Madam Speaker, it is clear that you had to stop the ringing of the bells, you had to stop the voting procedure on the motion presented by the Hon. Member for Vegreville, because Standing Order 82 provides that two hours after the commencement of proceedings on a motion to limit the debate, you shall interrupt the proceedings. Proceedings are involved when the bells ring! . . . they are proceedings because a voting procedure is involved, and this is established by the quotes I

just referred to. Finally, when my hon. colleague says that the Chair must put the motion of the Minister of Transport before the motion of the Member for Vegreville, I must insist that this indicates a poor comprehension of Standing Order 82. The Standing Order provides, and I quote:

> Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

The motion of the Minister of Transport.

Therefore, the matter of calling a vote on the motion of the Member for Vegreville must be disposed of before putting the motion of the Minister of Transport. I think that is clear, and I feel we must not lose sight of what is involved here, unless we want to create a precedent that may prove troublesome for the Official Opposition in the future. It seems to me the Standing Orders are sufficiently clear. If the Chair says the Member for Yukon is right or if it refrains from interpreting Standing Order 82 as we just did, it will subsequently be impossible for the House to vote on a matter in the case of time allocation, because an Opposition Member would be able to move, not only a dilatory motion but another motion that is not dilatory, and the Chair would have no justification for terminating the proceedings at 6:00 p.m. on the grounds that the motion in question was dilatory.

Consequently, we might well find ourselves with limited debates that would be limitless. Thus, the Chair made the right decision, and we support it. The Standing Orders are clear and Beauchesne is clear. I think my hon. colleague from Yukon is satisfied. In any case, the House will adjourn at six o'clock before disposing of the items scheduled before getting to the Order of the Day, and I think the ruling made by the Chair will prove very useful in future as a contribution towards more orderly proceedings in this House, so that when we limit debate, it will in fact be limited and Members will not be able to make undue and abusive use of dilatory measures.

[*English*]

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Madam Speaker, since the Government House Leader is interested in the facts, I would suspect that he might be interested in what actually transpired in the House during the course of the exchange, according to the "blues". If he will check he will note, according to the "blues", that you, Madam Speaker, called for motions. At that time an Hon. Member raised a point of order and it was followed by:

> MR. MAZANKOWSKI: A point of order.

Then Madam Speaker said:

> The minister of Transport.

The Minister then said:

> Madam Speaker, I move—

And then the following appears:

> MR. MAZANKOWSKI: A point of order.
>
> MR. NIELSEN: A point of order.
>
> MR. EPP: A point of order.
>
> MR. MCKNIGHT: A point of order.

Then Madam Speaker said:

> The Hon. Member for Vegreville.
>
> MR. MAZANKOWSKI: I move that the Hon. Member for Yukon be now heard, Madam Speaker.

The exchange went on from there. If the Hon. Government House Leader is interested in the facts, it should be clearly noted that, according to the exchange that took place in the official record of *Hansard*, it was very clear that I was on my feet before the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and that it should be so recognized.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I think my hon. colleague from Vegreville should make the distinction: I said that the Member had not been recognized before the Minister had started his speech, and that is the Standing Orders.

Madam Speaker: May I start by answering the point made by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. It is quite possible that *Hansard* has recorded in a certain order what has been heard on the floor of the House. If someone is in a room and several people are speaking at the same time and there is some secretary who is taking a verbatim report, that person will certainly organize it in a certain order.

What has to be clear and what I reaffirmed before the House is that several Members rose at the same time, and at any rate the Minister of Transport did catch the eye of the Speaker, in my view first. Then I heard points of order and I recognized the Hon. Member for Vegreville. I think the House has to allow that the Speaker, standing or where she is sitting, is supposed to be well placed to determine inasmuch as it is humanly possible who has risen first and who has risen second and third. However, that being said, we have entered into a proceeding and at this point we are deciding on something else.

I listened very carefully to the presentation made by the Hon. Member for Yukon and the only thing I did not really like about it was that he was inviting me to shirk my responsibility, not make a decision, pretend that the clock was just ticking by and that I need not make a decision now. That is not the kind of Speaker you have.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: I will live or die on the decision but I feel impelled to make it because I did decide to come into the House at 5.12 p.m., indicating then that that was my interpretation of the Standing Orders.

The rest of the Hon. Member's remarks I enjoyed very much because he is always very careful to bring forward arguments which help the Chair to take its decisions. It seems to me that the Hon. Member was inviting me to let the bells ring until six o'clock so that I could lapse the motion that an Hon. Member be now heard, as I have lapsed other motions at six o'clock. Indeed, that motion probably would have lapsed at six o'clock. I could have lapsed it but the situation is quite different in that we were in the midst of a proceeding whereby a motion had been presented by the Hon. Minister of Trans-

port under Standing Order 82 where a two-hour debate is to take place after which—and the Standing Order is quite clear in this when it says:

Not more than two hours after the commencement of proceedings thereon, the Speaker shall put every question necessary to dispose of the said motion.

It seems that the two-hour limit hangs on the interpretation that is given to "proceedings". I am very fortunate in that I do not have to interpret it myself. It has been interpreted by other greater authorities than I and interpreted based on the experience of several Parliaments, including our own. I will read back to the Hon. Member from Erskine May's Nineteenth Edition, which is the one I have, but I think the wording has not changed very much as he says. It reads as follows:

The primary meaning, as a technical parliamentary term, of "proceedings" . . . is some formal action, usually a decision, taken by the House in its collective capacity. This is naturally extended to the forms of business in which the House takes action, and the whole process, the principal part of which is debate—

As debate is the principal part of it, it does mean that "proceeding" may have other parts to it, namely all other actions which may be taken by Members, such as voting, presenting amendments, presenting motions, etc.

An individual Member takes part in a proceeding usually by his speech but also by various kinds of formal action, such as voting, giving notice of a motion, etc., or presenting a petition or a report of a committee, most of such actions being time-saving substitutes for speaking.

● (1750)

I will read from Beauchesne's "Interpretation of Proceedings":

Motions, amendments, references to committees, and the three readings of bills come under the term of "proceedings in Parliament" . . . The word "proceeding" is derived from the verb "to proceed" which means "to advance" or "to carry on a series of actions". Members take part in the proceedings usually by making speeches; however, many proceedings take place without any debate. Speeches are not essential; they either help or hinder a proceeding—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Madam Speaker: It is nice to see that Beauchesne had a fabulous sense of humour!

—but they are not a proceeding.

It seems clear to me that I am obliged by Standing Order 82, as it states very clearly "two hours after the commencement of the proceedings", to take all votes necessary to dispose of the question.

The Hon. Member argued that it is all votes necessary to the "said motion", as the Standing Order said. I agree with the Hon. Member that "said motion" means the motion presented by the Minister of Transport. However, in the way of "said motion" I have another motion, and the House must dispose of that motion, which is the motion presented by the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

If I were to deal with that motion afterward, that motion simply would not make sense. Therefore, the motion presented by the Hon. Member for Vegreville is in the way of the motion with which I must now deal, according to Standing Orders, two hours and some after the commencement of the proceedings. Therefore I am obliged to put the question to the House.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 371)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bradley
Broadbent
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Knowles
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCuish
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Patterson
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Waddell
Wilson
Wright
Young—105.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corriveau
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Ittinuar
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Beauce)

Messrs.

LeBlanc	Nicholson (Miss)	Rooney
Leduc	Olivier	Rossi
Lefebvre	Ostiguy	Roy
Loiselle	Ouellet	Savard
Lumley	Parent	Schroder
MacBain	Pelletier	Smith
MacGuigan	Pepin	Tardif
Mackasey	Pinard	Tessier
MacLaren	Portelance	Tobin
Malépart	Prud'homme	Tousignant
Maltais	Regan	Trudeau
Marceau	Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)	Turner
Massé	Roberts	Watson
Masters	Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)	Whelan
McRae		Yanakis—121.
Munro (Hamilton East)		

[*Translation*]

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Motion negatived.

* * *

[*English*]

POINT OF ORDER

MR. BROADBENT—PROPOSED S.O. 30 MOTION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As Your Honour knows, I gave notice earlier today of my intention to move a motion under the provisions of Standing Order 30, concerning a subject of great importance which is recognized by all the Parties in the House, namely, the invasion of Grenada. I know that by the time we finish the second vote it will be past six o'clock so I am asking if we can obtain the unanimous consent of the House to have the Chair make its ruling on that motion after we take the next vote.

● (1800)

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member is asking in fact that we go through all of Routine Proceedings before adjourning?

Mr. Broadbent: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to allow the Chair to go through Routine Proceedings past six o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Pursuant to Standing Order 82, it is my duty to put the next question which is as follows: Mr. Axworthy, seconded by Mr. Pinard, moved that in relation to Bill C-155—

Shall I dispense?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: No—an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain, and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, two sitting days shall be allotted to the consideration of the report stage and one day shall be allotted to the third reading of the Bill—

[*Translation*]

—and—

—that, 15 minutes before the expiry of the time provided by Government business on those days, any proceedings before the House shall be interrupted, if required, for the purpose of this order and, in turn, every question then necessary in order to dispose of the stage of the Bill then under consideration shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

[*English*]

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Madam Speaker: All those in favour please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Madam Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Madam Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Madam Speaker: Call in the Members. Shall we dispense with the bells?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Nielsen: Ring the bells.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, this is a closure motion: the bells will be rung.

Mr. McDermid: They have to be!

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Axworthy), which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 372*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand	Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)	Demers
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Campbell (Cardigan)	Dingwall
Axworthy	Chénier	Dion
Bachand	Chrétien	Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)	Collenette	Dubois
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)	Comtois	Duclos
Bégin (Miss)	Corbin	Dupont
Berger	Corriveau	Dupras
Bloomfield	Côté (Mrs.)	Duquet
Bockstael	Cousineau	Erola (Mrs.)
Bossy	Cullen	Ethier
Breau	Cyr	Evans
Bujold	Dawson	Ferguson
Bussières	De Bané	Fisher
Caccia	de Corneille	Fleming
		Flis

Messrs.

Foster
Fox
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Ittinuar
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacGuigan
MacLaren
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Pepin
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Watson
Whelan
Yanakis—122.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bradley
Broadbent
Cardiff
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Patterson
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thomson
Towers
Waddell
Wilson
Wright
Young—101.

Madam Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. NIELSEN—ALLOTTED DAYS, S.O. 62—PROPOSED MOTION

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There seems to be some doubt with respect to whether or not we in the Opposition, as of right, have the privilege of filing notice of an allotted day subject after six o'clock. It is clearly after six o'clock now and if the House would feel so disposed to grant its consent to extend time for filing under Standing Order 47, we would want to move the following motion for tomorrow's allotted day which has been designated by the Government House Leader:

That this House condemns the Government for its contempt for the taxpayers of Canada, which it demonstrates by the creation of a taxation system in the form of the Income Tax Act that is increasingly incomprehensible for individual taxpayers and by its failure to end capricious and unfair practices of the Department of National Revenue.

Madam Speaker: I do not think I will hear much argument. I will ask whether there is unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Madam Speaker: No, I am sorry. It being past six o'clock, I must adjourn the House until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning, pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 6.34 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 27, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

● (1105)

[*English*]

POINT OF ORDER

MR. NIELSEN—CONSIDERATION OF ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have to rise at this time in order to present to the Chair a submission with respect to what should be the Orders of the Day today. I believe it is important in raising this matter prior to the calling of the Orders that I should cite from Beauchesne's Fifth Edition Citation 237, which states at page 79:

A point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place.

● (1110)

Standing Order 62 provides, Mr. Speaker, that 25 days are to be allotted for the consideration of the business of supply in any given year. On those days Opposition motions shall take precedence over all Government supply motions. Standing Order 62(5) outlines the semesters of supply and establishes that in the period ending not later than December 10 each year, five days are to be allotted to supply. To date in this semester the House has considered the business of supply on one day only.

Yesterday, the Government House Leader stood in his place and announced that today would be an allotted day for the consideration of the business of supply. His words may be found at page 28349 of *Hansard*, and I read those words under the heading "Business of the House":

MR. PINARD: Madam Speaker, I should like to designate tomorrow as an Opposition day, this being subject to change.

The form of the Government House Leader's notice that he would be allotting today for supply is fully consistent with the established practices of this House. I emphasize the word "practices". Following upon the notice given by the Government House Leader, the Opposition was required by Standing Order 62(4) to give written notice of the motion to be considered on the allotted day. Standing Order 62(4)(a) and (b) outline the notice periods for Opposition day motions. Standing Order 62(4)(a) says:

Forty-eight hours' written notice shall be given of motions to concur in interim supply, main estimates, supplementary or final estimates, to restore or reinstate any item in the estimates. Twenty-four hours' written notice shall be given of an opposition motion on an allotted day or of a notice to oppose any item in the estimates.

Standing Order 62(4)(b) says:

If an opposition motion pursuant to section (9) of this Standing Order is to be proposed on a Friday, forty-eight hours' written notice shall be given that the recorded division on the motion, if demanded, is not to be deferred.

Those are the two applicable Standing Orders to my submission. Today being Thursday, only 24 hours' written notice was required for an Opposition motion. Although the notice requirements are expressed as a period of 24 or 48 hours, the long established practice of this House has been to understand these requirements such that the 24 hours' notice requirement is fulfilled if notice is submitted during the sitting day prior to the consideration of a motion, and such that Citation 400(1) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition states:

The publication of a proposed motion, once in the *Notice Paper* and the next day on the *Order Paper*, is sufficient to cover two days' notice under S.O. 42.

I emphasize, too, the submission that the practice requirements have been met so long as that notice is submitted during the sitting day.

If the notice requirement for today's Opposition day motion were to be strictly interpreted as amounting to 24 hours, Mr. Speaker, there would have been insufficient time between the time the Government House Leader rose in the House to allot today as an Opposition day and the time of 11 a.m. this morning when the House was scheduled to enter into consideration of Orders of the Day. That is the reason for the long established practice of notice being sufficiently filed if done within a sitting day.

● (1115)

Yesterday the House did not sit until 2 p.m. Thus, if a full 24 hours were required to elapse between the filing of a written notice and the time that a motion could be taken up in the House, an Opposition day motion could not be considered prior to 2 p.m. today. Because the Government House Leader could not rise for the purpose of giving notice of his intention to allot today for the consideration of the business of supply before Routine Proceedings had been reached, the 24-hour period, strictly interpreted, could not begin to run until at least 3 p.m. yesterday.

However, Mr. Speaker, Citation 399 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition notes as follows under the heading "Publication of Notices":

The exact time at which notices should be handed to the Clerk at the Table is of minor importance.

As authority for that, there appears the reference to *Journals*, April 14, 1913, at page 461.

Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen

A written notice of motion pursuant to Standing Order 62 was filed with the Table during the sitting yesterday. On that basis, I submit that the Opposition has met the notice requirements for an Opposition day motion and that the business of the House today should be the consideration of an Opposition day motion. Instead, Mr. Speaker, the Projected Order of Business indicates that the business to be considered in the House today is the report stage of Bill C-155. As well, today's Order Paper contains no reference to the motion that I submitted to the Table on behalf of the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty). In other words, the supply day that was allotted by the Government House Leader yesterday seems simply to have disappeared.

In anticipation of your dealing with Standing Order 47, Mr. Speaker, I submit that it has no applicability here. It is Standing Order 62 that deals with supply days. As there may be some concern that proper notice was not given yesterday or that the events which transpired in the House prior to the adjournment last evening may have blocked the filing of the notice of motion, I would like a moment to discuss yesterday's events as they occurred and the practices of the House with respect to the notice requirement.

It was at 5.12 or 5.15 yesterday, when Members returned to the House to vote on the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), that the Government House Leader spoke to me to confirm the fact that today would be an allotted day. I do not rest my case on that but I think that fact should be made known. He did the same thing last week when he allotted a day. Out of courtesy, he simply confirmed to me that there would indeed be an allotted day today. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, as can be demonstrated by reference to page 28349 of *Hansard*, that the announcement made by the Government House Leader was, in his own words, subject to change. At 5.12 p.m. yesterday, the Government House leader informed me that there would be no change and that the Government intended to proceed with an allotted day today.

Immediately after my discussion with the House Leader, proceedings began in the House again and I became involved in presenting a lengthy point of order on which the Government House Leader also made a submission. At the conclusion of the point of order, the House proceeded to the division on the motion for the Hon. Member for Vegreville. Throughout this period I did not have the opportunity to file the Opposition day motion with the Table. However, I did file with the Table a copy of the notice of motion during the time in which the division bells rang prior to the division on the time allocation motion moved by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy). At that time the House was still sitting and, indeed, still had a decision to make. In other words, the notice of motion had been given to the Table well before I rose to seek the consent of the House to file the motion.

● (1120)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May the Chair interrupt the Hon. Member to ask him a question at this point? At what time yesterday was this notice filed? I am asking the Hon. Member if he cares to offer this information.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, it was filed after the division had been recorded on the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville and before the division on the motion of the Minister of Transport. The House was still sitting, waiting to record the division on the motion of the Minister.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is being very helpful and very explicit. I hope he understands the reason why the Chair is asking the question. This was after six o'clock?

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, of course it was, and I will get to that in a moment. It appears quite clearly from the record.

However, my point is that it was filed while the House was still sitting. As I noted in my remarks last evening, I submit that consent was not needed. The Government House Leader was of the same view last evening, and I believe that he still is, although he may have some quarrel with my submission as to the correct order to be called today. I rose to seek consent last night so that there could be no question that the motion had been filed and there could be no question that the motion was properly before the House today. I did that because of a knowledge of some apparent doubt which existed with one or two of the officials at the Table.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the NDP at that time refused to give their consent to the filing of the motion. I can only presume that they did this in order to facilitate debate on the Crow and to prevent the House from considering the matter of Revenue Canada's abuse of authority. But Madam Speaker, having determined that consent was not forthcoming, adjourned the House for the day. At that point in time the House was still sitting. Indeed, the House was called upon to make a decision as to whether or not that consent would be forthcoming.

Therefore, we arrive at the current stage of the proceedings. The motion is not on the Order Paper and I question the absence of it. The Projected Order of Business indicates that Bill C-155 is the business for today. If Bill C-155 is proceeded with, I believe that the House could not then move to an Opposition day motion and complete consideration of that motion today. That is plain. As a result, it is most important that any outstanding questions with respect to the procedural acceptability or validity of the motion of the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe be settled now, at this stage. It is something we cannot reserve.

The key point in my submission rests on Citation 399 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, as previously cited. The substance of Citation 399 may be traced back at least as far as the Third Edition of Beauchesne which also contains, at pages 827 and 828, the Speaker's ruling on which the citation was based. That ruling is quite lengthy but I believe it bears directly on the events of yesterday and that it will help the Chair to make a ruling on the point of order now before the House.

The ruling by Mr. Speaker Sproule was based on the rules of the House as they existed at that time, November 21, 1912, when Standing Order 40 under "Notice of Motion" had this to say about the practice then:

● (1125)

Two days' notice shall be given of a motion for leave to present a bill, resolution or address, for the appointment of any committee, or for the putting of a question; but this rule shall not apply to bills after their introduction, or to private bills, or to the times of meeting or adjournment of the House. Such notice shall be laid on the table before five o'clock, p.m., and be printed in the Votes and Proceedings—

I emphasize, the time was explicit—at five o'clock p.m. Mr. Speaker Sproule of that day had to deal with the same question that is now before the Chair. As reported in Beauchesne's Third Edition at page 827, we find the following:

(*a*) The publication of a proposed motion once in the Votes and Proceedings and the next day on the Order Paper is sufficient to cover two days' notice under Rule 17 (now S.O. 45).

Rule 17 is now Standing Order 45. The (b) paragraph is most important. It reads:

(*b*) The exact time at which these notices should be handed to the Clerk at the Table is of minor importance.

The paragraph continues:

The House, according to Order, resumed the adjourned Debate on the proposed Resolution of Mr. Borden, to amend Rule 17* of the House of Commons, and the proposed motion of Mr. Hazen: "That the question be now put."

A point of Order was raised by Mr. Maclean (Halifax), That as forty-eight hours had not elapsed between the time the notice was given and the said Resolution was proposed in the House, the said notice was insufficient.

On the next page we find the following:

MR. SPEAKER: I have only to say that my understanding has always been that the notice is intended to be given to the members of Parliament for a specific purpose, namely, that they may not be taken unawares, but may have an opportunity to prepare for the motion. The two days' notice, as I have always understood it—and I have discussed this question with the Clerk previous to the present one, and with the one before him—means that the notice must appear on the official paper of the day twice, first on the day after it is given, in the Votes and Proceedings, and then, on the day following that, the day that it might be considered, on the Order Paper of the House. I am told that the usual practice has been followed in this case.

It was not followed in the case before us today and it should have been, in my submission. Mr. Speaker Sproule continued:

With regard to the exact time at which the notice should be laid on the table of the House, my information always has been that that is for the convenience of the officials who prepare the Votes and Proceedings for to-morrow, and the Order Paper for the following day, and for the convenience of the Printing Bureau. Therefore it was provided that the notice should be laid on the table of the House before five o'clock. I had occasion some years ago to make inquiry with regard to the time when these notices were laid on the table of the House, and I found that in many cases it was done as late as eleven or twelve o'clock, and sometimes after twelve o'clock at night. The first clerk whom I sat under, Mr. Patrick, when I applied to him gave me the explanation that the exact time at which they were laid on the Table did not matter so much but the essence of the rule was that they should appear on the official papers twice—first in the Votes and Proceedings, so that the members might have full notice, and the second day upon the Order Paper for that day. Therefore my decision is that the point is not well taken.

In other words, notwithstanding the late filing, the motion was accepted and the business of the House was allowed to proceed, as I will be suggesting it should be allowed to proceed today.

In my submission, it was possible to file the notice of the Opposition day motion at any time during the sitting of the House yesterday and, at the same time, meet the 24-hour notice requirement, notwithstanding Standing Order 47, which has no application in this instance. But even if it did, that six o'clock has not pursuant to our practices in this place been so stringently interpreted as to mean that a notice filed at 6:01 p.m., 6:05 p.m., or indeed 6:15 p.m., could not be accepted as long as the House was sitting. That such a filing should happen to take place shortly after 6 p.m., as is the instant case, rather than precisely at 6 p.m. or before 6 p.m., should have placed no great burden upon the Table as the Order Paper could not be printed until such time as the House had completed its sitting last night.

● (1130)

It is the right of Members to give notice of motions, and I submit that in any case where there is any doubt as to the procedural validity or standing of a motion, the Chair and the Table should err on the side of Members rather than deciding not to print the notice of motion on the Order Paper. In this case, however, there can be no doubt of the procedural regularity of the notice. At the time the unanimous consent of the House was sought by the Speaker yesterday, the House had not concluded yesterday's sitting. We still had two decisions to make—first, the recorded division on the Minister's motion and, second, just before adjournment when the Speaker at my request sought unanimous consent so as to remove any doubt which might have been in the minds of the officials at the Table. At the time unanimous consent was sought by the Speaker yesterday, the House had not concluded yesterday's sitting. This point is born out at page 28360 of *Hansard*, where the following may be found under the heading "Point of Order" and under the sub heading "Allotted Days, S.O. 62—Proposed Motion":

HON. ERIK NIELSEN (YUKON): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There seems to be some doubt with respect to whether or not we in the Opposition, as of right, have the privilege of filing notice of an allotted day subject after six o'clock.

That gets to the point the Chair was asking me. It continues:

It is clearly after six o'clock now and if the House would feel so disposed to grant its consent to extend time for filing under Standing Order 47—

That was the Standing Order which was causing some concern to the officials at the Table.

—we would want to move the following motion for tomorrow's allotted day which has been designated by the Government House Leader:—

At that stage it still had the status of being designated. Then I read the motion which appears in the official record of the debates during the sitting yesterday as follows:

That this House condemns the Government for its contempt for the taxpayers of Canada, which it demonstrates by the creation of a taxation system in the form of the Income Tax Act that is increasingly incomprehensible for individual taxpayers and by its failure to end capricious and unfair practices of the Department of National Revenue.

MADAM SPEAKER: I do not think I will hear much argument. I will ask whether there is unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Then the Hon. Members to my left said "No".

MR. PINARD: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

At that point I know the Government House Leader wanted to rise and make the same kind of argument in his usual expert fashion that I am making right now, so that we could proceed with an allotted day today. *Hansard* continues:

MADAM SPEAKER: No, I am sorry. It being past six o'clock, I must adjourn the House until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning, pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 6.34 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

The motion was given to the Table and it was later read into the record by myself. Both events took place before the adjournment of yesterday's sitting and in the presence of 223 Members who were present in the House for last night's vote on the time allocation motion.

Mr. Beatty: There were 224 counting Madam Speaker.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, 224 counting the Chair; I am corrected quite properly. On the basis of the traditional understanding of the 24-hour notice requirement as referring not to a set period of hours but to the fact that motions subject to a 24-hour notice requirement must be filed, at the latest, on the sitting day prior to the day—I am in the final stretch and I would like the undivided attention of the Chair, which has been listening very conscientiously to the important point I am making—that they are taken up for consideration in the House, and on the basis of Mr. Speaker Sproule's ruling and the subsequent citations in Beauchesne, there can be no doubt that adequate notice was given and that the motion should be before the House today.

The House was still sitting. If we are to apply with that degree of stringency the time of six o'clock, which seemed to be in the heads of some of the officials at the Table last night, then we discard all those past practices. That motion could have been printed on the Order Paper. Without intending any disrespect to the decision made by the officials at the Table in not including it in today's Projected Order of Business or the Order Paper, I seriously question that decision. It should have been printed, and I think I raised this point on a previous occasion. While the House was sitting, the Table was seized of the motion; indeed, 224 Members were seized of it. The whole purpose of providing that kind of notice is to put all Members on the alert so that they can prepare for the following day's business.

In fairness to the government House Leader, I should say that somewhere around nine o'clock or 9.30 o'clock last night—I do not have the exact time with me—an official in his office called me on the telephone to inform me that today's order would be Bill C-155. I thanked him for the courtesy of the information, but it did not deter me in my resolve to raise this very important point today.

I believe, with great respect, the fears or doubts of the officials at the Table, with whom I spoke last night were not well-founded. Sometimes, like me, even they could be wrong. The practices of this place have long been that the notice requirements are met even though the notice may have gone slightly beyond the six o'clock requirement. If there is any doubt whatsoever in the mind of the Chair on this question, it surely, in my submission, must be resolved in favour of the Standing Order 62 process rather than the rigid application of Standing Order 47.

Therefore Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Opposition I request that you call the motion of the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty) for debate this morning.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1140)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I shall try to be very brief. This morning, three Standing Orders are being applied, namely, S.O. 62(4)(a), S.O. 47 and S.O. 22(2), which gives the Government the power to determine the Orders of the Day. That being said, it seems to me the situation is very straightforward. First of all, this debate is purely academic, since the Government decided yesterday to put consideration of Bill C-155 on today's Orders of the Day. It could have decided to do so this morning, and we could even at this very minute decide that not Bill C-155 but Bill C-12 will be on the Orders of the Day, since it is up to the Government to determine the order of business in the House, and the Standing Orders do not require notice of such a decision, except that it must be made before the Orders of the Day are called.

What happened yesterday is very simple. At three o'clock, on a point of order, I designated today as an Opposition day, and I was under no obligation to add what I did and I do so occasionally—namely, that this was subject to change. At that point, the Opposition had all the time in the world to table a notice of motion before six o'clock. Whatever the intentions of the Opposition were, I am not going to make a mountain out of a molehill, since this would be as childish as it is useless. For some reason, they preferred not to table their notice before six o'clock, claiming that it was subject to change anyway and they wanted to find out whether I was going to change my mind.

My learned colleague refers to what happened around 5:12 p.m., when he asked me whether this was going to be an opposition day or not and whether I was going to change my mind. I merely answered that I did not think I was going to change my mind and if I did, I would let him know in due time. He could have tabled his notice before, and he could still do so at that point, until six o'clock. However, he did not. Subsequently, after six o'clock, the Member for Yukon (Mr.

Nielsen) felt obliged to seek the unanimous consent of the House for tabling his notice, which he read very quickly in order to have his notice read into the record and prepare his case for this morning. It was past six o'clock—this is important—and he asked for unanimous consent. The mere fact that the hon. gentleman asked for unanimous consent proves, in my opinion, that he had dropped the idea that he could do so without seeking the unanimous consent. In any case, I say we do not need this argument to win our case. Consent was denied, and the hon. gentleman seemed to anticipate what I was going to ask on a point of order. If the Chair had recognized the Hon. Member, I was going to say that I would advise the Opposition later that evening of the business of the House today, and I was certainly not going to rise to argue that unanimous consent was not necessary.

When my hon. colleague says that he felt I was going to argue his case, he is wrong. My purpose in rising on a point of order was to say that since unanimous consent was not forthcoming, I was not going to challenge the Chair's decision. Later, I would inform the Opposition of the business of the House for tomorrow, which is today.

Subsequently, about half an hour later, I managed to reach the House Leader of the New Democratic Party personally, and I confirmed that the business of the House for this morning would deal with Bill C-155. I personally tried to reach the Member for Yukon, but unfortunately, there was no answer. Maybe I had a wrong number. In any case someone in my office, as the Hon. Member acknowledged earlier, managed to reach him around 8:00 or 8:30 to confirm that the Orders of the Day would include Bill C-155. I spoke to the Clerk of the House myself to let him know that consideration of Bill C-155 would be on today's Orders of the Day, and I was not obliged to do so before six o'clock.

In the circumstances, the point raised by the Opposition House Leader is purely academic. He is not losing an opposition day, because today is not a designated day, and as they say, I undesignated it. I changed its designation. Today's Orders of the Day were determined yesterday. They were advised in time. That is our prerogative. It is Bill C-155, there is no problem. However, if the Opposition House Leader wished to reserve the right, in future, to table a notice after six o'clock but before the end of the sitting day, this is another issue on which a debate could be held if the situation warrants. It is a point that could be discussed. There are those who will say that a notice of motion which according to Standing Order 62(4)(a) requires twenty-four hours' notice, must, according to Standing Order 47, formerly S.O. 42, be tabled before six o'clock, and incidentally, in the citations from Beauchesne mentioned by my hon. colleague there is a reference to Standing Order 42, now Standing Order 47. Thus, when he says that S.O. 47 does not apply here, he should not refer to citations that are based on S.O. 47, formerly S.O. 42. There is a contradiction here.

There are those who will claim that by analogy, the twenty-four hours' notice mentioned in S.O. 62(4)(a), must be given before six o'clock, pursuant to S.O. 47. I can live with that, and I think that is the opinion we have received up to now. Once again, the problem is purely academic, because the Orders of the Day were changed yesterday to accommodate the Opposition. We were polite and we advised them. The Hon. Member for Yukon cannot deny this, since he himself felt obliged to seek unanimous consent, which was not denied by us but by someone else in the House.

Finally, to stress once again the perhaps pointless aspect of this argument when he refers to Citation 399 of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, I feel the decision does not contradict the point I am trying to make, and in any case, even if the Hon. Member for Yukon claims that Citation 399 contradicts what I am saying, let it suffice for me to say that the citation dates back to 1913, when the House did not adjourn automatically and sat until late at night. There was no set adjournment at five or six or nine o'clock, which explains the comment that the exact time at which notices are handed to the Clerk at the Table is of minor importance. In 1913, no one ever knew at what time the House would adjourn. I do not think my hon. colleague was here at the time, but I am sure that if he cares to check what I just said, he will realize that his point is not a valid one. This citation can not apply here because it does not refer to the same Standing Orders.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I said that I would be brief. First of all, pursuant to S.O. 22(2), it is up to me to determine the Orders of the Day. That is clear. Changes were made and this has happened before. We decided to change an Opposition day when the Progressive Conservatives played a trick on our colleagues who were in Europe. We can do it again if necessary. We did so yesterday evening, not as a response to that kind of trick, but to another kind of manoeuvre. My hon. colleague is smiling, and he knows very well what I mean. We did so to accommodate them, and S.O. 22(2) gives us the authority to determine that the Orders of the Day will include Bill C-155.

Second, I have some comments on the Hon. Member's notice that was not submitted in time. If he had not sought the unanimous consent of the House, what he said this morning, would have gained in credibility. Third, I think that, by analogy, we have no choice but to apply the time provision in S.O. 47 when dealing with the issue of twenty-four hours' notice pursuant to S.O. 62(4)(a).

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has a problem at this time. There are a number of Hon. Members asking to be recognized. In fairness to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), who should be recognized, the Chair would like to give the Hon. Member for Yukon an opportunity to reply afterwards, if that is agreeable.

Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I really think it would be helpful if I made the additional point so that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain could deal with it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Briefly, the Hon. Member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: The Government House Leader raised a question which I really did not develop fully for consideration of the Chair, and that is the rights of Members to have their motions printed in the official documents of the House. The Chair will note that that motion last night which was left with the Table during the sitting does not appear on the Notice Paper of the Order Paper. It does not appear anywhere.

I have not had the time to be able to cite specifically the precedent, but the House will remember that within the last year we had put down, after being notified of an allotted day, a motion, filing it with the Table. It was printed in the records of the House. The New Democratic Party on the same occasion put down a motion for the same allotted day, which would have caused the Chair to have to make a decision. But that is not relevant here. The relevant point here is that both of those motions were printed on the Notice Paper and both appeared in the official records of the House. Indeed, the Government changed the allotted day and the printing of both of those motions was carried on until the allotted day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In fairness to the Hon. Member, he is developing an area where a good deal of argument could take place. The Chair is not persuaded that it is absolutely relevant to a decision on a matter that must be before us. The Chair at this point would like—

Mr. Nielsen: It is before you now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is before us at this point.

Mr. Nielsen: The second one is before you now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There are other points that obviously could be considered. The Chair is trying, with the greatest attention that the Chair can offer, to focus on the essential points and would recognize the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain at this point.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I intend to deal only with the question originally put before you, if I may. At the outset I want to make it clear that I am obviously sympathetic to the purpose of the point of order of the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). It would evidently be to the advantage of the Opposition to be able to file, should this Chair find in favour, a notice at any point after six o'clock.

● (1150)

The question before us, however, is a different one, I think. I hesitate to say it but the Hon. Member for Yukon and his colleagues are the authors of their own misfortune. It has been the practice in this House for some long period of time, as I understand it, that the filing of an Opposition day notice has been required to be done prior to six o'clock. In fact, yesterday when I was informed at about one minute to six that no motion had been filed, my immediate reaction was that perhaps the Opposition day was intended to be ours and that we had not been informed. Knowing how competent the Hon. Member for Yukon usually is in these things, I could hardly believe that he had been so tardy and slipshod. Nevertheless, it turns out that this was the case and I regret having to say that.

There are two matters before you, Mr. Speaker. The first is whether it was required last evening that unanimous consent be sought to have the motion filed late. The Hon. Member for Yukon clearly believed that it was required, otherwise he would not have raised a point of order and sought that unanimous consent. The events of the day were not so filled with turmoil as to make it impossible for a Member to have filed notice prior to six o'clock.

Immediately upon calling orders of the day after three o'clock there was a dispute about whether the Minister or the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) had the floor. Subsequent to that the decision of the Chair was made that the Minister had the floor. The Minister moved his motion under Standing Order 83 and spoke for the ten minutes he is allotted. The Hon. Member for Vegreville followed with his speech, and for some reason that escapes the majority of sensible people in the House of Commons, he moved to go to the orders of the day. Effectively, what he did was eliminate the opportunity for any other Member to speak against the Government's attempt to impose time allocation. I can only assume that was his intention since no other intent could be read into his action.

What he effectively did was to make sure that only the Minister and himself were able to speak during the two-hour debate allotted for the purpose, thus excluding any Member of this Party or any individual Member of the House from speaking. The result was that at the end of the two-hour period prescribed in the Standing Orders the Chair, quite properly in my opinion, put all of the motions necessary to dispose of the question. That occurred at 5.15 in the afternoon so there was still lots of time to file an opposition motion.

The Hon. Member for Yukon then rose to argue on a spurious point that somehow or other the vote should not take place until six o'clock. It was an interesting but quite irrelevant argument, I thought, and he took up, as he has this morning, about half an hour of time making this argument based, I submit, on faulty background information. Nevertheless, he made it and time went by.

The vote was taken on the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville that we proceed to orders of the day. My Leader rose at that point and sought unanimous consent to extend the time of sitting to allow us to continue through the proceedings prior to orders of the day in order that he could move a motion, or at least receive a ruling on a motion for an adjournment debate on the very important question of the invasion of Grenada. That was refused. It is an important point to recognize that it was refused. In refusing to extend orders of the day it became quite clear that at the precise

moment that the vote on the motion of the Minister was concluded, we had technically arrived at six o'clock and the only thing left to do was to move to adjourn.

At that point I contend that the Hon. Member for Yukon could have made the argument he made this morning. He could have risen and said that having been informed by the Table that they were not going to accept his motion, it was his opinion that a Speaker's ruling was required then and there on whether there was a necessity for unanimous consent or whether the Standing Orders and precedents he has cited today should and could prevail. The Hon. Member chose not to do that.

I would refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 78, Citation 235, which reads as follows:

Any Member is entitled, even bound, to bring to the Speaker's immediate—

I emphasize "immediate", Mr. Speaker.

—notice any instance of what he considers a breach of order. He may interrupt and lay the point in question concisely before the Speaker. He should do so as soon as he perceives an irregularity in the proceedings which are engaging the attention of the House. The Speaker's attention must be directed to a breach of order at the proper moment, namely the moment it occurred.

I contend that if there was a question to be decided at that point, it was not whether the Hon. Member was entitled to file, having been refused permission to do so by the Table; the question before him was, should he rise on a point of order and get a ruling from the Speaker to permit filing to take place? He chose not to do that. I cannot help but read into his actions that he believed he had exceeded the time limit under normal practice and that he was requiring the unanimous consent of the House to do that which otherwise he could not do. I contend that his rising on the question today at eleven o'clock, interesting though it is, is too late. The question was quite clearly before him and should have been raised in the House yesterday at 6.15 if, indeed, it was a point of order.

Frankly speaking, I suggest that although as a Member of the Opposition I would be happy if you could find a way to rule that we are entitled to file a notice of motion after six o'clock, as it would be to our advantage if the Opposition could file at any time, the practices of the past have made it necessary to conclude that filing must take place prior to six o'clock.

Since the Hon. Member missed the opportunity to raise that precise point of order at a time when it could have been ruled upon by the Speaker, and since today's decisions passed by without the Hon. Member having raised the point, the Hon. Member then pursued the matter through asking for unanimous consent which he must have believed at the time was necessary. With the benefit of overnight reflection he seems to have changed his mind, but unfortunately he has not made a case sufficient to justify overwhelming support.

As I started, Mr. Speaker, I end. The Hon. Member for Yukon is learned in the rules of the House, and he constantly informs us of this. He has frequently pointed out to me and others when we are in violation of the rules, and I have accepted his advice graciously on all occasions. I can only conclude on this occasion that because of his inadvertence, neglect, tardiness, slipshod manner or whatever, he failed to do what is necessary. I regret that I cannot support the import of his argument although I do support the desire he has in mind.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has heard one spokesman from each of the three Parties. The Chair will now propose to hear the Hon. Member in whose name the motion was attempted and then will render a decision on the matter.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your courtesy. There are a number of key points which the Chair will want to take into consideration. I want in particular to respond to one argument made by the Government House Leader and the House Leader of the New Democratic Party. It relates to the procedure followed yesterday afternoon when my House Leader rose following six o'clock to ask for unanimous consent to allow the motion to be filed.

The suggestion was made by the Government House Leader and the House Leader for the NDP that the action of my House Leader was in some way a confession on his part that he did not, by right, have the ability to file that notice of motion last night after six o'clock and that somehow the fact that he rose at that time prejudiced my ability to have my motion considered today. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. The reason my House Leader rose when he did last night to seek unanimous consent was to avoid precisely what has happened this morning.

• (1200)

Instead of going on to debate the Crow, as the NDP would like, we on this side of the House want to debate a motion dealing with Revenue Canada. Our Members are prepared to deal with that motion. Many of us have worked for a considerable period of time in order to deal with it. What is essential here, Mr. Speaker, is that the ability of Hon. Members to act on motions such as this should not be circumscribed by a literal interpretation of procedures or by a decision made by the Table which would prejudice the rights of individual Hon. Members; in this case, myself.

What has happened today because of the New Democratic Party's unwillingness yesterday to give unanimous consent to the very reasonable request which was made by my House Leader is that we have already lost one hour of the time which is allotted for an Opposition day. Even if you find, Mr. Speaker, in our favour—as I hope you will and as I believe you must—the effect of the NDP refusal to give consent has been that a minimum of one hour has been lost to debate what would be the Order of the Day.

That was the reason my House Leader rose yesterday to seek unanimous consent. The record is very clear. He said: "There seems to be some doubt with respect to this." He did not say: "I believe I am no longer entitled to put down this motion". In order to eliminate any question and to facilitate the proceedings of the House, he asked quite properly for unanimous consent, which would have avoided the procedural debate we are having at the present time. It certainly would

have facilitated matters for the Chair and for every Hon. Member, including Hon. Members of the NDP and the Government, who would be taking part in the debate today. Surely, one of the reasons why notice is required is to enable Hon. Members to do their homework in preparation for debate.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should certainly set aside the argument which was made by the House Leaders of the NDP and the Government that in some way my House Leader prejudiced our right to make this argument today by his actions yesterday, or that he was in any way conceding that we did not, as a matter of right, have the ability to put that motion down.

A second point was raised by the House Leader for the New Democratic Party. He referred at length to the attempt by his Leader, the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), to ask for unanimous consent to extend the hours of sitting yesterday. The argument the House Leader made was that when Government Members refused that unanimous consent, it was then clear that the proceedings would lapse at six o'clock. Yet, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the final line in yesterday's *Hansard* you will see it says precisely this:

> At 6.34 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

The record of the House of Commons itself makes it very clear that the House was in session. The House was sitting until 6.34 p.m. last night. The record also makes it very clear that both at the time my House Leader submitted that motion to the Table and at the time he rose to ask for unanimous consent, the House was still proceeding. It is perhaps a reflection on Madam Speaker which is made by the House Leader of the New Democratic Party if he suggests that it was improper for my House Leader to be permitted to raise this matter at that point. However, Madam Speaker was clearly of the opinion that the House was sitting. Otherwise she could not have given the floor to my House Leader, and otherwise she could not have sought the unanimous consent of the House as requested by my House Leader. Again, the argument which is made by the House Leader of the New Democratic Party is spurious and irrelevant.

The question is this, Mr. Speaker. The first issue that has to be considered by you is whether or not Standing Order 62(4) is to be taken literally. Does it in fact require, literally, that 24 hours of notice be given before an Opposition day? On the face of it, clearly that is not the case. Clearly it would have been physically impossible yesterday, because the first that any of us in the House learned that it was the Government's intention yesterday to designate today as an Opposition day was following three o'clock. How could we conceivably have squeezed 24 hours into the period between three o'clock and eleven o'clock this morning? There has never been any dispute about that in the House. We have never had a case where the New Democratic Party and the Government House Leader have risen to argue that the 24 hours referred to in the Standing Orders must be taken literally.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, that point was amply made by his House Leader.

Mr. Beatty: Good. As long as you accept the point which was made by my House Leader, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased, because it is a key argument which has to be made here. It leads to this question: What is intended by the House in terms of the requirement of six o'clock? Why is there any requirement for a specified time? My House Leader alluded to that when he referred to the citation in Beauchesne and quoted from the decision which was made by one of Your Honour's distinguished predecessors. It was very clear that the reason that procedure exists is to ensure that Hon. Members are aware of what the next day's business would be. If the procedure has been interpreted by the Chair throughout the course of time as meaning that notice must be given during the present sitting day about what is happening the following day, clearly there is no dispute whatsoever about it, Mr. Speaker.

The record of the House of Commons itself shows that at the time notice was given, at the time unanimous consent was requested, the House was sitting. The sitting day was continuing. It cannot be argued that because it was after six o'clock, that somehow takes away from the right of Hon. Members of Parliament to submit these motions, notwithstanding the fact the House was still sitting, and notwithstanding the fact that, according to *Hansard*, at that time some 224 Hon. Members were present in the House. If we were to accept that, Mr. Speaker, what we would find is that this would be a negation of the whole principle which was accepted by you a minute ago when you said the House Leader put the case very clearly, that that Standing Order is not to be taken literally.

Mr. Nielsen: Nor is 47.

Mr. Beatty: And, as my House Leader has just said, nor is Standing Order 47. If the Chair accepts the principle that the reason for requiring notice is to ensure that Hon. Members are given the right and the ability to know what the next day's business is during the sitting day, one has no option except to conclude that the notice was properly given during the sitting day and on time. To set an arbitrary cut-off time, which is not in the rule book, of six o'clock, I would submit to you, Mr. Speaker, would be grossly unfair and would undermine the whole principle of this question which has existed since, I believe, 1913.

There is another matter which I would like to develop and which has not been touched on by the Hon. Members who have spoken today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, the Chair listened intently to the argument of his House Leader and the Hon. Member so far has repeated what his House Leader has said.

Mr. Nielsen: No, he has not.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I invite the Hon. Member, if he has a new point to make, to make it.

Mr. Nielsen: He is doing it.

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, that is precisely what I intend to do. I would like to refer the Chair to Standing Order 55 which reads as follows:

Whenever the Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the House is contrary to the rules and privileges of Parliament, the Speaker shall apprise the House thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon, and quote the Standing Order or authority applicable to the case.

My submission, Mr. Speaker, is that if there was doubt as to the procedural acceptability of a notice of motion filed after 6 p.m., the proper procedure was not for someone to decide not to include it in the Orders of the Day today and to prejudice my rights, as an Hon. Member, to deal with that motion, but rather for it to appear on the Orders of the Day and for the Speaker now, before calling the motion, to deal with the question of procedure. I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that my rights as an Hon. Member are prejudiced when a decision is made arbitrarily that a motion which is submitted by an Hon. Member on this side of the House in good faith, believing fully that it is within the rules of the House, is summarily not included in the Order Paper for today.

If one looks, even in a cursory way, at the Standing Order 55, the procedure which should be followed is very clear. For someone simply to make the decision that the notice of motion would not appear because it was filed following six o'clock departs from the principle established in Standing Order 55 and gravely undermines my rights, Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Parliament to deal with this matter and have my motion considered. I consider that element every bit as serious as the matters raised by my House Leader and the House Leaders for the other two Parties, because it is my rights as a Member which are in jeopardy as a result of this decision.

• (1210)

If you were to accept the argument that since it does not appear in the Orders of the Day today because it was filed after six o'clock we are to go to Government Orders and not debate an Opposition day motion, then I suggest that deeply undercuts my rights as a Member and prejudices my ability to defend an action which I believe, and which my House Leader believes, was entirely in order and consistent with precedent.

Mr. Fisher: You can say that without blushing?

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, I believe that on the basis of Standing Order 55 alone a compelling case can be made for the procedure followed last evening, and that not including my motion on today's Order Paper was wrong and my rights have been prejudiced. Additionally, I believe the argument by my House Leader was compelling since there is no question that when the order was filed last night it was filed consistent with the practices of this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to Hon. Members, the Chair has heard a good deal of argument—

Mr. Mazankowski: Procedural acceptability.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Well, the Chair is not going to listen to a series of repetitive arguments; but if the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) has a short point of order, the Chair will listen to him. But the Chair does not intend to listen to a lengthy repetition of arguments.

Mr. McKnight: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Mr. Pinard: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): I move:

That the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster be now heard.

Mr. Pinard: A point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: The motion must be put without debate.

Mr. Ouellet: The motion is not yet put.

Mr. Pinard: I got up on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: The motion has to be put.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville has moved that the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) be now heard.

Mr. Fisher: Who seconded the motion?

Mr. Nielsen: I seconded the motion.

Mr. Pinard: I raised a point of order before the motion was made.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Those in favour please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Those opposed please say nay?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): I rise to follow my House Leader and the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty) on the matter of the allotted day assigned by the Government House Leader with the caveat that it may be changed. As my House Leader and the Hon. Member in whose name the motion stands have expressed, that motion was subject to withdrawal.

The rationale for rising in his place to ask for unanimous consent, which I think would have facilitated the movement of the business of this House much more rapidly than we have this morning by carrying on this debate, was the time that had elapsed. If we are indeed to be consistent concerning the ability of Opposition Members to have allotted days, it would appear to be incumbent upon those of us on this side and on

the Government side to inform my House Leader whether the offer of an allotted day would stand or be withdrawn.

When my House Leader rose to seek unanimous consent and read the motion, as he did last evening, it would appear he was trying to facilitate the business of the House. That motion appeared to be agreed to by the Government House Leader. I thought I saw his head nodding in the affirmative and he had no objection to that happening. For some reason Members of the NDP refused to give unanimous consent, and therefore at the first opportunity my House Leader—

Mr. Althouse: Get your facts right.

Mr. McKnight: —presented the argument for the Opposition day. I fail to understand why anyone would not consent to a motion which would remove Revenue Canada from the backs of the taxpayers in Canada.

Mr. Althouse: A point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: We are on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster is on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We have been on a point of order all the way along. The Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre rises on a point of order.

Mr. Althouse: I am sure the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster would not wish to break the rules of the House and impute motives to any Members or any Party, particularly when, if indeed there was a "no" yesterday, it was not clear where it was from.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not making a point of order. The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster has the floor. The Chair requests the Hon. Member, in the interests of the House, not to repeat arguments but to deal with essential items concerning the point of order raised by his House Leader.

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I did not realize I was casting aspersions on anyone. I just said that the NDP denied unanimous consent.

Mr. Keeper: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it not necessary for a Member to tell the truth?

Mr. McKnight: The Hon. Member who put this motion feels that he was denied the right of a Member of Parliament to have a motion which he feels very strongly about debated on the floor of the House of Commons. Rather than repeat myself, I now move:

That the Hon. Member for Yukon be now heard.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pinard: By unanimous consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The concern the Chair has at this point is that motions of a particular form, repeated with a dilatory purpose, raise some fundamental questions about the way in which this House conducts its business.

Mr. Nielsen: Then hear us out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will hear the Hon. Member for Yukon and then render a decision on the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Yukon.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, it has been the practice in this place for many, many years for the Chair to listen to submissions and hear Members out who feel they have a contribution to make to a procedural debate. I urge the Chair to reconsider the imposition of any guillotine on a procedural debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the Hon. Member, being an experienced Parliamentarian, is well aware of ample precedents in which the Chair has listened patiently to arguments, and beyond a certain point has decided the argument has been sufficient for the purpose of the Chair to render a decision to the House. The Chair has listened for well over one hour, and listened patiently, to the Hon. Member. I am sure the Hon. Member, who has a great respect for Parliament and who at some time may face even greater responsibilities than he has now, will realize the implications of what he is doing.

Mr. Pinard: Oh, never!

Mr. Nielsen: There is no doubt about the truthfulness of your last two sentences, Mr. Speaker.

I have now had provided to me the precedents in order for the Chair to come to a balanced decision with respect to the rights of Members to have their motion printed in the official records of the House, which is part of the point of order I raised initially. Perhaps while I am presenting my argument, these precedents could be obtained for the Chair or I will pass mine up. However, I think it would be helpful if the Chair had them while I am arguing.

● (1220)

I shall refer to *Hansard* of February 12, 1982, at pages 14953 to 14966 inclusive. At that time, a very full debate on this question was raised and the Chair reserved its decision. Three days later, on February 15, at page 14997 and page 14998, the question was resolved. On February 12, 1982 I raised a question under the subheading:

MR. NIELSEN—PRINTING IN ORDER PAPER OF FILED OPPOSITION MOTION—CHANGES TO ORDER PAPER MADE BY GOVERNMENT

I made a lengthy argument at that time on the basis that the Order Paper had been changed. At that time as well, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain sought a meeting with the Chair to discuss the subject. He is not present at the moment

but he will recall that. He sought that meeting in order to discuss this matter with the Speaker, but was unable to do so because of the events that were occurring during that time.

On that occasion, as reported at page 14954 of *Hansard*, I said the following:

Let me read now the Order Paper following upon the announcement Thursday by the government House leader, the Order Paper and Notices for Friday, February 5, 1982. At page 2 the Chair will note that Friday, February 12, has been designated as (Allotted Day—Supply).

That situation is on all fours with the situation that is before us here. In that case, the words "Allotted Day—Supply" appeared in italics and in brackets. I was making the argument that the Government, having announced that allotted day, could not smuggle in a change on the Order Paper by the use of the Standing Order allowing it to set the business of the House. The point I am making is that under the Order Paper of that day appeared this heading:

Notices of Supply Proceedings Pursuant
to Standing Order 58(4)(a)—

That is now Standing Order 62(4)(a).

NOTE: Friday, February 12, 1982—Third allotted day for the supply period ending March 26, 1982.

Today's Notice Paper goes that far. That much is printed. I want to emphasize and underline the fact that that notice which has been carried throughout the week on the preceding Friday stipulated, following the word "Note", the date of Friday, February 12, 1982. I would underscore that as I underscored the appearance today on the Order Paper of the announcement by the House Leader yesterday making today an allotted day.

I shall now deal with the motion. In the precedent that I cited on page 14954 of *Hansard* for February 12 appears this passage:

As the Chair appreciates, under our Standing Orders there must be 24 hours' notice filed in order to set the allotted day down for debate. It is past history that notice of that motion was set down at 1.12 in the afternoon of Thursday, February 11. The motion that was set down first, I point out, bore no date. It was as follows:

The notice that followed was printed in the Order Paper under Standing Order 58(9). The point of that debate as it relates to this one was that the motion itself was in the possession of the Table. The House was seized of it, having been given it during the sitting, and it was printed in full on the Order Paper. The Speaker reserved her judgment with respect to the right of Members to have motions printed on the question of alterations and I would like to cite briefly from her ruling of February 15, 1982, at page 14997 of *Hansard*, under the subheading:

MR. NIELSEN—PRINTING IN ORDER PAPER OF FILED OPPOSITION MOTION—RULING BY MADAM SPEAKER

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to rule on the point of order which was brought up last Friday by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). His point of order was that the notice filed by him in the name of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) pursuant to Standing Order 58(4)(a) did not appear on the notice paper of Friday, February 12, 1982.

Before dealing with this point, I should like to clarify certain references made to the Order Paper by the Hon. Member in his submission on Friday last. The Hon. Member alleges that the government, merely by verbal announcement, has altered an item appearing on the Order Paper.

I respectfully submit to the Hon. Member that the government does not alter the Order Paper. Only decisions by the House can have that effect. On the other hand, the notice paper is made up of notices given by members of the House in accordance with the Standing Orders. The production of these papers is under the direction of the Clerk of the House.

Reference was made to page 2 of the Order Paper which is entitled "Projected Weekly Order of Business". Although it is not an official part of the Order Paper, it is inserted for the information and the convenience of Hon. Members. The same is true of the notes projecting dates—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has brought his instances to the attention of the Chair and has argued his case very well. The Chair has listened patiently to his argument. The Chair is now in the position of being able to make some observations that might perhaps be of assistance—

Mr. Nielsen: There are other points to be covered.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair must at some point decide and—

Mr. Nielsen: There are other points to be covered which you have not even heard yet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has been given ample opportunity. This is the third occasion he has been recognized on the same point of order. With all due respect to the Hon. Member, I would like to repeat to him a remark that I made before. What he is doing to Parliament by this procedure is something for him to weigh with his own conscience and his accountability to the people of Canada.

Mr. Nielsen: Is that a threat?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: At this point, with all due respect to the Hon. Member, the Chair is prepared to make an observation on the point.

Some Hon. Members: Point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is prepared to make an observation. The Hon. Member is seeking to substitute a procedure different from that which has been the practice of the House. The Hon. Member for Yukon very correctly pointed out that Standing Order 62(4) cannot be taken literally. Twenty-four hours' notice cannot be given and has not been given. The Hon. Member for Yukon, in a very learned and well prepared presentation, has cast reflections upon whether or not Standing Order 47 is relevant. The Chair has some concern as to whether or not it is relevant. However, the Chair must ask the Hon. Member for Yukon what he is arguing. He is arguing that the sitting time of the House should be the limit and not six o'clock. That is his argument.

I call to the attention of the Hon. Member the fact that yesterday there was a motion in the name of the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) which, if granted by the Chair,

would have had the effect of allowing for a sitting beginning at eight o'clock and continuing until an undetermined hour. I call the Hon. Member's attention to the fact that there are a number of provisions in our rules to allow for the extension of the sitting time of the House. I call to his attention that if we are to substitute a rule that a motion can be put down any time while the House is sitting, that would in effect make for a chaotic situation. In fact, there was once a time when we sat for 26 hours. If that kind of a sitting had preceded a designated day, there would have been no limitation whatsoever, according to the rule put forward by the Hon. Member for Yukon, on the time for which a motion would have to be set down.

The Chair is therefore required by the logic of the situation to look at the practices that have evolved in the House since 1968. With all due respect to the Hon. Member, the procedures of the House in 1913 may be relevant but the Chair has some difficulty relating them to the revised procedures that we have adopted since 1968.

● (1230)

It is therefore the decision of the Chair—

Mr. Nielsen: A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —that the practice of the House of requiring a six o'clock deadline for the submission of motions is a legitimate practice of the House established since 1968 and the logic of the situation requires that it be observed. The Chair rules that the Hon. Member's point of order is not well taken.

Mr. Nielsen: It is an observation, not a ruling. I have a point of order.

Mr. McKnight: On a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight).

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the Hon. Member for Yukon be now heard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Standing Order 33 reads as follows:

When two or more Members rise to speak, the Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his or her place; but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now heard", or "do now speak", which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

At this stage we have had before us a point of order which has been decided on by the Chair.

Mr. Nielsen: I have another.

Mr. Taylor: I have another one also.

Mr. Malone: I have another one.

Mr. Taylor: I have an entirely different one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will recognize the Hon. Member for Yukon. Again, the Chair will fall back on an observation made before on procedures of a dilatory character. In the British House, the authority of the Chair to deal with dilatory motions is clear. In our practice in the past it has not been so clear. However, at some point Hon. Members in this House will have to ask themselves at what point are they going to have confidence in the Chair to deal in an orderly way with the business of the House in an absolutely neutral and impartial way.

If a series of dilatory motions can be put forward now, one after another, the effect of which is to prevent the House from proceeding to its business, Hon. Members will have to reflect on what they are doing because the procedures that are being followed now in their custom of precedent will not lightly disappear from the record. Whether or not orderly government is possible in the House of Commons if such procedures are followed through to their logical conclusion is a matter for Hon. Members to consider.

The Hon. Member for Yukon has the floor.

Mr. Pinard: This is not Schefferville. The Speaker is right.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, we would have that confidence in the Chair, but when an occupant of the Chair rises and clearly and repeatedly states that he intends to make observations and then, in the course of making those observations, it suddenly becomes a ruling before Members are heard, that we cannot accept from an occupant of the chair because it is simply not upfront.

Mr. Pinard: So you are blaming the Chair. You are accusing the Chair.

Mr. Nielsen: I was making a point which I was prevented from making when the Chair made its ruling.

Mr. Pinard: You are reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. Nielsen: The record will clearly show that I raised the point in my initial submission to the Chair and the Chair has chosen, for whatever reasons, to ignore that second point upon which a ruling should be made.

I ask the Chair now to consider the points that I was interrupted in making by the ruling the Chair made during its observations when I was attempting to make additional new points which were not before the Chair in order to assist the Chair in its ruling. How can we—

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to know if this is a new point of order. If not, you have ruled and I suggest that the Hon. Member should respect the Chair's ruling. If he is blaming the Chair for having made a decision and is now trying to argue again because you had not given him, according to him, full opportunity to be heard—which is, of course, not true—then I suggest he is not respecting the Chair and should no longer be heard.

Mr. Nielsen: Usually the Government House Leader makes intelligent observations.

Mr. Pinard: I do not waste the time of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: If he had been following my remarks, and he is closer to me than the Chair, he should know that I was making new points and arguments in support of a point of order that I raised initially here today and which has been ignored in the so-called observations of the Chair.

Mr. Pinard: The ruling was made.

Mr. Nielsen: Not on the point I raised initially. The Government House Leader says that the ruling was made. The ruling has not been made on the point that I raised with respect to the right of Members to have their motions printed in the Order Paper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member—and the Chair has a great deal of respect for the Hon. Member's experience and background—he raised a point of order concerning whether a motion should have precedence over the item of Government business raised by the Government House Leader.

Mr. Nielsen: No, that is not my point at all. That is why the Chair should listen to my point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The point that the Hon. Member apparently made at some length, as I am sure the record will bear out, was that there should not be a proceeding with the item indicated by the Government House Leader—

Mr. Nielsen: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —but that a motion in the name of the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe should have been the order of the day.

Mr. Nielsen: That is not my point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That was the original point of the Hon. Member.

Mr. Nielsen: That was not the original point and I would like to make my point.

Mr. Pinard: You had an hour and we still do not understand you.

Mr. Nielsen: I have not. I have been interrupted so often.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With respect to the question of the right of Members to have motions printed—

Mr. Nielsen: Now you are getting closer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —the Chair has indicated, and I thought it was clear, that a motion should be put down within the procedures by six o'clock. Obviously, motions before six o'clock would be printed.

Mr. Nielsen: I have submissions to make before another ruling is made. I have submissions to make on that point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has listened at considerable length. There is no requirement that the Chair must listen indefinitely or that the Chair must listen to repetitive arguments. That has not—

Mr. Nielsen: It should at least listen.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —been the practice of any Parliament. The Chair has indicated that motions which follow the practice of the House and are left with the Table before six o'clock must certainly be printed and the precedents which the Hon. Member has cited, to the best knowledge of the Chair—

Mr. Nielsen: I have not finished citing them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member did cite some precedents previously. The fact is that motions after six o'clock do not have the same right as motions before six o'clock. That is part of the Chair's decision.

Mr. Nielsen: Since the Chair has not heard my submissions on the points that I had to make, it is my submission that it is the obligation of the Chair to hear argument on new points that Members wish to make before any ruling is made.

My narrow point which was totally distorted by the Chair—misinterpreted is perhaps a kinder word—was that Members have a right to have their motions printed on the Order Paper. I was in the middle of citing a precedent with respect to that matter when I was cut off by the Chair. I want to complete citing that precedent. I am reading from a ruling made by Madam Speaker. Surely the present occupant of the chair would at least listen to that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The present occupant of the chair is well aware of the matter that the Hon. Member is citing. The present occupant of the chair has done his very best, on more than one occasion, to recognize the Hon. Member for Yukon this morning.

In fairness to Parliament and in fairness to other Hon. Members, there are limits to the number of times the Hon. Member for Yukon can continuously rise at this point. I am sure, after mature reflection, the Hon. Member himself will recognize that Parliament must conduct its business in an orderly way. The procedures for orderly conduct of parliamentary business have evolved painfully, but Parliament rests upon the acceptance of those procedures, especially by experienced Parliamentarians who carry great responsibility in this House.

● (1240)

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, an impartial Chair has an obligation to listen to the arguments of Hon. Members and not attempt to impose discipline—

An Hon. Member: You are not being heard.

An Hon. Member: Your microphone light is out.

Mr. Nielsen: I am being heard by *Hansard*, if no one else wants to hear me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon has the floor.

Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen

Mr. Nielsen: We are governed by lights and dials and knobs in this place, and I could say a few words about knobs, too. I was saying that at page 14997, to refresh the memory of the Chair, Madam Speaker was dealing with this subject. I had reached this point, quoting her ruling:

Reference was made to page 2 of the Order Paper which is entitled "Projected Weekly Order of Business". Although it is not an official part of the Order Paper, it is inserted for the information and the convenience of hon. members.

That is where Bill C-155 appears today. That, Sir, is a new point which the Chair has not considered. Simply because Bill C-155 appears on the Projected Order of Daily Business does not fit within the Standing Order as being sufficient notice with respect to the change of the order of business—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Can the Chair put a question to the Hon. Member, with all due respect to him? He is quoting, I believe, from page 14997 of *Hansard*. Is that correct?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, you will recall—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: February 15, 1982, the Speaker?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, if you will tell those at the console to turn on my light I will be heard by you.

I said at the outset that in order to assist the Chair I wanted your officers to get you the precedents from which I cited when I was on my feet on this last occasion before being interrupted. I cited the page number of *Hansard* from which I was quoting—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could I indicate to the Hon. Member that in the precedents quoted by Madam Speaker at that time both of those motions had been placed on the Table before six o'clock, within the required time.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, maybe I am having difficulty communicating. I am talking now about Bill C-155 and the idea that simply because it appears on the publication being dealt with by Madam Speaker at that time, the "Projected Weekly Order of Business"—did not constitute the kind of notice that Standing Orders refer to when the Government is given the authority to set the order of business of the House. Could we understand that point, Mr. Speaker? I am only one Member. There are 282 Members in this place who require notice. Last night there were 233, or whatever the number was.

Now as to what occurred. I was telephoned by an officer in the office of the Government House Leader. I managed to inform perhaps five or six Members of this Party that there had been a switch in the order of business today. None of the other Members had been communicated with so they are confronted today for the first time with something different to debate, and the Member in whose name the motion stands was not one of those I consulted after receiving the personal notice from the office of the Government House Leader.

Therefore, you have at least 93 or 94 Members of this Party who were unaware of any change in the order of business today. I dare say there would also be some Members in the New Democratic Party who were unaware there was a change in the order of business today. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. The Standing Orders do not give the Government House Leader the opportunity, as broadly as you want to stretch them, the authority or the opportunity to come in in the middle of an order of business and change without due notice the order of business. That is what happened here.

We were aware that today was to be an allotted day. That is the business on the official Notice Paper, not Bill C-155. On the occasion upon which Madam Speaker ruled, and in defence and support of her ruling against the arguments I was making at that time, she said that the Projected Order of Business is not an official publication of the House of Commons and, therefore, the Government House Leader could do what he did. If that is a precedent, if Madam Speaker's ruling means anything, surely it means that Members should not be caught unawares by a sudden change in Government business at 8.30 p.m. or 9.30 p.m., as was the case last night when I was so informed. There was no way at that time that I could have given notice to Members here, particularly the Member in whose name the motion stands for today, or could—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could the Chair put a question to the Hon. Member? In the interests of clarifying the situation, is the Hon. Member contending that the Government House Leader did not have authority to call Bill C-155 as the business for today? Is that the Hon. Member's contention?

Mr. Nielsen: I certainly do contend that in support of the right of the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe to have his order proceeded with today, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could the Chair ask the Hon. Member another question in the interests of resolving our difficulties? If that is the contention—

Mr. Nielsen: Why do you not let me complete a sentence before you stand up, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Courtesy is a normal procedure of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, it is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is attempting to observe it. If the Hon. Member's contention is that the Government House Leader does not have authority to call Bill C-155, what does the Hon. Member believe should be the order of business of the day and what is his contention?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, if I were to be allowed to complete a sentence, with great respect to the Chair, before being interrupted, the Chair might understand what I am contending. But if I am continually interrupted in mid-sentence, then there is no way that I am ever going to get through to the Chair so that it will understand.

What I am contending is that some 95 Members, in particular the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe, came here, on notice given on the official records of the House,

prepared to debate a Private Member's motion. That is what they came here to do. They were not given notice of any other order until they received the Projected Order of Business in their mail some time before twelve o'clock today. That was the first indication those Members had that Bill C-155 and not the motion of the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe would be debated.

I say it is an abuse of the Standing Orders of this place for the Government House Leader to attempt to do what he has done; not with respect to me, because I had that notice, and not with respect, I presume, to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, because he had that notice. But some of the rest of the Members had that notice. Therefore, being prepared, the Government having slipped up—I could be kinder to the Government than that—it is the doubts in the minds of some of the officials at the Table that have produced this problem, and I say that with respect to them too. But the reason we are not proceeding with something of which we had notice is because of what happened last night and today.

I contend, Sir, that the Government can only proceed with Bill C-155 today if it had given proper notice to all Members that it was the Government's intention to do so—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: the Hon. Member—

Mr. Nielsen: That is what Madam Speaker was asked on February 15, 1982, if you will hear me out, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has made his point. With due respect to the Hon. Member the Chair has listened to him for a considerable period of time this morning. I have recognized him on four occasions so far.

Mr. Nielsen: Only because you have interrupted me. It could have been once.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question which the Hon. Member seems not to accept, namely from the Chair is designed to clarify in the mind of the Chair the items before us. This is one which the Chair asks the Hon. Member to reconsider.

• (1250)

What we face is a situation in which the motion by the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe, which was put on the Table after six o'clock last night, has been ruled by the Chair not to be in order. In the circumstances, the business of the House has been indicated by the Government House Leader under Standing Order 22 and it is the opinion of the Chair—

Mr. Gamble: A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is the opinion of the Chair that the Government House Leader, according to Standing Order 22, has the right to indicate House business and that Orders of the Day be called at this point, as indicated by the Government House Leader.

Mr. Gamble: A point of order.

Point of Order—Mr. Nielsen

Mr. Nielsen: I have a question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is not prepared to entertain a series of dilatory motions whose object—and I call this to the attention of Hon. Members—is to impede the orderly flow of House of Commons business. This is something which Hon. Members might well wish to remember. They may well wish to remember my words of today, because circumstances could well change in this place and Hon. Members are creating precedents that they themselves might have to live with. That is something that they will have to be concerned about and answer to themselves.

At this point the Chair recognizes the points of order that have been raised. It has ruled on the points of order that have been raised. It is always the right of Hon. Members to raise points of order, but there is a point at which the Chair has to decide that the proceedings are dilatory, designed to impede the conduct of business of the House, and under such circumstances the Chair has to exercise some initiative. The Chair is calling the item of the day and on the Clerk to read the item.

Mr. Mayer: A point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: I have a question of privilege.

Mr. Mazankowski: I have a question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will hear a point of privilege from the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski).

Mr. Nielsen: I have one too.

Mr. Mazankowski: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I hope that you will find my question of privilege not dilatory.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could interrupt the Hon. Member for Vegreville for a second, because my question of privilege has to do with the remarks of the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville has the floor.

Mr. Nielsen: My question of privilege has to do with the remarks of the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville has been recognized.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I would gladly defer my question of privilege and yield the floor to the Hon. Member for Yukon, but I want to reserve the right to raise my question of privilege because it is a very serious matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: My question of privilege arises out of remarks made by the Chair. The Chair accused me of having risen four times. I point out to the Chair, with respect, that the only reason I had to rise four times was because I was interrupted by the Chair six times.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect, the Chair's statement was that the Chair had recognized the Hon. Member four times, which is not quite what the Hon. Member has said.

Mr. Nielsen: The record will clearly show what happened, Mr. Speaker. I was continually interrupted.

The other question of privilege I have is that it is said that I would not answer questions from the Chair. Sir, with respect again, the Chair hardly gave me that opportunity to answer questions because of its continual interruptions in my submissions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville has a matter of privilege.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I have had an opportunity to review the remarks in the official report of the House of Commons proceedings, *Hansard*, arising out of the exchange which took place yesterday at page 28349. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you that I believe very sincerely that my privileges—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could the Hon. Member please serve notice on the Chair relating to this matter? I believe the Standing Orders require that he give the Chair notice under such circumstances.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, in fairness, the Chair has asked if the Hon. Member would give notice of it.

Mr. Mazankowski: I have just had the opportunity of reviewing the official record of the House of Commons proceedings. I will not be very long. I think—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, there is a point at which the proceedings and practices of this House have to be observed.

An Hon. Member: We want to hear what it is.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, if the Hon. Member has an item of privilege arising out of the conduct of proceedings, he does not need notice.

Mr. Gamble: Right here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: But to raise a question the day after concerning what appears in *Hansard*, the Chair respectfully asks the Hon. Member to give notice. That is the practice of the House.

Mr. Deans: A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I quote Standing Order 20(2):

> Unless notice of motion has been given under Standing Order 47, any Member proposing to raise a question of privilege, other than one arising out of proceedings in the Chamber during the course of a sitting, shall give to the Speaker a written statement of the question at least one hour prior to raising the question in the House.

The Chair cannot disregard the Standing Orders of the House, nor would the Hon. Member really knowingly request the Chair to do so.

Mr. Malone: A point of order.

Mr. Mazankowski: I just simply want to reserve the right to make a point of privilege which I think is very fundamental. I firmly believe that my rights and privileges as a Member of Parliament have been breached and eroded. I think that on the basis of the official record of the House of Commons proceedings—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member can give notice, and his privileges and rights will be observed scrupulously according to the Standing Orders of the House.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member, who is an experienced Parliamentarian, knows that this is the Standing Order and that it calls for notice.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity—

Some Hon. Members: Order, order!

Mr. Mazankowski: —to serve notice now that I will be raising this matter of privilege at the earliest opportunity—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has given—

Mr. Mazankowski: —this afternoon.

An Hon. Member: You have to give written notice.

Mr. Mazankowski: This is my notice.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, it says "shall give to the Speaker a written statement of the question at least one hour prior to raising the question in the House". If the Hon. Member is giving to the Chair a written statement, the Chair will be pleased to receive it and can assure the Hon. Member that his rights will be scrupulously observed.

Mr. Taylor: A point of order.

Mr. Mayer: A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer).

Mr. Mayer: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think you know the respect with which I hold the Chair.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mayer: They can laugh, they can laugh. I am not speaking to Government Members; I am speaking to the Chair.

Mr. Nystrom: Throw him out.

Mr. Mayer: I fully agree with you, Mr. Speaker, when you say that we have to have confidence in the Chair to deal with the business of the House. I wrote this down, it may be paraphrasing, but you made the point that we must have confidence in the Chair in order to deal with the business of the House in an impartial way.

Mr. Evans: What is this, a conversation?

Mr. Mayer: I agree with that and I think all Hon. Members would agree with that. I can read the Standing Orders too. I believe you read Standing Order 33 from the Chair, but I will read it again:

When two or more Members rise to speak, the Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his or her place; but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now heard", or "do now speak", which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

My point of privilege is that yesterday afternoon in the debate the Speaker—

Mr. Evans: You are out of order.

An Hon. Member: That happened yesterday.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member will be aware that his point of privilege falls into a category similar to that of the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Mr. Mayer: No, no.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the matter arises out of yesterday's proceedings—

Mr. Mayer: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Then I will hear the Hon. Member.

Mr. Mayer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It arises out of what happened I suspect less than a half hour ago in the House. My concern is that there is a conflict. I have to—

An Hon. Member: You suspect?

Mr. Mayer: —relate to what happened yesterday in order to point out the conflict I see with what happened today.

Yesterday, when the motion was put by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), Madam Speaker allowed some subsequent debate on that motion. She recognized the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) and she recognized the Hon. Government House Leader. Today, you did not allow debate; you put the motion forthwith. I submit that according to the Standing Orders—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member—

Mr. Mayer: Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has made a very serious accusation. This is that a Member be heard.

Mr. Mayer: That is right.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Debate is not permitted on that a Member be heard. The Standing Orders say "to be put forthwith without debate".

Some Hon. Members: One o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock p.m., I do now leave the chair until two o'clock p.m.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*Translation*]

SHIPBUILDING

NEED FOR MULTI-LEVEL MEETING TO IMPROVE SITUATION IN INDUSTRY

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Madam Speaker, this week, the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repairing Association issued, through its Chairman, a press release on the disturbing situation in the shipbuilding industry. According to figures provided by the Association, after the 9 per cent cut in the Shipbuilding Industry Assistance Program, 100 commercial ships built abroad have been licensed in Canada, while only 51 orders for commercial ships were placed in this country. The Chairman admitted that the only short-term orders were placed by the Canadian Government, adding that this was only a partial solution to the present problems in the shipbuilding industry.

Yesterday in Quebec City, I attended a conference on recovery of the shipbuilding industry in Quebec. The comments of all speakers were rather calm and serene, in the circumstances. I seconded a proposal by Pierre Fortier, a Liberal Member of the National Assembly, to have a federal-provincial meeting in the near future to consider possible solutions to the problem. Actually, I would favour a multipartite meeting of representatives of the Government of Canada, the Government of Quebec, the municipal governments concerned and management and labour. This kind of consultation would certainly be a step towards a comprehensive response to the disastrous situation in the shipbuilding industry.

S.O. 21

[*English*]

STATUS OF WOMEN

CONSEQUENCES OF STEREOTYPING

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Madam Speaker, the level of poverty among Canadian women is unacceptable and the rate is steadily increasing. Of the 500,000 elderly poor in Canada, fully 350,000 of them are female. Inflation in recent years has eroded their incomes and impoverished their retirement. Working women earn less than 50 per cent of the wages of working males.

The problem, in part, is culturally derived from stereotyping. A recent Canadian study demonstrates that school age females still harbour many myths about working women. An astounding 80 per cent of school age females expressed the belief that a university degree would decrease their chances of marriage. More than half expressed the belief that children of working mothers became juvenile delinquents.

I therefore suggest that government programs of questionable value or marginal success be eliminated, or have their budgets reduced, so as to allow the available means for a national children's TV program to be broadcast in all regions, with an inter-mix of both official languages, with the objective of stimulating curiosity and reason, enhancing tolerance, and broadening the sex roles for both young females and males, putting language training and role shaping in concert with the most compatible age for such learning.

* * *

PARLIAMENT

RECORDING THE HISTORY OF THE THIRTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Madam Speaker, the first session of the Thirty-second Parliament will end in a few days. Historians will judge it as perhaps the most profound since Confederation. Indeed, the session has evolved a new federation as the nation has become fully sovereign. Whosoever writes the history of this session carries on an enormous responsibility. John Ruskin wrote:

> The only history worth reading is . . . the history of what was done and seen, heard out of the mouths of the men who did and saw.

Every Member of this House, therefore, carries the burden of having to record that history as they "did and saw". I challenge the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the former Prime Minister (Mr. Clark), the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent), and in fact, every Member of this Thirty-second Parliament, to record in writing their emotions and experiences of this session. That challenge goes to you too, Madam Speaker. For months now, I have been writing mine in a document called "Parliament and Patriation—The Triumph of Unilateralism". It is a challenging undertaking. This session of Parliament has been truly exciting and historic.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONTAMINATED WATER SYSTEMS IN NATIVE COMMUNITIES

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Madam Speaker, the Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, tabled June 1, 1982, drew the attention of the House to serious water and sewage problems in Indian communities across Canada. The Committee recommended that a special capital fund be created to correct these problems. A year and a half have gone by and very little has happened. Indian people continue to suffer poor health because of impure water.

The Kingsclear band in New Brunswick is a case in point. For the last nine days the primary school has been closed because of a contaminated water system. The iron count is nearly three times the permissible level. The water runs black, and carries an offensive odour. Indian Affairs advised the band to flush the water system three or four times a month. Flushing means that for a few days the water runs brown instead of black. Several children have developed a rash, and the community hesitates to use the water for washing. Many families now carry their water from two nearby springs.

These primitive and subnormal conditions should not exist in Canada in 1983. The Government must accept its responsibility and make funds available now so that Kingsclear and other Indian communities can have decent water.

* * *

THE PRESS

LACK OF PRESS COUNCILS IN MANITOBA AND SASKATCHEWAN

Hon. Jim Fleming (York West): Madam Speaker, I seek the floor today to address the issue of press councils, an important issue because the print media in most Canadian cities have no direct daily print competition.

When the Kent Report was released, only three Provinces had press councils. In Ontario, less than half of the daily newspapers were members. Since the Government's proposal for a national advisory council on newspapers was made, there has been progress. In 1982 the Ontario Press Council had 17 members; today there are 34 dailies belonging to it. Equally encouraging is the establishment of press councils in British Columbia and the Atlantic provinces.

The only part of Canada where voluntary press councils are still not available is Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I use this occasion to urge the daily press in those two Provinces to act. Without such a mechanism, individual Canadians must deal with their daily newspaper at the benevolence of the publisher or editor or, in the extreme, through a costly trip to court. Such courses of action are not satisfactory when the print media have such a considerable impact on the public, and when so much of the media is in the hands of so few owners.

I reassert that the proposed national advisory council is completely independent of government and remains a potential means of redress for Canadians where advisory councils do not

exist. If a point were to come when a national advisory council would no longer be necessary, surely that would be not only when we have voluntary press councils in all Provinces but when those councils are clearly free from potential influence from the publishers, both as the prime or major source of funding and appointments.

A free press has nothing to fear from independent press councils—

Madam Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

WITHHOLDING OF PROPORTION OF GRAIN EXPORT PRICES

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Madam Speaker, the nation as a whole, especially Canada's grain farmers, should not have to tolerate the Government's decision to hold back on average 25.2 per cent of grain producers' money from export sales. The Government, through the Canadian Wheat Board, is holding from producers 17.7 per cent of the export price wheat, 29.3 per cent of the export price of Durum wheat, 26.8 per cent for feed barley, 27.9 per cent for malting barley, and 24.4 per cent for feed oats. This amount, if multiplied by the number of tonnes exported this year, will result in a total pool account of approximately $1.1 billion by the end of this crop year.

This is totally intolerable and inexcusable at any time, but especially now when farmers are in such financial difficulty. The vast majority of farmers burdened with loan payments will be forced throughout the year to borrow money at rates of 14 per cent to 16 per cent, costing them additional millions of dollars. All of this will occur even though the Wheat Board can borrow at one-quarter per cent below prime. Therefore there can be no logic for these present holdbacks and the low initial grain prices.

• (1410)

One can only explain this by suggesting the Government is playing politics with the grain producers' money. It intends to withhold producers' money until it feels an election is imminent. The Liberals then will attempt to trick Canadians into thinking they are being good to farmers by giving back to producers the money that is already rightfully theirs.

Madam Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

S.O. 21

POLITICAL PARTIES

INVASION OF GRENADA—POSITION OF PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester): On Tuesday, Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) was pressing the Government to state a position on the U.S. led invasion of Grenada. It sounded clearly as though he was being supportive of the invasion. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said the Government would like more information before making a decision, the Leader of the Opposition suggested this information had already been provided by President Reagan in a television report on Tuesday morning.

That was Tuesday, Madam Speaker. Yesterday, a day later, the Opposition external affairs critic was singing a different tune. In comments to reporters the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) said that the Conservatives were trying to be as neutral as possible on the invasion.

"We're trying to be more neutral . . ." he is quoted as saying by *Canadian Press*. "Let's get the evidence first," he stated.

What a difference a day makes, especially in the world of Tory policy making. We may well ask just who speaks for the Conservative Party on such serious and sensitive matters. Is it the Party Leader who wants us to support the invasion, or is it the official external affairs critic who says we should wait and see? Even worse, is the Leader of the Opposition shooting from the hip, or is he just ready to take a position for Canada on such important matters on the basis of what President Reagan says or does?

* * *

AGRICULTURE

FORMATION OF FARM WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION

Mr. G. M. Gurbin (Bruce-Grey): Madam Speaker, there have been numerous responses in the farm community to the current economic crisis in the agricultural industry. One of these has been from a women's activist group called Concerned Farm Women. Based in Bruce and Grey Counties, their expression of concern for the farming community exemplifies the traditional presence of agrarian reform groups throughout the histories of these two Ontario counties.

This farm women's lobby group was formed in response to the debilitating effects of high interest rates and other economic consequences of the recession. In an effort to preserve their communities, these farm women rallied together for their common cause. One of their many activities was to take on a project about farm women, to determine and document the extent of financial and psychological stress among farm families. The result of this project is the publication of a book entitled "The Farmer Takes a Wife".

This book documents the stress resulting from the recent crisis in the agricultural economy. Lack of profit from low commodity prices and high input costs, and other financial concerns were cited as the main factors contributing to stress

on the farm. Higher degrees of stress were evident where financial problems were extreme. Specific financial problems causing stress included inability to pay the interest on bank loans; the impending possibility of losing all or part of one's farm; machinery purchases and repairs, and other farm expenditures.

The book concludes that farm women's priorities continue to focus on the traditional concerns for family and farm but that their work is now more complicated with the new challenges of financial stress facing them today.

Having defined the extent of the difficulties, Concerned Farm Women, with other—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—MANAGEMENT OF NEWS BY UNITED STATES

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Madam Speaker, the people of the United States are being told only the part of the story on the illegal invasion of Grenada that the Reagan administration wants them to know. It is called managed news.

The U.S. media are being outrageously deficient and negligent in reporting the whole story as it develops. For example, during the past night CBS Nightwatch presented mainly the statements and views of the U.S. Government and of individuals who support this immoral action. Not one word was broadcast of the objections by South American countries such as Colombia, Panama, Peru, Ecuador, Venezuela, Guyana, and Costa Rica.

No mention was made of objections by Spain, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Greece, Portugal, West Germany, Japan, China or Canada.

There was not a word to the people of the United States that Grenada is an independent member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, like Canada.

This U.S. intervention ranks in the same category as intervention in Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Afghanistan.

The U.S. Government has even barred its own reporters from entering Grenada to report on-the-scene events.

American Free Radio has broadcast to the world for decades to tell us about freedom and democracy, including freedom and responsibility of the press.

The question is who is going to tell the American people?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—UNITED STATES REPLY TO CANADIAN REPRESENTATIONS

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, in regard to the situation in Grenada, I want to deal with the reported reply given by the Deputy Secretary of State of the United States to our ambassador in Washington when our ambassador complained that Canada had not been consulted prior to the action taken in Grenada.

For the Prime Minister's benefit I quote the reply attributed by Mr. Gotlieb to Mr. Kenneth Dam, Deputy Secretary of State. Canada was not consulted, according to Mr. Dam, "because of concerns on the security side that the invasion shouldn't be too widely known".

In view of the grave implications of Mr. Dam's statement for on-going Canada-U.S. relationships, has the Prime Minister communicated with President Reagan or other senior officers of his Government to obtain clarification of this rather remarkable statement?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition calls it a remarkable statement. I think he has made some rather remarkable statements himself in the last couple of days. I would add to his astonishment the fact that, according to Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of Great Britain, she had not been consulted either. Presumably the United States did not find it advisable to consult her, or to consult Canada.

Mr. Mulroney: Madam Speaker, I want to assure the Prime Minister that as a Canadian citizen I take no pleasure in reading that kind of statement that was on the front page of the newspapers today. I do not have to assure the Prime Minister of that.

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF UNITED STATES REPLY

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the importance of it, may I repeat, Canada was not consulted, according to Mr. Dam, "because of concerns on the security side that the invasion shouldn't be too widely known". I ask the Prime Minister, in the interests of the Government of Canada, if he has consulted with the Leader of the American Government or one of his leading officers to obtain clarification of that.

It seems to me that this kind of statement should not be left on the record unchallenged. I should like to know, for the record, if the Prime Minister has communicated with the President to obtain that clarification?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, the answer is that on that point I have not communicated with the President. I have been in correspondence with the President on other matters, but not on that point. I

must say that I share the astonishment of the Leader of the Opposition. He is quoting a senior officer of the State Department as having said that. I do not know the implication of that. I do not know the impact of that. I just know that the United States apparently chose not to consult Canada, not to consult Britain and, presumably, not to consult France either, although I do know for a fact that the eastern Caribbean countries had agreed among themselves that Canada should be consulted. Something apparently happened in the urgency to act that they did not consult us.

There was a communication to Canada at seven o'clock or 7.30 on Monday evening—apparently the same kind of communication went to Great Britain—where we learned that the United States and the other members of the task force or invasion force were saying to us that various options were being considered for rescuing the American citizens on the island.

● (1420)

I could add, Madam Speaker, that when I learned of that on Monday night, when the Minister phoned me back on Monday night, I immediately said that we should tell the Americans that they should envisage every way of rescuing or making sure their citizens were secure before contemplating an invasion. That message in fact was not delivered because, by the time it was ready to be delivered the next morning, the invasion had already taken place.

Therefore, Madam Speaker, I do know that we were supposed to have been consulted. I have been told this by Prime Minister Seaga of Jamaica, who phoned me to apologize for the fact that the person who was supposed to notify Canada had not done so. That person was not the President of the United States. It was one of the other political leaders of the area. The same thing may have happened in the case of Great Britain. I have read in the dispatches that the opposition in Great Britain is chiding Prime Minister Thatcher precisely because she had not been notified, either. Was it for reasons of security? I do not know the reason Margaret Thatcher is being given.

REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER CHALLENGE REPLY

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I believe it is clear from the reply of the Prime Minister that he also reads very serious consequences into the statement, because as a NATO ally and as a NORAD partner of the United States of America our relationship must be based on mutual trust at all times. That occasionally requires us to resolve doubt in favour of our greatest friend, neighbour, and ally, the United States of America.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: This is a very disturbing reply, having regard to the unique degree of trust and confidentiality which must exist between our allies. May I ask the Prime Minister if the Government intends to allow this statement by the Under Secretary to remain, or will he challenge the statement and advise the House of the manner in which he would propose to do that?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I am not challenging the statement, nor do I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he said on Tuesday in this House that President Reagan had explained everything he needed to know in his statement on Tuesday. I believe there are a lot of things we have to know, Madam Speaker, which we are trying to find out. The instance raised by the Leader of the Opposition is one of the things which puzzles us. However, I will tell you, Madam Speaker, that there are a lot of pieces to the puzzle which we cannot put together.

I tell the Leader of the Opposition again that I was phoned by Prime Minister Seaga after the event, apologizing for the fact that the person who was supposed to communicate with me had not done so. I also know, I repeat, as is apparent from the debate in Great Britain, that Mrs. Thatcher had not been informed, either, of the invasion. It is apparent that most of the allies had not been informed of the invasion. It is something in which a few participating parties were involved, but no one from the outside.

It is quite conceivable, Madam Speaker, that the United States and the other participating partners did not want anyone to know. It is possible also, as I indicated, that they wanted us to know and that the persons who were supposed to contact us did not do so. I repeat, it was not the United States which was entrusted with letting us know of the invasion, it was another Caribbean leader, and the message did not come through.

FOREKNOWLEDGE OF BRITISH AUTHORITIES

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is also directed to the Prime Minister who has left the impression with the House that perhaps the British were not informed, as he was not informed. Would the Prime Minister indicate if he is aware of the fact that Sir Geoffrey Howe stated in the British House of Commons that:

> Britain had been told last Friday that the Organization of East Caribbean States might be asking for military help in invading Grenada.
>
> The next day those States decided to form a multinational force and the United States informed Britain that a request for assistance had been received in Washington.
>
> Sir Geoffrey said that on Saturday night Britain had been told by Washington that the United States would proceed "very cautiously."

Would the Prime Minister indicate if any of that type of information was conveyed equally to the Canadian Government?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, it will depend on what the Hon. Member means when he says, "proceed cautiously". That is the whole point. "Proceed cautiously" with what? I suggest that there was no firm knowledge conveyed to Canada that "proceeding cautiously" would involve a disembarkment of American and other troops

on the shores of a sovereign country. There were all kinds of hypotheses put forward.

We do know—we were informed—that several of the eastern Caribbean leaders were quite indignant and incensed about the events going on in Grenada, particularly about the murder of Prime Minister Bishop. These views were conveyed to us. Some were talking that we should act physically. Some were talking that we should even try to get groups together to restore order. However, I am saying that, as far as we know, the decision to invade was not taken, as advised by the United States, until some time, perhaps, late Sunday or during the day of Monday. I do not even know at what hour that decision was conveyed to the Caribbean leaders.

I do know that in that period of time, between the Sunday and the invasion on Tuesday, a message was supposed to come to me, personally, about the invasion, asking my views about it, even asking if we would be prepared to participate. That message never came to me because the call was was never put through by the responsible political leader.

POSSIBILITY OF COMMONWEALTH PEACEKEEPING FORCE

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, would the Prime Minister indicate to the House three things? First, who was the responsible political leader who did not put the call through? Second, in view of the fact that the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States has asked the Commonwealth Secretariat for a peace-keeping force to take control of Grenada—assuming that security can be forthcoming—until such time as an election may be held, would the Prime Minister indicate if any request has been made to Canada to join in that Commonwealth peace-keeping force? Third, what would be our response in the event such a request were made? Would we willingly join?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, I have sought the answer to part of that question, to wit, whether the request had been made to us directly. So far as I am able to find out, no such request has been made to us. We know of Secretary General Ramphal's suggestion, or appeal. However, I believe it was made generally to the Commonwealth countries. I have myself been attempting to communicate with certain Commonwealth leaders to explore the same type of idea, Madam Speaker.

If an election is to be held after the invading troops leave, then presumably some kind of Commonwealth force would be required. I am offering, subject to the approval of Cabinet, to participate in such an observation force on an election.

If, Madam Speaker, and I hope it is not the case, but if the hostilities are prolonged—and we have no certain information on that, either, but it appears that the invaders are meeting with considerably more resistance than they thought—I would even go further and suggest that perhaps we could call for a truce, ask all foreign nationals to leave the island of Grenada, and then the Commonwealth could send observers in to ensure that that truce is respected. This is a strange way of making this suggestion public, Madam Speaker. I am trying to get views of other Commonwealth leaders on that, but I feel it is appropriate in these circumstances, because of the great confusion surrounding the whole operation, that I take Parliament into my confidence in this matter.

• (1430)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF MR. DANIEL BENOIST, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR MINISTER OF SOCIAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL SOLIDARITY OF FRANCE

Madam Speaker: I have the honour to draw the attention of the House to the distinguished presence in our Gallery of Dr. Daniel Benoist, Secretary of State to the Minister of Social Affairs and National Solidarity of France, with responsibility for the aged.

Some Hon. Members: Hear! Hear!

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—INFORMATION PROVIDED BY PRIME MINISTER OF BARBADOS

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, I was going to address this question to the Prime Minister but I will ask it of the Minister who has otherwise been fielding questions on the Grenadian situation.

I understand from External Affairs that there was a meeting last Friday in Barbados between officials in our Commission in Barbados and Mr. Adams, the Prime Minister of Barbados. At that meeting Prime Minister Adams said there was a very strong likelihood of a U.S. led invasion of Grenada. Was this information passed on to Ottawa? I am told it was the Minister for External Relations, who has disappeared from the scene in the last few days, who received this information. If so, why was no immediate action taken on Friday or Saturday to remove Canadians from Grenada? Or was the Government, with advance knowledge of an invasion, deliberately failing to evacuate Canadians in order not to undermine the United States rationale for carrying out an invasion, namely, to save its nationals?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I apologize to the Hon. Member that the Prime Minister has stepped out to take a call from Mrs. Thatcher. He will be returning shortly.

Relating to the Hon. Member's question, the premise is inaccurate. It is true that our High Commissioner in Barbados,

Mr. Noble Power, met with Prime Minister Adams last Friday. In the course of that discussion Prime Minister Adams mentioned the possibility of the Eastern Caribbean states considering military action and that it would have to be discussed at a subsequent meeting of those states. He made no mention of a decision for an invasion, nor did he make any mention of any participation by the United States.

The accuracy of his recollection of that meeting and the report he gave on it is confirmed by a meeting High Commissioner Power had yesterday with Prime Minister Adams in which the Prime Minister apologized, through Mr. Power, to our Prime Minister for there not being prior consultations with Canada.

Miss Jewett: Madam Speaker, the Minister has not given us the assurance I think this House needs, that the Minister for External Relations was in fact informed of the meeting and the speculation—if it was only speculation, because I understood it was much more than that—that there was going to be an invasion.

REMOVAL OF CANADIAN CITIZENS FROM GRENADA

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, to the same Minister, I am particularly worried about all Canadians there and about the six CUSO workers—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I really have to ask the Hon. Member to come to her questions more quickly. This is the supplementary question and it looks like it is going to be as long as the first one.

Miss Jewett: Madam Speaker, I was just coming to the question. Has the Minister any information about whether the United States has at last stopped stalling Canada's attempts with a Hercules aircraft to evacuate the Canadians there?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I say to the Hon. Member, through you, that I have no evidence or indication that the U.S. at any time has been stalling in relation to our rescue operation. We have been anxious that Canadians be brought out at the first possible time it was safe to do so. Indeed, our consular official who travelled yesterday to Grenada returned and said it was not safe to move Canadians from the Ross Point Inn to the airport at that time because of the areas in which fighting was still occurring. I subsequently explored the possibility of the use of American helicopters to move our people to the airport.

During the night, when I received a call from General Sturgess, who is in charge of our military mission in Washington, we received permission for the Hercules aircraft to go in and take the people out as soon as they could be safely removed to the airport.

While I cannot vouch for the absolute authenticity of the latest word, I have just been handed a note which says that the High Commissioner in Barbados has phoned and that Canadians are now being assembled at Point Salines and the Hercules has departed Barbados for Grenada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Regan: I would add that, in the meantime, seven Canadians elsewhere in the island, and we do not have their identities as yet, have apparently been evacuated by American aircraft to South Carolina. There may be several Canadians still in the St. George's area and we are doing everything possible under the military conditions, which are quite different than have been portrayed in the last day or two, to make effective contact with them.

Miss Jewett: Given the length of the Minister's replies, it does show the need for an emergency debate in this House.

FATE OF GRENADIAN LEADERS

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, does the Minister have any information at all on the fate of government leaders in Grenada, particularly the fate of Bernard Coard, and can he give us any information about the puppet Government the United States is organizing in Barbados—

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Miss Jewett: —for Grenada?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I have no information at this time relating to the fate of Bernard Coard or other government leaders on the island, although I do have a report that contact has been made with the Governor General, the details of which are unknown.

Again I want to emphasize to the Hon. Member that the conditions on the island are such, particularly in built-up areas, that there are far more people with arms opposing the invasion than had been anticipated, and communications as well as movement are extremely difficult. Under those circumstances it is not surprising that it is not yet possible to have information on the whereabouts of former government leaders. I have no information whatsoever with reference to the possible formation of a new government.

REPORTED REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE FROM GOVERNOR GENERAL OF GRENADA

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, my question is for the same Minister who will know that in a parliamentary democracy the highest constitutional authority is the Governor General. Given that Prime Minister Eugenia Charles, Prime Minister of Dominica, indicated that the original request for assistance this past weekend in fact originated with the Governor General of the island, has the Government changed its view of the event?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, we have no confirmation of the fact that Governor General Scoon initiated an invitation for an invasion. I would only say its credibility is, I suppose, somewhat in question because of the fact it had not been mentioned in preceding days. However, I do not exclude that possibility, and we will continue to make inquiries in that regard.

● (1440)

Mr. Bosley: Madam Speaker, the Minister will know that the reason that was at least claimed for no earlier knowledge of this information was that Mr. Scoon was under house arrest and that his life was in risk if this information came out.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Bosley: Madam Speaker, Members opposite claim that the Governor General of Grenada was under house arrest by the Americans. That just shows their lack of knowledge of what is going on. My question, Madam Speaker, to the Minister is—

An Hon. Member: It's cheap.

Mr. Bosley: It is not cheap, Madam Speaker. It is the Members opposite who are being cheap.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Will the Hon. member ask his question?

Mr. Bosley: Madam Speaker, you are obsolutely correct.

GOVERNMENT POLICY INQUIRY

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): To paraphrase what the Prime Minister said earlier this week, is it Canada's policy to support the requests of Governors General of Commonwealth countries when they ask Commonwealth countries to come to their aid?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I shall begin by dealing with the first part of the Hon. Member's question in which he said the reason that the information was not communicated in the last two days was because the Governor General was under house arrest. If he had communicated an invitation to the Americans to undertake such an invasion, then, as I was suggesting, it was obviously in the interest of the Americans to have made public the fact that they had received such an invitation, and I would find it surprising that they had not done so.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Regan: In relation to the second part of the Hon. Member's question, the question is hypothetical and obviously would depend upon the circumstances. Those circumstances would be judged by any sensible Government on the basis of the merit therein.

SAFETY OF GOVERNOR GENERAL OF GRENADA

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, could the Minister please explain to the House how the Government of Canada, recognizing that the then Prime Minister of the country was shot once he was released from house arrest, can maintain that the Governor General of the island was not at some risk from the people in control of the island?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I am not sure if the Hon. Member is not listening or whether he is desperately trying to find grounds for a supplementary question. I have never at any time said that the Governor General was not under some degree of risk. He may well have been. That is not at all relevant to the matters which we have been discussing. Perhaps the Hon. Member would like to check the "blues".

* * *

[*Translation*]

INCOME TAX

DEPARTMENT'S TREATMENT OF TORONTO SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA MUSICIANS

Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue.

[*English*]

A recent ruling by Revenue Canada requires that musicians with the Toronto Symphony Orchestra be taxed as employees rather than as independent contractors or professionals. Liberal Members of Parliament from Toronto have been deeply concerned about this particular ruling, and the matter is now urgent. In order to meet Revenue Canada's deadline, the bank would have to start today to redesign its payroll deduction systems, and the orchestra's annual meeting is to be held at four o'clock this afternoon. Can the Minister offer to the orchestra or its musicians any hope that this ruling will be reconsidered?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the Hon. Member for his question. I would like to point out that yesterday afternoon, I discussed this matter with some of his colleagues, including the Members for Scarborough Centre and Mississauga North—

[*English*]

After those discussions, I asked officials of my Department to stop any actions related to the ruling made by the district office.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bussières: Madam Speaker, I also want to inform the House that I will be meeting with representatives of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra on Tuesday, November 1—

[*Translation*]

—and also reassure the Hon. Member and all Members of this House that a thorough review of this case will be made early next week.

[*English*]

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. Crombie: A supplementary question—

Madam Speaker: If the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North does not take the floor, I will give it to someone else.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

APPOINTMENT OF VICE-PRESIDENTS—PROPOSED INCREASE IN CANADIAN CONTENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Communications. In the Minister's policy statement of several days ago he set out a very laudable objective for CBC television which is, that within a relatively short period of time, the CBC should provide 80 per cent Canadian content during prime time. However, the Minister made it clear that there would be no more money forthcoming for that kind of increased production and suggested that the money could be raised by the CBC through increased efficiency, which we assume would mean the laying off of another 500 employees. Given the fact that CBC has announced the appointment of six new vice-presidents, would the Minister explain how CBC can achieve that goal without more money, and how it can become more efficient by firing employees and appointing more vice-presidents?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Madam Speaker, I can inform the Hon. Member that I did indeed mention at least four ways in which the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation could have access to more funds, including the Hon. Member's suggestion for better management of the CBC which today has a budget of $850 million. I would like to add: giving CBC senior management an opportunity to reallocate resources and make its international sales operations more aggressive than they have been in the past. In doing so, they could release funds that would give them access to another fund we established as of July 1 of this year, which would enable the CBC to purchase nearly $115 million worth of new productions made by private Canadian producers. There is also a possibility for the CBC to make co-productions with major French and European television networks and with the private sector in general. All this would help produce a very substantial amount of new programming in this country.

[*English*]

LOCALE OF PRODUCTION DECISION PROCESS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. Going back as far as the Fowler Commission, every study that has been done of the CBC recommended that more production decisions should be made at the regional level rather than in Ottawa, yet in the last couple of weeks we have seen the resignation of the senior person in charge of CBC productions, Mr. Herrndorf, obviously because more of those responsibilities are being shifted to Ottawa. How can the Minister square this increased bureaucracy in Ottawa with the recommendation that production decisions be made at the local and regional levels?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Madam Speaker, it goes without saying that a network like the CBC must have strong regional production. The only way we can create a national network is through strong regional productions which are then fed into a national network.

Regarding the substance of the Hon. Member's question, he may have noticed that one of the measures taken very early on by the new President of the CBC was to appoint a new Regional President responsible for ensuring that the regions have access to senior management in Ottawa and can report directly to the head office in Ottawa, thus emphasizing the importance of regional resources.

* * *

[*English*]

INCOME TAX

REQUEST FOR MORATORIUM ON TAX RULINGS AFFECTING ARTISTS

Hon. David Crombie (Rosedale): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. I would first like to thank him for changing his mind since Monday and placing a moratorium on the tax ruling from his Department with respect to the musicians of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crombie: Thank you very much. I had raised in the House previously a question requesting that similar action be taken on behalf of the artists and painters of our country. At that time the Minister also indicated that he could not do so. However, I would like to ask him today if, in light of his decision with respect to the musicians, he would reconsider his response and place a moratorium on the tax rulings affecting artists so that they can now enjoy the kind of tax regime which will allow them to be creative again.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, unfortunately, I can not consider both cases in the same light.

When early this week, the Hon. Member asked his question about the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, he pointed out that there were differences between various orchestras in Canada. For instance, I know that at the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra and in Vancouver and Halifax, musicians are considered to be in an employee-employer relationship with the orchestra and are therefore subject to payroll deductions such as unemployment insurance premiums and Canada Pension Plan, which does not apply to the case that led to a ruling by the Department, a ruling, now suspended, with respect to the Toronto Symphony Orchestra, nor, for that matter, to the Montreal Symphony Orchestra.

In view of the different treatment of some symphony orchestras in Canada, I have decided to suspend the ruling and to review the contracts and determine how orchestras are dealt with as far as the employer-employee relationship is concerned.

If we look at the matter of deduction of expenses for other artists, including painters, engravers and so forth, the situation is quite different, since it concerns the provisions of the Income Tax Act for deduction of expenses incurred to produce a work of art, in relation to the sale of the work in question, and I feel that since these cases are not related, I cannot deal with them in the same way.

* * *

● (1450)

[*English*]

ENERGY

IMPORTATION OF VENEZUELAN OIL—SECURITY OF SEA LANES

Mr. Tom McMillan (Hillsborough): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. The current crisis in Grenada has raised some serious doubt about the security of major sea routes in the region, especially from the point of view of the importation of oil into Canada from the whole region and the possibility that that importation might be jeopardized. Given that the Atlantic Provinces and Quebec together import approximately 100,000 barrels of oil a day from Venezuela alone, has the Government assessed the implications for Canada of any threat to the security of these crucial Caribbean sea lanes as a result of current or potential de-stabilization in the general region of Grenada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, I do not think there are any major problems in this respect, because Canada's sources of oil supplies are very diversified, and if there were a communications problem between Venezuela and Canada, I am sure we could find alternative sources for the oil supplies needed in the Maritimes and Quebec.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT PLANS

Mr. Tom McMillan (Hillsborough): Madam Speaker, notwithstanding the answer the Minister just provided to the House, in the event that the Caribbean sea routes for oil shipments from Venezuela, for example, to eastern Canada are jeopardized by the instability in the region, however remote that possibility might be—although many experts claim it is real—is the Government planning any contingency measures? If so, what are they?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Madam Speaker, I do not think we need be overly concerned about this problem. I wish to thank the Hon. Member for raising the matter, and we shall take appropriate action, but as far as I am concerned, I do not think there is a major problem, nevertheless I will raise the matter with my officials as soon as possible.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—PRIME MINISTER'S CONVERSATION WITH BRITISH PRIME MINISTER

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. I understand that the Prime Minister just had a conversation with the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Is he now in a position to tell the House specifically about the nature of that conversation? More specifically, did he discuss with her any of the possible options that might be taken by Commonwealth countries concerning the extremely serious situation in Grenada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, at this stage I would think it advisable not to take the House into my confidence about what I said to Prime Minister Thatcher or what she said to me.

Mr. Broadbent: I would assume from what the Prime Minister said earlier in Question Period, however, that he will at some point take the House of Commons into his confidence.

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S INFORMATION PRECEDING INVASION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, I wish to return to a question that was asked earlier concerning the possibility that, as early as last Friday, the Canadian High Commissioner knew about the possibility of an invasion being one of the serious options under consideration. If this was known, was it transmitted to a member of the Cabinet or a

senior member of External Affairs in Ottawa and, if either an official or Minister of the Crown was informed of this possibility, why was action not taken then to evacuate Canadians?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, there was information conveyed to the Government about the Friday meeting between our High Commissioner and the eastern Caribbean heads of government when they met in Barbados. But that was in the context of the question we were then discussing, about whether or not we should extend recognition to the new regime.

The House will recall that the then Acting Minister said that we were consulting other countries in the area. It was in the framework of these consultations that certain statements of eastern Caribbean state leaders were made to the effect that something should be done, and the idea of having some physical intervention was expressed by one of them. However, I know of no planning and, according to all of our information, certainly there was no involvement of the United States at that point.

I repeat what I said earlier. I think the decision to have an actual invading force was taken some time between late Sunday and late Monday. That was well after the events to which the Hon. Member is referring.

TRANSMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO CANADIAN AUTHORITIES

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, if it is the case that the High Commissioner of Canada was provided with a variety of options last Friday, including the possibility of invasion, would the Prime Minister tell the House if this was conveyed to the Government of Canada over the weekend? If so, in addition to dealing with the problems of Canadians residing in Grenada, why did the Government of Canada during that weekend not send back its opposition, in the strongest possible terms, to any possible invasion?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, because the first real news that we had of the invasion was Tuesday morning. The first suspicion that we had that an invasion might take place was Monday night. The moment that I heard about it I did ask for that message to be sent.

What happened on Friday was not, as the Hon. Member said in misquoting me, that a variety of options, including invading, was put to us. There was a group of leaders who were expressing their strong feelings about the events that had taken place in Grenada. There was no plan for invasion, nor was that option put to us. But, as a result of those events in the preceding week, we did take steps to try to ensure the safe evacuation, if need be, of Canadian nationals who were in Grenada. That much we did attempt to do.

The House was told by the Acting Secretary of State how our attempts to have a LIAT charter plane evacuate Canadians were frustrated by the elapse of time and hesitation of some of the authorities involved in the Caribbean area.

EMPLOYMENT

EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT'S JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS IN CALGARY

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. According to his employment creation formulas, for one program he uses data that is 54 months out of date, while in another the date is 18 months out of date. In each riding of the city of Calgary he creates 5.5 jobs for every 8,000 unemployed. Is it the Minister's opinion that that is an adequate response to unemployment in the City of Calgary?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, I think that is virtually the same question that the Hon. Member asked me last week. If he will check *Hansard*, he will find that the answer is exactly the same today.

SUGGESTION THAT LOTTERY ALLOCATE JOBS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Madam Speaker, it has been suggested by a constituent that the Minister conduct a lottery for those 5.5 jobs for 8,000 people. Will the Minister fund a lottery to choose the 5.5 people who get a job?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Personally, Madam Speaker, I am not very inclined to lotteries. I am not certain that the hon. gentleman means his suggestion seriously.

* * *

● (1500)

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

INELIGIBILITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERMEN

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. On September 21 the Minister indicated that he was looking at options to deal with the problems faced by Newfoundland inshore fishermen as a result of a catch failure. There are over 2,000 fishermen involved. The Minister has been contacted by the fishermens' union and by the Newfoundland Government. Has he now examined the options? What action is the Minister prepared to take in view of the fact that these fishermen do not qualify for unemployment insurance?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, that is, in contrast to the previous question, a very sensible one. I have been, as the Hon. Member has suggested, examining the situation. I have asked for a set of proposals in relation to it. I had hoped to have those recommendations today. I expect to have them tomorrow or very early next week. Once I have seen them and been able to chose among the various options which my officials have

suggested to me, we will be able to make an announcement very quickly.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PETITION

MR. KEEPER—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Madam Speaker: I have the honour of informing the House that the petition presented by the Member for Winnipeg-St. James (Mr. Keeper) on Wednesday, October 26, 1983, meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I have the usual Thursday question. Would the Government House Leader be so kind as to inform the House of the order of business he intends to call today, tomorrow and as far up to November 4 as he can take us?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Yes Madam Speaker, it is Bill C-155.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 30

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—INVASION BY MULTINATIONAL FORCE

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, I rise on House business. Some consultation has taken place. Would it be possible to obtain the permission of the House by way of unanimous consent to allow the question you had before you in the name of the Leader of this Party requesting an emergency debate on the situation in Grenada to be put? As you know, the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) filed proper notice yesterday. Unfortunately, the matter was not dealt with. He has since filed notice today requesting that the question of Grenada be dealt with by the House of Commons by way of an emergency debate. Could you seek the unanimous consent of the House to deal with that matter now rather than in its proper order, so that we could determine whether or not such an emergency debate might well take place?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, on this side of the House we are most certainly agreeable to the Chair considering forthwith the request made under Standing Order 30. We give our consent as requested by the New Democratic Party.

[*English*]

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, we too would agree to the request of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. Further, we would be prepared to go so far as to relieve the Chair of the necessity of ruling on the urgency of the matter and agree to give consent now to an emergency debate on the motion tonight at eight o'clock, when it will occur in any event.

Madam Speaker: As we have unanimous consent it is so ordered that there will be an emergency debate upon a motion to be moved by the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent). Since there is unanimous consent for an emergency debate at eight o'clock, perhaps the House will agree also that the Hon. Member for Oshawa give the House a brief statement so the House will know exactly what the subject matter of that debate will be.

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Madam Speaker, I think the most concise way of giving the House a statement of the subject-matter would be for me to move the motion, which following the events that have transpired during the past 24 hours, has changed somewhat in nature.

I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett), the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 30 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely: the invasion of Grenada, an independent member of the Commonwealth whose Queen is also Queen of Canada, by a multinational force led by the United States of America, an action which violates the principles of international law, contravenes the Charter of the United Nations, and, according to a Minister of the Crown as revealed in the House of Commons yesterday, has resulted in endangering the lives of Canadians; an action about which the United States in extraordinary unconcern did not even inform the Government of Canada.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. MAZANKOWSKI—APPLICATION OF S.O. 33

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. At the outset I would like to say this. Since the point I want to make does come close to a ruling that was made yesterday, I want to tell you in advance that I am in no way intending to reflect upon a decision of the Chair. However, having said that, I do firmly believe that I have a bona fide and legitimate question of privilege, particularly after having had an opportunity to review yesterday's proceedings.

My breach of privilege, Madam Speaker, I believe occurred at Routine Proceedings at page 28349 of *Hansard*. Briefly, there is absolutely no doubt in my mind that I rose at precisely the same time as, if not before, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy). I think that is confirmed by the official report of the House of Commons debates, namely *Hansard*. I can say to you that we really have no other official record to go by. There is really nothing else to go by but the record of *Hansard*.

I want to quote precisely what happened. At page 28349 we find:

MADAM SPEAKER: Motions.

AN HON. MEMBER: A point of order—

MR. MAZANKOWSKI: A point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Minister of Transport.

MR. AXWORTHY: Madam Speaker, I move—

MR. MAZANKOWSKI: A point of order.

MR. NIELSEN: A point of order.

MR. EPP: A point of order.

MR. MCKNIGHT: A point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Vegreville.

HON. DON MAZANKOWSKI (VEGREVILLE): I move:

That the Hon. Member for Yukon be now heard, Madam Speaker.

MR. PINARD: A point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is a motion on the floor.

MR. PINARD: A point of order.

I would then like to refer to your words, Madam Speaker, at page 28357 for October 26, 1983, prior to the vote. You stated in your observations, I guess would be a fair way of putting it:

What has to be clear and what I reaffirmed before the House is that several Members rose at the same time—

If you go back and look at the actual transpiration of events, Madam Speaker, you will note that those Members to whom you referred were recorded as having risen after I was recorded as asking to be recognized on a point of order and after the Minister of Transport had been recognized by you. I merely point that out. You said that you were having difficulty in ascertaining who should or should not be recognized because there were several Members—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I did not say I had difficulty. I said that the Chair has to select when several Members rise at the same time. That is what the Chair has done. I selected one of the Members who had risen at the same time.

I have dealt with the matter the Hon. Member is raising. If the Hon. Member were writing the verbatim report of what took place in the House and if three Members rose at the same time and shouted "A point of order", how would he list them in the report? He would make an arbitrary listing of those three people who rose at the same time. The argument the Hon. Member is using is not totally convincing. It does not convince me. Furthermore, the Hon. Member knows that when several Members rise at the same time it is customary to recognize a Minister before any other Member. This kind of courtesy has been afforded to Ministers in our House and in many other Houses. I do not have the exact reference, but I am sure it was in Erskine May that I read it was the practice in Great Britain.

• (1510)

I have dealt with the matter. Further, the Hon. Member does not have a question of privilege. It is a point of order, if he has one. I dealt with this the other day. Furthermore, the entire proceeding is over. We have had the motion, we have had the debate, we have had the vote—the entire proceeding is over. I really do not see what is the point of raising a point of order on that particular matter at the present time.

Mr. Mazankowski: Madam Speaker, I hope you will allow me to make one further point. I was not aware that Standing Order 33 provided for a different status of Member being recognized. That is really my second point. If there was any doubt, it seems to me it is incumbent that there be a strict application of Standing Order 32 and Standing Order 33. Under the heading "Rules of Debate", Standing Order 32 reads:

Every Member desiring to speak is to rise in his or her place, uncovered, and address the Speaker.

It is fair to say that I was uncovered, and probably so was the Minister of Transport. Madam Speaker has sugested that there are two classes of Members, but Standing Order 33 reads:

When two or more Members rise to speak, the Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his or her place; but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now heard", or "do now speak", which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

There is a no indication there about having been recognized or about whether a Minister has the floor. It reserves the right for a Member of Parliament to be heard.

There are the rules which have been established by the House of Commons. The House of Commons is master of its own house. It establishes its own rules, it administers them and enforces them. I humbly submit that under the provisions of Standing Order 33 my rights as a Private Member of this Chamber were denied. I believe very firmly that I had the parliamentary right to put my motion. If we are to have a set of Standing Orders, then there should be provisions that qualify how the Standing Orders will be applied. They are certainly not contained in this rule book. Either this rule book has some meaning, or we might as well thrown it out the window.

Madam Speaker: The rule book has a lot of meaning, but it has to be read against practices, against interpretations of several authors, the authority of which we accept, namely, Erskine May, Bourinot, Beauchesne and possibly others, and against the precedents. This is what the Chair is constantly doing.

I am sure the Hon. Member does not want to suggest that Members do not have equal rights. They all have equal rights in the House, but courtesies are afforded to certain Members as a matter of practice and as a matter of general consensus in the House. For instance, the Leader of the Opposition will rise

during Question Period; he can ask two, three or four questions. It is a courtesy. He could rise, and if other Members had risen before him and attempted to catch the eye of the Speaker, the Speaker would not expect the Leader of the Opposition to jump up several times; the Speaker would immediately recognize the Leader of the Opposition. Does that mean that the Leader of the Opposition is not equal to any other Member? He is equal, but perhaps he is a little more equal in the sense that those courtesies are afforded to him, as they would be to a Member who has perhaps sat in the House a very long time. This is in the parliamentary spirit, and I do not think I am betraying the spirit of the House by allowing that.

Mr. Mazankowski: You are allowing the Minister of Transport.

Madam Speaker: Yes, there are a few criteria. The power to select of the Speaker, of course, is absolute; that is one sure thing. The Speaker relies on a few criteria, one being that the Speaker tries to recognize those who rise first, naturally. That is *tout à fait normal.* If several Members rise at the same time—one, two or three on the same side—of course I am free to select anyone I choose to select. I wonder whether the Hon. Member would have any objection had all the Members been on the same side.

I will refer to what Bourinot said about recognizing Ministers. Under the chapter entitled "Precedence in Debate" it reads:

> It is usual, however, to allow priority to members of the administration who wish to speak and to new members who have not before spoken—

That is not the case with the Hon. Member. It continues, "and in all important debates", and so on. I have dealt with that problem. I am sure I have not been unfair to the Hon. Member. Now he says, quoting Standing Order 33, that his motion should have been put forthwith, but Standing Order 33 has to be read against something else; that is to say, when an Hon. Member has possession of the House, he cannot be interrupted by a motion that another Member do speak. If he does not have possession of the floor, of course on a point of order such a motion may be entertained.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, the question which has been raised is a serious one. I rise for the purpose of seeking clarification for the future because of its importance. First may I observe, as the Chair has quite rightly pointed out, that the recognition of the Leader of the Opposition in the circumstances described is a long-standing practice of the House, because he is the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. There is no Standing Order requiring that; it is a practice. Similarly with respect to Ministers of the Crown, quite rightly the Chair pointed out, on the basis of the strength of the Bourinot citation, they are given that courtesy as a matter of practice. However, there is no Standing Order which gives Ministers that kind of priority.

Here we are dealing with a Standing Order of the House, created by the House as the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) said, and enforced by the House. There are two aspects to that Standing Order that have to be viewed in light of yesterday's events for which clarification is required. The Hon. Member for Vegreville is not only on the record as having been recognized but clearly on the record as having moved his full motion. That relates to Standing Order 33, which I suggest to the Chair has to be taken in two parts. The first part reads:

> When two or more Members rise to speak, the Speaker calls upon the Member who first rose in his or her place—

At that point there is a semicolon in the Standing Order. The second part of the Standing Order reads:

> —but a motion may be made that any Member who has risen "be now heard", or "do now speak", which motion shall be forthwith put without debate.

It is the second part of that Standing Order on which I seek clarification. That was the situation yesterday. The Hon. Member for Vegreville rose and was recognized, and he put his motion on the basis of the second half of that Standing Order. Without reflecting at all upon the discretion of the Chair which the Chair exercised yesterday in recognizing the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), quite properly, the Chair went on then to recognize the Hon. Member for Vegreville, again quite properly; but it was at that point the motion was made. The provisions of Standing Order 33 after the semicolon require the Chair to put the question forthwith on that motion.

There need not be any number of Members rising at all because that applies to the first half of the Standing Order. If I wish to rise in my place, even if no other Member stands, my interpretations of the last half of that Standng Order would permit me to advance a motion that the Hon. Member for Joliette (Mr. LaSalle) or any other Member be now heard or now speak. If I make such a motion without any Member standing, I think that the question has to be put to the House. *A fortiori*, even stronger, if one Member rises, I can put the second half of that Standing Order to the House by moving that kind of motion. If more than one Member rises, we shift to the first half of that Standing Order. In either event, in any circumstance that I have described, such a motion would be in order. That is the area that we are dealing with.

● (1520)

The Chair might want to think about that before giving me the clarification for guiding our future practices in this House because it has been important in the past and will become increasingly important in the future.

I have one last point before I resume my seat with regard to the proceedings of yesterday. The Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) indicated to me that he was going to raise the matter. Again, without any intention whatsoever of reflecting on the exercise of any discretion by the Chair yesterday or any ruling made by the Chair today or yesterday, the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette, like myself, looks at that Standing Order and sees the final wording that the question shall be put when the motion has been moved by a Member forthwith without debate. Those are the words. Any-

thing that occurs in this place is, of course, debate. We have a precedent that says even Question Period is debate.

Yesterday the Government House Leader was heard after the motion was put. I was heard. Today, the Chair was confronted with a situation where he had to put the motion without debate. He applied the Standing Order, in my view quite rightly, rigidly and put the question immediately without hearing any points of order or whatever—because they are all debate.

That area has to be clarified because, Madam Speaker, one thing was done yesterday and quite another thing today. We are, therefore, in somewhat of a dilemma. I would suggest very strongly that you might want to hear other Members, particularly the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette. I suggest very strongly that you do not come to any decision today on that question but take it—I see the Chair nodding its head in the negative. I make the suggestion not for the purpose of asking her, as she said yesterday, to shirk her responsibility. I would never do that. However, I would ask her to take it under very careful consideration, look at past practices in the House, look at the orders and at the precedents before coming to any precipitous ruling. The question and its future application is important not only to the Opposition but the other side as well, because they also have used that Standing Order.

Referring to precedents of the Chair, particularly when it is not necessary to come to an immediate conclusion today, it might be prudent for the Chair to consult with her officers and satisfy herself by a personal reading of the precedents that there might be some merit in what I am saying so that we can be guided more efficiently in the future.

Madam Speaker: I think we can end this matter. I do not see why the time of the House should be taken for clarification by the Speaker on points of procedure. I am not in the habit of giving clarification of points of procedure in the House. That is not my function.

This case is clear enough. It has been dealt with. The total proceedings took place yesterday and everything was perfectly in order. Today, after the proceeding is all over, Members are asking for points of clarification for future conduct, as the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) says. Certainly the Speaker is not going to fall into the trap of giving clarification and applying it to future conduct which the Speaker knows nothing about. Future situations in the House will be judged as they occur, taking into account all of the circumstances, the Standing Orders and precedents which may apply to the particular situation which has arisen.

The Hon. Member says quite rightly that a motion that an Hon. Member be now heard has been dealt with one way on one day and a different way the other day. That is precisely because the circumstances were different. The Hon. Member did not mention the fact that, of course, Members may on a point of order ask that an Hon. Member be now heard as long as no other Member has the floor legitimately. Beauchesne states that a motion that a Member be now heard must be moved before the Member recognized has begun speaking. If the Member recognized has simply said "Madam Speaker," that is enough to be in possession of the House and, therefore, under those circumstances a motion that another Member be now heard is not in order. If the Hon. Member who has been recognized has not exercised his right to speak and another Member rises and proposes that another Member be now heard, then the motion has to be put to the House forthwith and voted upon.

The two circumstances were different. They are quite clear to me and, I am quite sure, they are clear to all Hon. Members. I consider this matter closed. I do not feel it is necessary to hear any other argument unless we have a seminar on procedure. We could do that at some other point; we could go out of the House and have a seminar on procedure. I will be quite willing to share my knowledge with Hon. Members and to share their opinions on a number of matters, but I do not think this is the time or the place to do it.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. DEANS—APPLICATION OF RULES OF DEBATE

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I have been attempting since twenty minutes to one to gain the floor on a point of order on a question that arose at twenty minutes to one or thereabouts. Strangely enough, it touches upon something that was raised without dealing with the same circumstance. I know the Speaker may feel that I am trying to rehash, but I am not. I hope she will listen to me in this instance. I would raise it later, but I have to raise it at the earliest possible moment.

This morning during debate, two things occurred that require, in my opinion, the Speaker to make a ruling. The first was that a Member had the floor on a point of order. Another Member took the floor away from that Member by rising on a point of order. That happened this morning. The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) was speaking on a point of order. At that point a motion was made by another Member who rose on a point of order that the floor be given to someone else.

I do not want to go into the detail. I would simply ask that the Speaker review the debates of this morning to determine whether or not my submission on that is accurate and, if it is, to rule, as I would have asked had I got the floor, that one Member who has the floor on a point of order cannot be interrupted by another Member rising on a point of order. That is the first question. It is important that that be upheld; otherwise chaos would ensue.

The second point is, in my judgment, equally important. The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) sought the floor and got the floor today during the discussion on points of order. The only way that he could have got the floor was to rise to speak to the point of order that was then under consideration. However, having engaged in discussion for a moment or two, in fact for a minute or two, he then

moved that the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) be now heard. I contend that that is out of order. A Member who gets the floor on an existing point of order surely is not in a position to move that another Member be now heard. If there is a point of order being discussed on the floor of the House, a Member rising on that point of order cannot then move, under Standing Order 33, that another Member be now heard.

● (1530)

I ask, for the sanity of the place if nothing else, that that matter also ought to be reviewed and that a clear ruling be made that when a point of order is under discussion it is not then possible for a Member to rise and, in advance of the point of order having been ruled upon, make a motion that another Hon. Member be heard. I would suggest that that is quite improper.

I further suggest that if it were to be allowed that a Member, once engaged in discussion whether on a point of order or something else, whether in debate, on a point of order or a question of privilege, cannot then transfer his speaking place to another Member simply by motion. If that were the case it would be possible for one Member or one group of Members to preempt any other Member from gaining the floor legitimately.

That speaks in part, although I did not intend it to, to the point raised by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). I did not intend to address the question he raised but I put it to you that, unfortunately—and this is no reflection on the Chair because these things do occur—it can create some very difficult situations. This was the case this morning. If that prevailed, once one Member got the floor, he or she could transfer that speaking order to another Member who could transfer it to another Member who could transfer it to another Member, and so on. The only way to stop that would be to hold a vote, and I do not think that is what Standing Order 33 was intended to so.

Madam Speaker: I suppose I have to thank the Hon. Member for bringing up the matter. I was not in the Chair this morning when those events occurred but I understand that the Member who tried to pre-empt the Member who was speaking on a point of order was ruled out of order, and that was to the satisfaction of the House. Exactly what the Hon. Member says should not be allowed to happen was prevented by the fact that it was ruled out of order.

I will review the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). I see the Hon. Member shaking his head. I am not going to review the other point brought up because that matter is closed. I will look at what the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is referring to. If there has been any injustice to any Member, we will certainly try to correct it.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. While you will be making all those beautiful reviews, perhaps you would consider reading Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 117, Subparagraphs 4 and 5. I think that if those provisions were to be applied we would have more order in the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I should like to suggest that you review the "blues" for today when a point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse)—I did not have my electronics functioning as they usually do—I rose trying to say to the Chair that there could not be a point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre when there was already a point of order before the Chair; but the Chair allowed that. It is no reflection on the Chair but that is the kind of thing I mean. That is my recollection. I could be wrong.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. GAMBLE—RIGHT TO BE RECOGNIZED ON A POINT OF ORDER

Mr. John Gamble (York North): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege as a result of the occurrences in the House this morning. It is not very often that I take positions of this nature or become involved in procedural matters. I came into the House at a quarter after eleven and was here until one o'clock. During that very extensive period of time points of order were raised with respect to the nature of the business of the House for today. I came in to deal with the matter that I understood would be dealt with, and that was the motion of which this Party had given notice yesterday before the House closed and with respect to which there had been a designation of an Opposition day by the House Leader for the Government. As I finally viewed his conduct in the House at the end of that day, his acknowledgement of consent to the nature of the business of the House was the motion that I came into the House prepared to deal with.

These remarks are made by way of preliminary discussion only because this morning the Chair ruled that regardless of any of those consequences—quite frankly the nature of which I have discussed here and no one else has with respect to that last comment—the nature of the business of the House was not to be the nature of the business that I anticipated. I had on several occasions endeavored—

Madam Speaker: Order, I have to interrupt the Hon. Member. There was no ruling on this. The Chair had no choice but to contemplate the business of the House which was before the House. The business which was before the House was probably different from what the Hon. Member for York North was expecting it to be. The Chair does not determine what the business of the House will be.

The Hon. Member has to be quite clear that this is not the role of the Chair, and the Chair has not done that. The business of the House is determined by the Government which gives the Clerks an indication what the business of the House will be for the next day. The Clerk of the House of Commons has no choice but to write that down and make it the business

of the House. I do not rule on that nor do any of the assistants in the Chair rule on it.

Mr. Gamble: Madam Speaker, I was making those remarks in a preliminary fashion. I do not have the "blues" for today and I did not really intend to deal with the merits of the issue, but I think if you will check the "blues"—I am rising now because I did not want to give notice as the issue happened today—I think you will find that in the course of making observations, the Chair ruled what the business of the House was to be. The business of the House was to be Bill C-155. Those, I think you will find, are the exact words used by the Chair this morning. My question of privilege however—

Madam Speaker: I am sorry, I cannot let that go by. The Chair quoted what the business of the House was to be, but it did not rule on what would be the business of the House. The Chair cannot rule on that.

Mr. Nielsen: It did.

Madam Speaker: I should like to know what the question of privilege of the Hon. Member is. I have listened for quite a while and I still do not know.

Mr. Gamble: Quite frankly, the question of privilege is the most basic privilege which a Member of Parliament can have, and that is, the right to be heard without prejudice as to what the Member of Parliament is going to say. I have stood in my place time and time again to make an observation by way of point of order that I was not permitted to make.

I understand the Chair may hear a number of Members on a particular point or order and may in fact come to a conclusion that he or she has heard enough, but I can tell you what I do not understand. I do not understand how anyone occupying the chair can decide that the nature of the intervention of any Member is for a dilatory purpose. That was exactly the kind of comment we heard from the Chair this morning. I make these remarks without intentionally reflecting on the Chair.

I ask, Madam Speaker, at this point, how does the Chair determine, before even hearing a Member stand and utter the first word, the nature of his intervention? Is it by the colour of his tie? Surely not. Surely some recognition must be made of the fact that there may be points that should be contributed to a discussion with respect to a point of order which is legitimately raised in connection with the conduct of the business of this House, a matter on which other Members are entitled to make remarks. I did not have that as a right, and I consider that to be a very serious question of privilege. It is a question which goes to my right as a Member of Parliament. It is as fundamental as my right to come into the House. That is my question of privilege, Madam Speaker.

● (1540)

Madam Speaker: I was not in the House and I will have to look at the "blues" and the report in *Hansard*. I just cannot make any sense out of what the Hon. Member is now saying because I cannot refer to the actual comments which were made in the House. I am just making this reservation, that there has been a ruling by the Chair on what the Hon. Member is referring to. Of course, I will not reverse that ruling. The Hon. Member is shaking his head. He said he would not ask me to do that. Of course, I would not even want to attempt to look at a ruling if, by so doing, that would indicate that any Hon. Member can reflect on a ruling made by the Chair.

There is a possibility of objecting formally to a ruling of the Chair, and that is open to the Hon. Member if he wants to do so. However, once it is made, Hon. Members may not reflect on a ruling of the Chair. If that is the thrust of what the Hon. Member has just been saying, I cannot judge it because I have to look at it in the context of the debate which took place at that time. I will look at it and I will come back to the Hon. Member.

Mr. Gamble: Madam Speaker, my purpose was not to reflect upon the ruling of the Chair. My purpose was to draw to the attention of the Chair the fact that the Chair reflects upon the opinions of Hon. Members before they have had an opportunity to speak. That is the issue which will be made very apparent to the Speaker when she examines those "blues". I will be very grateful if she will examine them and get back to the House.

Madam Speaker: I will do that.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

Madam Speaker: Presenting reports from standing and special committees.

Mr. Nielsen: Did you say Petitions?

Madam Speaker: No, I said, "Presenting reports from standing and special committees." Tabling of documents. If the Hon. Member has a petition, we are just coming to it. Statements by Ministers. Petitions. The Hon. Member for Yukon.

* * *

PETITIONS

MR. NIELSEN—IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON PLACER MINERS IN YUKON

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I have a petition from the undersigned residents of Canada, primarily residents of Yukon, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, and humbly sheweth that the survival of the Yukon placer miners is threatened by

unfair changes in legislation and regulations proposed by the federal Government Departments. Such changes in the legislation and regulations as those proposed by the federal Government would lead to the destruction of the placer mining industry in the Yukon. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament not to enact any proposed legislation which would further threaten the security of employment in Yukon at a time when the staggering and unprecedented level of unemployment in Yukon threatens the quality of life in northern communities. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Madam Speaker, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in certain assurance that your humble House will therefor provide a remedy. They humbly sheweth: Whereas there is a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada; whereas this must be remedied as quickly as possible; whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action that may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Madam Speaker, The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth; whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada; whereas this might be remedied as quickly as possible; whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I must remind Hon. Members that they must not read or quote all the "whereases". They must just read the title and the prayer. I would ask the Hon. Member to go immediately to the prayer because he has already given us the title.

Mr. Huntington: Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that whereas, Madam Speaker, there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, etc.—

Madam Speaker: No. Order. No "whereases". Not even one.

Mr. Bosley: Madam Speaker, I did indicate other "whereases". Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. NEIL—SAFE DRINKING WATER

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Madam Speaker, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth—and this has to do with the quality of the water in the cities of Regina and Moose Jaw, which is a danger to the health of the residents and visitors to those cities. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to enter into negotiations with the Province of Saskatchewan and the cities of Moose Jaw and Regina to grant substantial financial aid for the project. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine): Madam Speaker, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and that this might best be remedied by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, the petition of the undersigned residents of Canada in the towns of Carbon, Champion and Cochrane, Alberta, now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to insist on a general election being called now. As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Madam Speaker, I have the duty and honour today to present a 30-page petition to the House to the following effect. We the undersigned insist that

Bill C-155, the Crow legislation, be amended to allow grain producers the option of either receiving their share in the Crow benefit as a producer payment, or electing to have it paid on their behalf to the railways. The purpose of this petition therefore is to express their concern with the present provisions of Bill C-155. The freedom of choice concept will guarantee the consensus which the Prime Minister and the Minister of Transport said they were seeking. And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

● (1550)

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from residents of the Provinces of Saskatchewan, Ontario and Quebec, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. Wherefore the undersigned have considered the alternative plan by the New Democratic Party on the Crow rate, which must be maintained. Also, considering that the railways of Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern, efficient transportation system, they pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party's alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. It is signed by residents of Lashburn, Saskatchewan, and Ottawa and Hull.

[*Translation*]

MR. HAWKES—PROMOTION OF GAME OF CHESS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty to present a petition signed by over 284 Canadians across the country on behalf of more than four millions of their fellow citizens who enjoy the self-discipline and intellectual stimulus provided by the game of chess. The purpose of this petition is to point out to the Federal Government the absolute necessity to follow the example of many provincial and national governments and to recognize in the game of chess a universal form of cultural expression combining physical with mental excellence.

[*English*]

The purpose of this petition is to ask the Secretary of State (Mr. Joyal) to change departmental policy to include measures to promote chess and consequently physical and mental excellence. The petitioners hope, Mr. Speaker, that in your examination of their petition you will find it in order, sense the urgency of their plea, and use the discretionary powers vested in your office to allow discussion and referral to committee at the earliest possible moment. On a previous petition there were over 1,000 signatures, Mr. Speaker, and I hope you use your office to refer this matter to committee. It has been dragging on for several years.

Petitions

MR. McKENZIE—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine): Mr. Speaker, the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your Honourable House will therefor provide a remedy.

Whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and this might best be solved by calling a general election immediately, we the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. McGRATH—LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by citizens of this country exercising their ancient right. The petition refers to a serious crisis of confidence in the Government of this country. If you read through the ancient form of the petition, in short it calls upon this House to vote non-confidence in this Government.

MR. BENJAMIN—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and duty to present a petition to this House. The undersigned residents of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right. I must add this with all due modesty, Mr. Speaker—

An Hon. Member: You have lots to be modest about.

Mr. Benjamin: —but these 98 petitioners from Spirit River, Rycroft and Grand Prairie, Alberta, have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the NDP and Les Benjamin, MP for Regina West—wasn't that nice of them? They urge the Parliament of Canada to adopt the provisions in order that the statutory Crowsnest Pass freight rates may be maintained and that the railways of all Canada be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system. The undersigned have carefully considered this alternative plan and do ever humbly pray that the House of Commons and Government will act upon it.

MR. FRASER—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. The petition refers to the need for an immediate national election. Therefore, we the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Petitions

MR. FRIESEN—CALL FOR RESIGNATION OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, the undersigned residents of the Province of British Columbia now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide the remedy. Humbly sheweth that we the undersigned, a group of concerned Canadian citizens, wish to express our disaffection with present Liberal Government policies and demand the resignation of this Government. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. It is signed by residents of Aldergrove, White Rock, Delta, North Vancouver and Langley in British Columbia.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley-Hants): Mr. Speaker, I, too have a petition signed by citizens of Canada asking to avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to the petitioners in the certain assurance that this honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. The petition, in most graphic terms, talks about the crisis of confidence in Canada. It calls for an election and it says that we the undersigned humbly pray and call upon Parliament to move as soon as possible to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Mel Gass (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petitioners now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. My petitioners humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and it might best be remedied by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. FRETZ—INCREASE IN ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY TOLLS

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, the undersigned residents in Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. There has been a 100 per cent increase in Seaway tolls in the years 1978 through 1981, and they ask that there be no further increase in tolls for the use of the St. Lawrence Seaway for the foreseeable future, or at least until the shipping industry has seen a substantial recovery. Wherefore the undersigned humbly pray that your honourable House will accept the aforementioned recommendations. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present a petition signed by some 321 residents of Canada who were on Parliament Hill on Saturday, October 22, expressing their opposition to the Government's decision to test the United States Cruise missile on Canadian territory. The petitioners state that the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada escalates the nuclear arms race and is therefore a serious threat to the peace of the world, and that history proves that as military strength increases, so does the temptation to use that military strength. The petitioners stress that Canada can play a more crucial role in achieving multilateral disarmament, and call upon Parliament to debate and pass Bill C-678, an act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone, which would allow Canada to act as a mediator along with other countries who will participate in a worldwide nuclear disarmament process. As in duty bound your petitioners ever pray.

MR. TAYLOR—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The undersigned residents of Canada in the towns of Vulcan, Stavely, Exshaw, De Winton and Cluny now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to insist on a general election being called now. As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. PATTERSON—INCREASING DIVORCE RATE

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to present a petition on behalf of almost 100 of my constituents in the riding of Fraser Valley East. The purpose of the petition signed by these people is to express their concern for the family unit as a God-given institution and a basic foundation unit of society. Believing that the rapidly increasing divorce rate and breakdown of the family unit is one of the major factors contributing to the rise of numerous social ills in our present society, they urge that Parliament oppose attempts to permit quick or easy divorce. Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to encourage the preservation of marriage and the family as a basic foundational unit of society and oppose legislative attempts to permit quick or easy divorce.

• (1600)

MR. SCHELLENBERGER—LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. To the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada from the Vancou-

ver area now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. The undersigned say that whereas there is a crisis of confidence in Canada, there must be a remedy immediately, and therefore we, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a peitition to present to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Meacham, Colonsay and Viscount in Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that western Canadian farmers paid $131 million to move export grain under the Crow freight rate in 1981-82. This grain in turn contributed $6.3 billion to the balance of trade, and the undersigned believe that this is the farmers' fair contribution to the Canadian economy and that western farmers will pay one times Crow. Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory grain rate.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the removal of the Crow rate will see its replacement by an imposition that will set grain freight charges five times Crow rate or higher by 1990; that such increases are being imposed at a time when grain prices for producers are at the 1974 level; and that detailed calculations show that the rate of five times Crow will cost the community of Weldon $471,800,000 because of higher rates, these figures being based on the actual deliveries in 1980-81—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I think the Hon. Member is aware that under the rules of the House, the description must be of the briefest nature possible.

Mr. Hovdebo: Wherefore the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the Crow rate in perpetuity as presently guaranteed by statute and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. COOPER—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Albert Cooper (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I too have a petition from the people of the Hines Creek, Spirit River, Worsley and Wanham areas of Alberta who believe that there is a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and believe that that can only be solved by a federal general election. Therefore, we the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. NICKERSON—IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON PLACER MINERS IN YUKON

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, I too present a petition addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. This petition is signed by a number of residents of Canada, primarily residents of Yukon, who avail themselves of the ancient right to submit a petition to the House. They state that the survival of Yukon placers miners is threatened by unfair changes in legislation and regulations proposed by the federal Government Departments. They believe that such changes in the legislation and regulations as those proposed by the federal Government would lead to the destruction of the placer mining industry. Therefore, Sir, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament not to enact any proposed legislation that would further threaten the security of employment in Yukon at a time when the staggering and unprecedented level of unemployment in Yukon threatens the quality of life in northern communities.

I feel obliged, Sir, to point out that one of the signatories to this petition gives as his address Anchorage, Alaska. I believe that this gentleman is a Canadian citizen, but I do hope that his signature on this petition will not invalidate the petition the petition which has been signed by so many other genuine residents of Canada.

[*Translation*]

MR. NYSTROM—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am sorry, I should have said Mr. Speaker. This is difficult.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I do not agree.

Mr. Nystrom: If someone is to blame, Mr. Speaker, it is the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

I also have the honour to present a petition signed by the residents of many towns in Saskatchewan, namely Herbert, Saskatoon, Rush Lake and other communities such as Morse, all of them residents of Canada who now exercise their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy.

They humbly sheweth that:

Whereas Western Canadian farmers paid $131 million for grain in 1981-82 under the Crow rate, whereas this in turn contributed $6.3 billion to the balance of trade of Canada; whereas the undersigned believe that this represents an equitable contribution to the Canadian economy and that Western

Canadian farmers shall pay only one time the Crow rate, wherefore, they humbly pray and call upon Parliament to retain the present Crow rate for grain. And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, forgive me for having called you Madam Speaker.

[*English*]

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled a petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy; humbly sheweth that since there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, which can only be done by the calling of a general federation election immediately, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I too have the duty and honour to present a petition to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition is signed by 288 citizens of the Dominion of Canada resident in Brentwood Bay, Calgary, Cassidy, Chemainus, Courtenay, Duncan, Edmonton, Langley, Lantzville, Ladysmith, Kelowna, Nanaimo, Parksville, Sooke, Vancouver, Victoria and Wabush, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide the remedy; humbly sheweth that having due regard to the serious economic dilemma which faces Canada today, including widespread unemployment, business bankruptcies and personal hardships affecting millions of Canadians, and whereas the Liberal Government has shown little confidence in reversing this disastrous crisis, the undersigned 288 petitioners have lost confidence in the Government of Canada and thereby insist that Parliament be dissolved and a federal general election be called immediately. Your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray, but not for too long, I hope.

● (1610)

MR. DARLING—LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled in the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that Your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy; humbly sheweth, that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and that this must be remedied as quickly as possible and might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada, and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want the House to know that those people across the way who are presenting those petitions forget the fact that they had the power for just a few months and did not know what to do with it. I do not know what they mean by these petitions.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If the Hon. Member is so concerned about our not knowing what to do with power, I would challenge him to go to his Leader, ask him to call an election and see if we would then know what to do with power.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I might comment on the point of order by simply saying that we knew what to do with it, but he did not know what to do without it.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, in the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners with certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. Whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada; whereas this must be remedied as quickly as possible; and whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, therefore we, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada, and, as in duty bound, your petitioners ever pray.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Just before I recognize the next Hon. Member, no doubt on a petition, may I remind Hon. Members that under House rules, since there is an emergency debate tonight, there will be no adjournment motion from 6 p.m.

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by 25 residents of the towns of Bramlea, Brampton, Mississauga, Bolton, Ontario, Orangeville and one from Rural Route No. 6, which is in Shelbourne, Ontario. They now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitoners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy.

They humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Goverment of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the

undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound, your petitoners will ever pray.

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I too, have a petition to present to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. To the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. They humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election, immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

[*Translation*]

MR. KEEPER—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Mr. Speaker, I also wish to present a petition.

To the honourable House of Commons of Canada and Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents of Canada in cities such as Blaine Lake, North Battleford, Krydor, etc., who now avail themselves of their old and inalienable rights to voice a common grievance, with the firm assurance that your honourable House will find a remedy.

They humbly declare that:

Whereas the farmers of Western Canada have paid $131 million to export their grain in the year 1981-82, in accordance with the Crow rate;

Whereas this will contribute $6.3 billion to Canada's trade balance;

Whereas the undersigned believe this is a fair contribution to the Canadian economy;

And whereas western farmers have no intention of paying the Crow rate more than once;

Wherefore, the petitioners humbly call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory grain Crow rate.

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

[*English*]

MR. McKNIGHT—INCREASE IN ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY TOLLS

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, in the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House of Commons will therefore provide a remedy; humbly sheweth that any proposed increases in the tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway be frozen at least until December 31, 1985. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to fulfil this wish of your citizens.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition submitted by a number of residents of Tofield, Alberta and Sherwood Park. It is to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. In the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy; humby sheweth and claim that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada; that this must be remedied as quickly as possible and might be best done by the calling of a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition, largely from a group of residents of the Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe constituency but also from other Ontario residents ranging as far afield as Willowdale and Gravenhurst, Ontario. The petition is to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. To the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable the House will therefor provide a remedy. The petitioners refer to a serious crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and call for an election. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. FRETZ—SAFE DRINKING WATER

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, in the petition the undersigned residents in Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that because some of the most powerful poisons known to man have been discovered in the Niagara River, the source of drinking water for millions of people including thousands of Canadians, and because adequate action to stop the pollution of said river has not been undertaken by the former Minister or the present Minister of

the Environment, immediate and decisive action must be taken to stop the flow of toxic materials into this once beautiful water course. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that your honourable House will accept the aforementioned recommendation and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

● (1620)

MR. ALTHOUSE—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of COmmons of Canada, in Parliament assembled I have a petition of the undersigned residents of the town of Wadena in the Province of Saskatchewan who now exercise their right to present a grievance. They humbly sheweth that they are very much against missile testing in Canada, that the U.S.A. can keep its missiles at home, that we call upon the Government to refuse to test the Cruise and your petitioners as in duty bound, will every pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and privilege to present to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. The purpose of this petition is to indicate as clearly and as forcefully as they can to the federal Government that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible and that this might be best done by calling a federal general election immediately.

Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by a number of residents from various areas of British Columbia. I am very happy to join with my B.C. colleagues in indicating that the people in my constituency associate themselves with British Columbians in so far as this petition is concerned.

To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, in the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. They humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. PARKER—SALE OF HOUSES IN B.C. NATIONAL PARK

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour for me to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled. In the petition the undersigned residents of Canada now exercise their right to present a grievance and humbly sheweth that the residents of Field, B.C., are faced with restrictions on the sale of their homes within the national park that make it virtually impossible for sales to take place. This is creating hard ship for residents, especially senior citizens, for widows of park employees, for workers transferred to other areas and for people forced to move because of health reasons.

We, the undersigned petitioners, call upon the federal Government of Canada to expand the rules to allow residents from the adjacent park and Lake Louise to purchase homes in Field, British Columbia. Failing this, we petition the Government of Canada to purchase the buildings at the appraised value, and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Albert Cooper (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, to point out just how people across Canada have come to view this Government, I have a number of petitions from the Province of Quebec. Although I cannot read the title with any great clarity because it is in French, I know the English translation. They call upon the Government of Canada to resign and to call a federal general election because they, like the rest of Canadians, are fed up with this Government.

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty and the honour to present a petition on behalf of a number of citizens of western Canada who wish to avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present to this House a grievance of concern to them, in the assurance that this honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. They humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I wish to apologize to several Hon. Members when I mistake their names and ridings.

The Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) or the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): There is a strong urge to hear from the Hon. Member for Regina East.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MR. DE JONG—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to all Hon. Members who want to hear me present a petition to you this afternoon, a petition mainly from citizens in and around Ottawa, Ontario. They express their concern about the proposed legislation that is before us. The petitioners have signed this petition to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The undersigned residents of Canada now exercise their right to present a grievance that western Canadian farmers paid $131 million to move export grain under the Crow freight rate in the 1981-1982 crop year. This grain, in turn, contributed $6.3 billion to the balance of trade. I point out that these are people from Ontario who are not directly involved in farming but they appreciate the situation, and the undersigned believe that this is the farmers' fair contribution to the economy and that the western farmers are willing to pay one times Crow and no change. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory grain rate. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. I am presenting this petition to you and to the House of Commons from Canadian citizens, mainly from Ontario.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from 207 citizens of the Dominion of Canada, citizens who are residents of Brentwood, Inuvik, Sidney, Sooke and Victoria, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy; and humbly sheweth that having due regard to the serious economic dilemma which faces Canada today, including widespread unemployment, business bankruptcies and personal hardship affecting millions of Canadians, and whereas the Liberal Government has shown little competence in reversing this disastrous crisis, the undersigned petitioners have lost confidence in the Government of Canada and thereby insist that Parliament be dissolved and that a federal general election be called immediately, and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and the duty to present to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled today.

The petition of the undersigned citizens of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy.

Whereas there exists in Canada a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada,

Whereas this must be remedied as soon as possible,

Whereas this might best be done by the calling of a general federal election immediately,

Therefore, we the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action is necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada,

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray that this happens as soon as possible.

• (1630)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson), the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish), and the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), in that order.

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a very serious petition to present to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to the petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might be best done by calling a general election immediately.

Wherefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—INVASION OF GRENADA BY U.S. FORCES

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of being in Guelph, Ontario last night prior to the visit of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) there today. I was presented with a petition signed by those in attendance last night and was asked to bring it before Parliament.

The petitioners, as residents of Canada and as members of the British Commonwealth, request that the Prime Minister of Canada express outrage to the President of the United States of America at the invasion by American armed forces of Grenada, another member of the Commonwealth. The petitioners believe that no country in the Americas is safe from interference in its sovereign affairs if the United States deems it vital to American foreign interests. The petitioners appeal to Parliament on behalf of all humankind who fear that such irrational action by a nation as powerful as the United States

may, and could eventually, plunge the world into a nuclear holocaust.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present from some people in the most beautiful riding in Canada to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to the petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there is a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and that this must be remedied as quickly as possible by the calling of a general federal election immediately.

Wherefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen), the whistling bird.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, I take it the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) was referring to Surrey-White Rock-North Delta.

Mr. Huntington: No, I was not, and you know it.

Mr. Friesen: I have a petition to present to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to the petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately.

Wherefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. It is signed by the residents of Surrey, White Rock, Vancouver, West Vancouver, and North Vancouver.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada from the Prince George area of British Columbia, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to the petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and that the best way to remedy it is to call a federal election immediately.

Wherefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. SARGEANT—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition to the House of Commons from residents of my constituency in the Province of Manitoba, in particular from the fine communities of Riverton and Gimli, Manitoba. To the honourable House of Commons of Canada and Parliament assembled, we, the undersigned residents of the Province of Manitoba, exercise our right to present a grievance which humbly sheweth that the Crow rate is an important benefit to western Canada and one of the earliest incentives granted to settlers; that the changing of the Crow rate will reduce farm incomes, contribute to the breaking up of communities on branch lines and increase trucking and road costs; and that three Royal Commissions have recommended retention of the Crow rate.

Wherefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the Crow rate in perpetuity as currently guaranteed in statute. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will humbly ever pray.

MR. HAWKES—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty, and indeed it is a pleasure, to present a petition on behalf of many citizens of the City of Winnipeg, the home of the "never to be forgotten" but "soon to be replaced" Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy). The objective of this petition is to indicate clearly to the federal Government the urgent crisis which exists in Canada today and which all of us can see in terms of unemployment, bankruptcies and considerable difficulty. The purpose of the petition is to ask the Government of Canada to call a federal general election at the earliest possible date so that that crisis can be overcome and the country can return to being healthy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the petitioners hope their petition will be examined, that the Chair will find their petition acceptable and realize the urgency of their plea, and that the Chair will make use of its discretionary powers to allow this petition to be considered and refer it as soon as possible to committee.

[*English*]

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, the petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a

remedy, humbly sheweth, having due regard for the serious economic dilemma which now faces Canada, including widespread unemployment, business bankruptcies and personal hardships affecting millions of Canadians, and whereas the Liberal Government has shown little competence in reversing this disastrous crisis, the undersigned petitioners have lost confidence in the Government of Canada and thereby insist that Parliament be dissolved and a federal general election be called immediately. Your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

MR. NYSTROM—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present which is signed by 45 or so Canadians mainly from Alberta and Saskatchewan but also by a well-known and distinguished former journalist, Mr. Bruce Levy of Ottawa and a widely renowned and learned academic from Quebec, M. Jean Ethier of Hull. These two well-known people and the others are calling for the House of Commons to preserve the Crow rate for western farmers. They maintain that western Canadian farmers pay over $100 million a year to move export grain under the Crow rate and that this grain is contributing over $6 billion per year to the balance of trade, which they say is very important for all Canada, including central Canada.

Also they say that we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory Crow rate. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners shall ever pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, it may come as no surprise to you that I have a petition to present this afternoon from a fine group of Canadians who feel that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada. They want an opportunity to remedy this as quickly as possible. They feel that that may be done by calling a general election. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada, of course, that is, by calling an election immediately.

• (1640)

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled a petition signed by residents from the area of Mundare, Alberta, Vegreville, Alberta, and Innisfree, Alberta. In the petitions the undersigned citizens of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. They humbly sheweth that there does exist a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and that this must be remedied as quickly as possible and must be done by the calling of a federal election immediately. We, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada, and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. BENJAMIN—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson). I should have sent this petition to him since I know he is an ardent proponent of keeping the statutory grain rate. He is having great difficulty, mainly with some of his own colleagues. Some 60 petitioners from Assiniboia, Scout Lake, Lafleche, Rockglen, Lesieux, Kildeer, Lakenheath, Meyronne and Ottawa, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan proposed by the New Democratic Party and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan in order that the statutory Crowsnest Pass freight rate may be maintained and that the railways of all of Canada may be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transport system. These petitioners do humbly pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that has been signed by a number of Canadian citizens from Kimberley, B.C., Wycliffe, B.C., and Brantford, Ontario. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by the calling of a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada, and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by 28 residents of towns of Mount Forest, Guelph, Kenilworth, Ontario, and R.R. 4 Kenilworth, Ontario. They now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will provide a remedy. They humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and that this must be remedied as quickly as possible and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada, and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and duty to present a petition on behalf of some of

the very fine people of the community of Lamont in the well served federal riding of Vegreville. To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, in the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. Whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, whereas this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and whereas it might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, therefore we the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners forever pray.

MR. KEEPER—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan in the communities of Etonia, Calgary and Mantario, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party that the Crow rate must be maintained and that the railways of Canada must be developed into a modern and efficient transport system. Wherefore, we the undersigned humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan, which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rates and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. NIELSEN—IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON PLACER MINERS IN YUKON

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the House of Commons. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, primarily resident in Yukon, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the survival of the Yukon placer miners is threatened by unfair changes in the legislation and regulations proposed by the federal Government Department in that such changes in the legislation and regulations as those proposed by the federal Government would lead to the destruction of the placer mining industry in the Yukon. Wherefore, the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament not to enact any proposed legislation that would further threaten the security of employment in Yukon at a time when the staggering and unprecedented level of unemployment in Yukon threatens the quality of life in northern communities and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Bill Wright (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty to present to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor present a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might be best done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and privilege to present to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. The purpose of this petition is to indicate to the federal Government as clearly and as forcibly as possible that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and that this must be remedied as quickly as possible and that this can best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

● (1650)

MR. HOVDEBO—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Madam Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents of the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that increases in the Crow rate will affect the prices of producers' grain which are now at the 1974 level and that it will cost the community of Hoey $180,100 per year. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the Crow rate in perpetuity as presently guaranteed by statute, and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. This petition is signed by a number of people from the communities of Domremy and Hoey in Saskatchewan.

MR. SCHELLENBERGER—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. For the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, all from northern B.C., now

avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. They are also concerned about the crisis of confidence in Canada and feel that the only way to solve this is by calling a general election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada, and as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. McDERMID—IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON PLACER MINERS IN YUKON

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by individuals from Carmacks, Pukaskwa, and Whitehorse in the Yukon regarding a grievance common to your petitioners that the survival of the Yukon placer miners is threatened by unfair changes in legislation and regulations proposed by federal Government Departments. Such changes in the legislation and regulations as those proposed by the federal Government would lead to the destruction of the placer mining industry. Therefore, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament not to enact any proposed legislation that would further threaten the security of employment in the Yukon at a time when, we all know, the staggering and unprecedented level of unemployment in the Yukon threatens the quality of life in the northern communities that I mentioned, and many others.

MR. FRIESEN—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that, whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Governemnt of Canada, whereas this might be remedied as quickly as possible, and whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. It is signed by residents of the City of Alberta.

MR. KEEPER—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled, I have a petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan and communities such as High River and North Battleford, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a common grievance. Your petitioners, in certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party that the Crow rate must be maintained and that the railways of all of Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transport system. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate, and, as in duty, bound your petitioners ever pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition mostly signed by residents of Dufferin County in my constituency but including residents of other areas of Ontario. The petition is to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. To the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy.

The purpose of the petition is to demand an early election in Canada. The petitioners conclude by saying that therefore, we the petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and duty to present a petition on behalf of some of the wonderful people from the communities of Princeton, British Columbia, North Vancouver, Canyon, British Columbia and other communities in that Province along with citizens from Edmonton in Alberta.

To the honourable House of Commons and Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in certain assurance that the House will provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that, whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, whereas this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound, your petitioners will forever pray.

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from citizens in the beautiful Province of British Columbia from Fernie and Sparwood and then we move over into Alberta. There are probably 25 citizens who state in the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now do avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a

grievance, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, that there exists, in their opinion, a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and that this could be remedied as quickly as possible. Therefore, there should be a federal election called, and, therefore, they state, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ALTHOUSE—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from residents of the Nipawin-Craik River-Choiceland area of Saskatchewan, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the removal of the Crow rate will see its replacement by rates that will impose a higher rate cost of five times the present Crow rate and higher by 1990, that such increases are being imposed at a time when the price for producers' grain is at the 1974 level, and the detailed calculations show that the rate of 5.1 times the Crow rate will cost the community of Nipawin $564,600 per annum extra in payment for grain freight that would otherwise have stayed in that community based on actual deliveries in the 1980-81 crop year. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon the Parliament of Canada to maintain the Crow rate in perpetuity as presently guaranteed by statute. In duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HARGRAVE—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from 34 petitioners in the city of Vancouver. To the Hon. House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, this must be remedied as quickly as possible. Whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

• (1700)

MR. McDERMID—IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON PLACER MINERS IN YUKON

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition here from the residents of Victoria, British Columbia, from Whitehorse in the Yukon, from Lake Laberge. A number of them are placer miners themselves. The petition is to the honourable House of Commons in Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, primarily residents of the Yukon and some other parts of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the survival of the Yukon placer miners is threatened by unfair changes in legislation and regulations proposed by federal Government Department. Such changes in the legislation and regulations as those proposed by the federal Government could lead to the destruction of the placer mining industry. The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament not to enact any proposed legislation which would further threaten the security of employment in the Yukon at a time when the staggering and unprecedented level of employment in the Yukon threatens the quality of life in northern communities. As in duty bound, your petitioners will every pray.

MR. FORRESTALL—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I as well have a petition. I might like to put forward another one. Hon. Members will at lest know Canadians are now out of Grenada and more or less en route to Barbados.

To the honourable House of COmmons in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will provide therefor a remedy, humbly sheweth, Mr. Speaker, that whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, whereas this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

This is signed by 38 residents of the Province of British Columbia.

MR. SARGEANT—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition on behalf of a number of Saskatchewan farmers. They petition the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that western Canadian farmers paid $131 million to move export grain under the Crow freight rate in the 1981-82 crop year. This grain, in turn, contributed $6.3 billion to the balance of trade. The undersigned believe that this is the farmers' fair contribution to the Canadian economy and that western farmers will pay one times Crow, in other words, no change. Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly

pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory Crow rate. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. TAYLOR—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, the undersigned residents of Canada in Blackie and Irricana, Alberta, which are farming towns where practically everyone farms or derives his livelihood from farming, feel that their livelihood is going to be jeopardized by Bill C-155 if it passes. They now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to insist on a general election being called now. As in duty bound, your petitioner will ever pray.

MR. GUSTAFSON—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, this petition relates particularly to the very serious cash flow problem which farmers face. To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, with the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the initial price for grain producers in western Canada should be raised to a level which more accurately reflects the prevailing world price of grain. Wherefore, we, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada.

MR. NEIL—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition signed by residents of Esquimalt, North Vancouver, West Vancouver, Vancouver and Burnaby. It is addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned petitioners of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that it can be remedied by the calling of a general federal election immediately. Wherefore, we, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition here today to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents in the Province of Saskatchewan who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party that the Crow rate must be maintained and that the railways of all Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the alternative plan of the New Democratic Party which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rates. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and duty to present a petition on behalf of some of the citizens in the communities of Burnaby, Vancouver, Surrey and Richmond, British Columbia, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that, whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, whereas this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, wherefore, we, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from citizens of the Lower Mainland of British Columbia and Southern Ontario. To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada which should be remedied as quickly as possible by the calling of a general federal election immediately. Wherefore, we, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

● (1710)

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by 17 residents of the cities and towns of Toronto, Brampton, Georgetown, Rexdale and Downsview. The Chair will be pleased to know that it was not Mr. Danson who signed from Downsview. They avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. They humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and this must be remedied as quickly as possible, which might be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. KRISTIANSEN—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, as the Member of Parliament for Kootenay West, an area whose history in the past and its one-time threat of secession was in part responsible for the building of the Crowsnest Railway, I am proud to present the following petition to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition was signed by 18 residents of the Province of Saskatchewan and the communities of Maidstone, Waseca and Lashburn, along with residents of Ottawa, Ontario and Hull, Quebec. They now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. The undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the NDP that the Crow rate be maintained and that the railways of all of Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transport system. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the NDP alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HAWKES—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty, on behalf of some citizens of some of Alberta's smaller towns, to present a petition to this House. The petitioners are from Tofield, Beaumont, Leduc and Villeneuve. The objective of their petition is to bring to the attention of this House and the Government the fact that there is a crisis of confidence. In particular in their region, agriculture and energy policies, along with issues affecting tourism, have caused bankruptcy, loss of jobs and severe hardship for many of these people. The purpose of the petition is to call upon the Government to give urgent consideration to the necessity of restoring confidence in this country and to suggest to the Government that the only possible method of restoring confidence is to go through the process of a federal general election.

The petitioners hope that in your examination of their petition you will find it in order, sense the urgency of their plea and that you might use the discretionary powers vested in your office to allow discussion and referral to committee of this matter at the earliest possible moment.

MR. McKNIGHT—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, request that the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board make any change necessary to the formula used to calculate payments under the western grain stabilization fund in order to trigger an immediate payout from the over $900 million currently in the fund. I am pleased to see the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) in attendance.

Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to provide a remedy. As in duty bound, your petitioners ever pray.

MR. FORRESTALL—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are now half way from Grenada to Barbados on their way to freedom.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member restrict his remarks to the petition?

Mr. Beatty: That was a news flash, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The rules of the House call for order at this point. If the Hon. Member is introducing a petition, his remarks should be strictly relevant to that.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will have a petition from Grenada.

To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore we, the undersigned petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada.

MR. NYSTROM—CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition concerning the merchant marine, signed by 42 Quebecers from a number of large and small centres in Quebec, and also one Leslie Benjamin of Somerset Street here in the city of Ottawa.

An Hon. Member: Who?

Mr. Nystrom: Regina, sorry.

[*Translation*]

It is a petition by the Seafarers' International Union of Canada to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled.

The petition of the undersigned citizens of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a common grievance, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that Canadians have been deprived of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial spin-offs because we have no industrial maritime strategy and the federal Government has neglected to provide Canada with a consistent maritime policy, although more than two years ago it promised to announce such a policy, and that the Government's action is endangering Canada's economic growth. Therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government be asked to adopt forth with a consistent and effective maritime policy, resulting in the creation of a Canadian merchant marine and expansion of Canadian industry and the shipping industry and related sectors. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

● (1720)

[*English*]

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, British Columbia especially, now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. They humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in Canada. This should be remedied as quickly as possible, which can best be achieved by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action is necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty to present a petition to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. Whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada and this must be remedied as quickly as possible, which might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. It is dated this 27th day of October in the year of Our Lord 1983.

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, I know that the people who are represented by the Hon. Member for Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke (Mr. Hopkins) will be interested in this petition because it is signed by a number of people from Pembroke and Petawawa in the Ottawa Valley. That is an area with which you and I are so familiar, Mr. Speaker. The petition is to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that there is no doubt that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. That petition is dated October 27, 1983.

MR. DE JONG—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I too rise to present to the House a petition which I think the Hon. Member for Swift Current-Maple Creek (Mr. Hamilton) should be interested in since many of the petitioners are from the riding of Swift Current-Maple Creek. The petition is to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your Honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party that the Crow rate must be maintained and that the railways of Canada must be upgraded and developed to provide a modern and efficient transportation system. Whereas the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like your direction on this matter because I am not as familiar with the rules and the etiquette of the House as are many of the people who have been in the House for years. I seek your direction and perhaps your advice on a matter that arose when I spoke. While I was reading a petition, the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) said: "I spy a stranger in the House". I think, Mr. Speaker, that he was referring to me because I have recently come back from a trip.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect, I am sure the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is reverting to a time-honoured formula of the House, and the Chair noted that and looked around. I am sure such a formula is never used with reference to Members duly elected to the House of Commons.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and privilege to present a petition signed by Canadian citizens from Campbell River, Surrey, West Vancouver, North Vancouver and Vancouver proper. It is addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your Honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. The petition is dated October 27, 1983.

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from residents of British Columbia and, as citizens of the Dominion of Canada, they avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a suitable remedy. They believe, Mr. Speaker, that there exists a lack of confidence in the Government of Canada today and that the only way to remedy this would be to call an election. Therefore, the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and duty to present a petition on behalf of some very fine and thoughtful citizens from the communities of West Vancouver, North Vancouver and Surrey and from many citizens of the good community of Valleyview in the Province of Alberta. To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore the confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HOVDEBO—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House would be interested to know that farmers have occupied the Department of Transport offices in Winnipeg, Edmonton and Regina this afternoon. To the honourable, House of Commons—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, he should confine his remarks strictly to the presentation of his petition.

Mr. Hovdebo: To the honourable, House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the Crow rate is an important benefit to western Canada and one of the earliest incentives granted to settlers and that changing of the Crow rate will reduce farm incomes, contribute to the breaking up of communities on branch lines and increase trucking and road costs, and that three Royal Commissions have recommended retention of the Crow rate. Therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the Crow rate in perpetuity as presently guaranteed by statute. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. SHIELDS—IMPACT OF LEGISLATION ON PLACER MINERS IN YUKON

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition which was circulated in the placer mining capital of the world, Dawson City, where the largest placer mining operations in the country have taken place. Because of the potential destruction of the placer mining industry, petitions were circulated in Dawson city and I would like to put on the record what the petitioners asked for. The letter stated that the Yukon Placer Mine Survival Committee is seeking the support of all northerners in their fight for survival against unfair changes in legislation and regulations proposed by federal Government Departments which would lead to the destruction of the industry. It goes on, "If you feel you could help us, please add your address and phone number." The petition was circulated in Dawson City.

• (1730)

The petition is to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, primarily residents of the Yukon, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the survival of the Yukon placer miners is threatened by unfair changes in legislation and regulations proposed by federal Government Departments and that such changes in the legislation and regulations as those proposed by the federal Government would lead to the destruction of the placer mining industry.

Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament not to enact any proposed legislation that would further threaten the security of employment in the Yukon at a time when the staggering and unprecented level of unemployment in the Yukon threatens the very quality of life in northern communities. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. This is dated October 21, 1983.

MR. MAZANKOWSKI—FEDERAL SALES TAX ON FARM FUELS

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada signed by some 40 residents of Canada. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the crippling federal sales tax on farm fuels in having a very deleterious effect on farmers' incomes and input costs. They are asking that the federal sales tax on farm fuels be reduced.

Therefore, the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take the necessary action to provide a remedy and relief in this particular area. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present to the House of Commons. It is to the Honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. It is largely from residents of Wellington County in my constituency. In the petition the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will thereby provide a remedy. The petitioners demand an early general election. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, it is my duty and pleasure to present a petition to the House of Commons on behalf of many citizens of Grand Prairie, Alberta, a community that is depedent partly on agriculture, partly on oil and gas and partly on tourism.

The objective of the petition is to bring to the attention of the House that there is a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada. Members of this community have watched bankruptcies as a consequence of the National Energy Program and they are concerned that Bill C-155 will cause similar bankruptcies in the agricultural sector. There is a shortage of jobs and the Government continues to create jobs in other parts of the country at a rate which it refuses to do for the citizens of Alberta.

The purpose of their petition is to suggest a remedy to the House of Commons and to the nation. That remedy would be a federal general election at the earliest possible moment. If Members on the other side care about Canadians, their economic wellbeing and their health, they will comply with the sense of this petition and cause an election to occur at the earliest possible moment.

Therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada, and that includes a federal general election at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure and the duty to present a petition on behalf of the fine people of Claresholm, which is in the southern part of my riding, of Stavely, Mossleigh and also from some people who were visiting there from Surrey-White Rock and Victoria, British Columbia. These people are very concerned because scores of them have lost their jobs, many farms have gone into liquidation, others fear bankruptcy and businesses fear that they will fold up. Consequently they have petitioned the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled and now avail themselves of the ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that Your Honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. One of the remedies suggested is that the petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to insist on a general election being called now before the whole country fails. As in duty bound, your petitioners ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to the House of Commons a petition signed by residents of the Province of Nova Scotia from such places as Mabou, Baddeck, Inverness, Sydney, Belle Cote and New Waterford. The petitioners stress that the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada escalates the nuclear arms race and is therefore a serious threat to world peace.

The petitioners further stress that multilateral nuclear disarmament must occur in order to secure peace in the world.

Therefore, the petitioners call upon Parliament to debate and pass Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapon's free zone, which if passed, would allow Canada to act as a mediator along with other countries that wish to participate in the worldwide nuclear disarmament process. Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners as in duty bound, will ever pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that Your Honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that, whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, whereas this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. It is a cross-Canada petition with signatures from "Toronto the Good", Valleyview, Grande Prairie in Alberta, Maple Ridge in British Columbia; Neilburg, Saskatchewan; Birtle, Manitoba; Fox Creek, Alberta and other communities.

Mr. John Thomson (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that, whereas there exists a crisis in confidence in the Government of Canada, and whereas this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. This petition is dated October 27, 1983. It is signed by residents of Kamloops, British Columbia, Calgary, Alberta, Tranquille, British Columbia, Terrace Bay, British Columbia, and a number of other ridings and communities in the Province of British Columbia.

● (1740)

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by 28 residents. They all come from Orangeville, Ontario, which is noted for having a very distinguished representative in this House, the Hon. Perrin Beatty.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is the custom in this House to refer to Hon. Members by constituency and not by name.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I was simply overcome with my admiration for the Hon. Member and I have difficulty remembering his lengthy constituency name, but I do apologize to the Chair.

The petition of the undersigned citizens, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to yours petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Wherefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour and duty to present to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled the petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that having due regard for the serious economic dilemma which faces Canada today, including widespread unemployment, business bankruptcies and personal hardships affecting millions of Canadians, and whereas the Liberal Government shows little competence in reversing this disastrous crisis, the undersigned petitioners have lost confidence in the Government of Canada and thereby insist that Parliament be dissolved and a general federal election be called immediately. Your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

[*Translation*]

MR. SARGEANT—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition.

The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada who now exercise their ancient and undisputed right to present a grievance with the full assurance that the House will remedy it.

Humbly sheweth that:

Whereas Western Canadian farmers paid $131 million to move export grain under the Crow freight rate in the 1981-82 crop year;

Whereas this grain in turn contributed $6.3 billion to the balance of trade;

Whereas the undersigned believe that this is the farmers' fair contribution to the Canadian economy;

And whereas Western farmers will pay one times Crow;

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory grain Crow rate,

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

[*English*]

MR. NEIL—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by a number of Canadian residents who reside in Tofield, Alberta, and Sherwood Park. It is addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. FLIS—CALL FOR VOTE PASSAGE OF BILL C-155

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by taxpayers of Canada who reside in the Provinces of Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick. To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled the petition of the undersigned citizens, residents of Canada, humbly sheweth that, due to losses from the carriage of grain, Canada's railways are unable to invest in the expanded railway capacity that is needed to maintain Canada's heretofore good reputation as a reliable exporter-supplier and that Bill C-155, the Western Grain Transportation Bill, will allow this investment to take place while providing the necessary protection to the farmers of western Canada, and that with the passage of this Bill tens of thousands of jobs will be created across the country thereby contributing to economic recovery. Therefore, we the undersigned petitioners humbly pray all Members of Parliament to cease the unnecessary procedural wrangling, immediately conclude debate and vote upon Bill C-155. Your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Bert Hargrave (Medicine Hat): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the good citizens, 23 of them, of Gananoque, Ontario to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. It reads as follows. The undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. It calls upon the House of Commons to call an election at the earliest date and concludes: "Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray."

Unlike the petition presented by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Flis), pray here is spelled p-r-a-y and not p-r-e-y.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. House Leader inspected my petition and found it in order. I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his remarks and respect the rules of this House.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I did indeed inspect the petition. It was not signed by three Members of Parliament. It has to be, to be in order.

MR. KRISTIANSEN—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of hands across the mountains, I am pleased as a Member for British Columbia to present the following petition signed by some 18 residents of Maidstone, Battleford and Waseca, Saskatchewan; Hull, Quebec and Ottawa, Ontario, to the honourable House of Commons in Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan and others who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your Honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party that the Crow rate must be maintained and that the railways of all of Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transport system. Therefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest

Pass freight rate. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

● (1750)

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, as in my duty as a Member of the House of Commons, I wish to present a petition on behalf of residents of the great riding of North Vancouver-Burnaby. The purpose of this petition, signed as it is by concerned Canadians, is to indicate to the House that there is a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada. The nature of the petition is to demand that a general federal election be called immediately.

The petitioners hope, Mr. Speaker, that in your examination of their petition you will find it in order, sense the urgency and desperation of their plea, and that you might use the discretionary power vested in your office to refer this petition to His Excellency the Governor General at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, that this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and that this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately.

Wherefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada and in the Canadian Parliament. And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I have the unique, extraordinary and special privilege of introducing a petition on behalf of the thoughtful and wise people from the community of Windsor, whose Minister and Member was in the House just a few moments ago. Those good citizens of Windsor petition the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that, whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, whereas this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. BENJAMIN—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, in order to speed up the representation of petitions, I will present two petitions which I really should have given to the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) because I know he is an ardent supporter of keeping the Crow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please state his petition.

Mr. Benjamin: I would be glad to, Mr. Speaker. These are two petitions signed by 37 people from Chaplin, Central Butte, Moose Jaw and Ottawa who humbly petition the House of Commons that they, the undersigned, have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party. Wherefore, they humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the NDP alternative plan in order that the statutory Crowsnest Pass freight rates may be maintained before we have a general election and that all railways of Canada may be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system.

CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty and honour to present to the honourable House of Commons of Canada a petition of the undersigned citizens of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. They humbly sheweth that there exists a crisit of confidence in the Government of Canada which must be remedied as quickly as possible by calling a general election. Wherefore, the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. It is signed by 23 citizens from Fairmount, British Columbia; Spruce Grove, Alberta; Radium, British Columbia; Bawlf, Alberta; Calgary; Edmonton; Canal Flats; and Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Mr. John Thomson (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Dominion of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that, whereas there exists a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada, whereas this must be remedied as quickly as possible, and whereas this might best be done by calling a general federal election immediately, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take whatever action may be necessary to restore confidence in the Government of Canada. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray. It is dated this day, October 27, 1983, and it is signed by 25 residents of

Kamloops, British Columbia; Barrie, Ontario; Huntsford, British Columbia; Oak Bay, British Columbia; Delta, British Columbia and Edmonton, Alberta.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to present signed by 287 Canadians, many of whom live in Banff where the people are angry with the Government over the destruction of a beautiful park in order to accommodate an ex-Liberal Cabinet Minister who built a hotel there and sold it for a sizeable amount of money. Many of these people are also very angry because the Government has extracted—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please state his petition.

Mr. Taylor: Does the Government not want to know why the people are angry?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is an experienced Parliamentarian. Will he please state his petition?

Mr. Taylor: I would be very happy to present it on behalf of the people of Banff, Canmore, and even a chap from Halifax; there are also signatures from Exshaw and Ottawa. They are all angry with the Government and ask that a general election be called because of many reasons we do not have time to outline now. They avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to the petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefor provide a remedy. Your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to insist on a general election being called now. And, as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

[*Translation*]

MR. WADDELL—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, the petition of the undersigned residents of Canada who now exercise their ancient and undisputed right to present a grievance with the full assurance that the House will remedy it.

Humbly sheweth that—

[*English*]

—Since my mother is in the gallery and does not understand French, perhaps I could read it in English. They humbly sheweth that the Crow rate is an important benefit to western Canada, where she is from, and one of the earliest incentives granted to settlers. The changing of the Crow rate will reduce farm incomes, contribute to the breaking up of communities on branch lines and increase trucking and road costs. The petition is from Saskatchewan. It is signed by a number of petitioners from the great Province of Saskatchewan who humbly pray that their petition will be accepted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being 6 p.m., I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m., at which time the House will proceed to the question of the invasion of Grenada, pursuant to Standing Order 30.

At 6 p.m., the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 30

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—INVASION BY MULTINATIONAL FORCE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Leave has been granted to the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent) to move the adjournment of the House pursuant to Standing Order 30 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the invasion of Grenada by a multinational force led by the United States.

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa) moved:

That this House do now adjourn.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the invasion of Grenada which took place not many days ago is an act which should be condemned by every person in all lands representing all ideologies who believe that negotiations, not violence, should be what conducts the affairs of mankind as they are organized in states, and who believe that no state has the right to impose its particular system of government upon any other. That is what this debate is about. I will come back to that point in a moment. Before I do so, I want to say what the debate is not about and to clarify a few matters.

The debate is not about whether one liked or disliked the Government of the former Prime Minister of Grenada, Mr. Bishop, a man who was brutally murdered. Whether one agreed or disagreed with his form of Government, or with what he was doing according to his principles in his land for his people, is not, I repeat, what this debate is about. It is not approval or disapproval of him.

• (2010)

Nor is this about the brutal act of murder that not only took Mr. Bishop's life but that of many members of his cabinet as well as two or more trade union leaders. That kind of brutality, however unacceptable it is—as surely it is among all civilized people—is not what we are debating tonight.

Nor, third and most important, is the debate about the violence that Grenada as a state was involved in vis-à-vis other states. No one involved in the invasion of Grenada that I am aware of has suggested that the State of Grenada itself was embarked upon any form of aggression against any of its neighbours.

Those are the three important matters that I want to say that the debate is not about, Mr. Speaker.

I now want to turn to the essence of the matter. What we are talking about is an act of aggression, as open, as calculated, as inhuman as any other act of murder. I use my words with care because I think it is important for us as politicans to keep in mind what acts of unjust war, in particular are all about. Wars in general are about killing people. Today, as we are debating in Canada, in a fellow member country of the Commonwealth young men and probably young women also are being killed. This means, and we should think of these things,—that when their lives are snuffed out they will never see a cloudless sky with stars again. They will not have the pleasures and the friendships we will have, and they will not experience the joys of parenthood. They will not do all the mundane or blissful things that are part of the human existence.

These people who are being killed, whether young Grenadians defending their land, whether Cubans who happen to be in their land, or whether a young soldier from Iowa who happens to be a U.S. marine and who has been instructed by his Government to act in this way, and, like young soldiers in any nation, is inclined to accept what he is told to do as being the right thing, are lives being lost today. War is not some abstract entity that is a collection of mere statistics. War means that men and women, particularly young men and women, are going to disappear from the planet in a violent and cruel way. We must keep that in mind in this debate.

In my view what we are involved in, in this debate, in this Parliament, is an act that was deliberately and coolly calculated to create violence. It was an act coolly and carefully calculated by a great democracy in the world, the United States of America. I will come back to that in a minute, Mr. Speaker.

Although fellow members of the Commonwealth were involved in this decision to invade Grenada, anyone who understands the political reality of war in this hemisphere or anywhere else on the planet, knows that the United States of America, as the great power involved in this instance, is really behind the activity. For anyone who has any doubt, I ask them to consider whether it is conceivable if the other states involved in this so-called joint action would be taking this action were it not for the United States Marines. Would they, on their own, be combining to invade Grenada? My own judgment, and I suspect that of anyone who thinks about it seriously, would be that they would not be involved.

This is an act to invasion, an act of aggression initiated and led by the United States of America. We in this Parliament have an obligation to state the truth, to accept the truth and, in unpalatable cases, to try to change the reality. That is what we are involved in tonight.

If, as I say, this act of aggression was something initiated in its fundamental causality by the United States, I want, with care, to say why I think that. In so doing I want to deal with the reasons offered by the United States, its President, its Secretary of State, and other spokespersons, for the action and I want Members of the House to consider them.

No doubt as we are here tonight the President is on television and is readdressing these questions and reasserting the arguments and dressing them up with so-called fact. But just consider the arguments and consider whether anyone would believe them if they were offered, for example, by the head of another super power in another part of the world to justify acts of aggression in another part of the world.

First of all, the President has suggested that the United States has been involved in this act to protect its own citizens. That was one reason that was given. Surely we have to see this as a bogus argument. We now know, not through our own sources but through the *New York Times* as well as other American media, that the United States sent envoys, special representatives of the State Department, a number of days ago, shortly before the invasion, to ascertain whether there was necessity for involvement by the United States of America and its armed forces, presumably, and the answer they got was no.

We also know that the spokesperson for the largest single group of Americans there, namely, the university students, had openly expressed the wish that their President and the United States not take any violent action that could create problems for them.

It takes someone with a rather fanciful imagination to believe that the reason for the action of the United States was to protect its own citizens in Grenada.

Second, the United States has had the audacity, I say, in that region of the world to claim that it was acting to lay the foundations of democracy. I just mention some other countries in that region and ask Members of the House to try to place themselves in those countries and hear the words of the American President. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to think of Haiti, Guatemala, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic. All those countries in our lifetime have had violence inflicted upon them by the United States again, I regret to say, as a democrat. These countries have been attacked, have experienced the violence of the United States marines and invariably the argument given was that the purpose was to create conditions for democracy. Quite the opposite occurred. After each of these actions of violence by the use of the military, democracy did not grow. Vicious, inhumane dictatorships were what emerged from these invasions—dictatorships that lasted not for a year or two but for a number of decades.

As Senator Moynihan of the U.S. said a couple of days ago, you do not create democracies by using violence, and particularly you do not create democracies in one state by inflicting upon it the organized violence of another. Senator Moynihan said in criticism of his own government: "I don't know how you restore democracy on the point of a bayonet". That sums it up very well.

The third reason given for this action by the United States, Mr. Speaker, was that the American Government was asked by the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States to participate in this intervention—again, not to mince words, "to participate

in this invasion". I say again, Mr. Speaker, that this argument is bogus. I say so for a couple of reasons. The most fundamental reason is that no collection of states, whether or not they are democracies, has the right to say, "We will get together and gang up on another state". I do not care, Mr. Speaker, if 45 countries in the world get together and decide that the 46th country is wrong in terms of what it is doing internally. The 45 states should not impose their will on that one state.

● (2020)

This is not the first time in history this has happened, Mr. Speaker. We should keep in mind that democracies use power like tyrannies. Athenian democracy was the same. There was an Athenian empire which sought to impose its will upon other people. A democracy, I repeat, can abuse its authority, its power. It can violate its norms when it deals with other states. The so-called collective decision of a group of states to invade one state in a region has no moral—and I would also argue legal—authority.

The next point I would make, Mr. Speaker, is that the charter of this collection of Eastern Caribbean states has two important requirements in it, both of which were violated. One is that for such action to take place unanimity is required. Grenada is a member of that organization. It should not surprise many people that Grenada did not participate in that decision. That was the number one violation of their own charter. Second, and very important, collective action taken by members of the Eastern Caribbean Organization was to be directed toward an outside aggressor who was taking action against one of its members. Again, Mr. Speaker, that requirement was not met.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the three arguments which have been offered with great seriousness in the U.S. media by the U.S. President and by its Secretary of State simply do not hold water and we in this House, like the rest of the civilized world which wants to be honest, must see that reality.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: I would also add, Mr. Speaker, that the action taken by this collection of states against Grenada violates the Rio Treaty. It violates the principles of international law and goes against the United Nations Charter. It goes against the preamble of the Charter and it goes against Article I and II of the Charter. In particular, Article II of the United Nations Charter says that members of the United Nations should refrain from "threat or the use of violence against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state".

I say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that it is a rather sad irony that the attack against Grenada should have taken place the day after the thirty-ninth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, the United Nations whose very name was suggested by a very distinguished and very great democrat by the name of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I believe that if Mr. Roosevelt was alive he would have grave concerns about the abuse of the very principles of democracy, the very principles of co-operative action upon which the United Nations was founded, and for whose purposes he worked so hard.

I would like to turn now, Mr. Speaker, to what I believe are the real reasons for the invasion of Grenada. They should concern us as members of a country which is part of the Americas. They should also concern us at this particular time in world history when matters are so precarious, when nuclear weaponry make a distinct possibility of the obliteration of mankind. I happen to think, and the evidence can be adduced, and if we had more time I would be only too happy to provide it, that the Reagan administration—not the Carter administration and, not many members of the United States Senate or the United States Congress, but the Reagan administration—has been waging an undeclared war against Nicaragua. It has aided in the suppression of human rights in El Salvador, and it supports the dictatorship which exists in Guatemala. These are unpalatable truths for a democrat. These are unpalatable truths for many people in the U.S. Congress.

The Reagan administration is turning, in my judgment, the whole of Central America into a crusade. It is doing its best to turn that region, and a good part of its members, into a crusade against any kind of political regime which can be seen in any sense of the modern use of language to be philosophically left of centre. It is supporting in this holy crusade—or unholy crusade—any kind of regime on the right, providing that such regime supports the government of the United States. Just as during the Crusades, Mr. Speaker, when the so-called Christian heads of state perverted the very principles of morality, of Christianity, in the name of Christianity, so do we now find people in the Reagan administration completely perverting the most fundamental principles of democracy in the name of democracy. George Orwell told us what this was all about.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: It is in this context, Mr. Speaker, that I say that the attack on Grenada was simply an event just waiting for an excuse to happen, in the mind of the Reagan administration. If we in this House do not say in the clearest way that this is unacceptable, if we do not make it clear that the American administration is doing things which are fundamentally wrong, we betray our own traditions as a democratic people and we will also not be supporting those thousands of American democrats who oppose their government in this kind of activity.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but his time has expired. He could be allowed to continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Broadbent: I thank Hon. Members of the House. I will try to conclude very quickly.

We must make very clear here in the Canadian House of Commons that we do not support this kind of activity, this

aggressive behaviour which has been undertaken against the nation of Grenada, because if the United States—and again I stress, the present administration of the United States—succeeds with this, and that is why President Reagan is on television again tonight, then I ask, can Nicaragua be far behind? And after Nicaragua, will it be Cuba? After Cuba will it be the Dominican Republic? And after the Dominican Republic, who knows?

We have a very basic obligation, Mr. Speaker, to send a message to the Government of the United States that it is morally wrong. I also want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that, as is very often the case in politics, morality counts for practical events. They are not disconnected aspects of human existence. Morality in politics frequently counts in the way states behave. If we do not make the proper decision in this instance as a parliamentary democracy on the northern borders of the United States, not only will we be doing a disservice to moral principles, we will not be sending the kind of practical, moral message which must be sent to the Government of the United States. That is what is involved in this debate.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Parliament of Canada tonight must now join France, Britain, Sweden, Venezuela, Mexico, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic and many other States in making it unequivocally clear that we condemn this invasion.

● (2030)

On the opening day of this session of Parliament, Mr. Speaker, an extremely serious debate took place in this House. On that occasion, as was the case today, I moved a motion under the provisions of our Standing Orders calling for an emergency debate. I did so because the Government of the Soviet Union, through whatever series of events, and in one sense it matters not, got involved in a decision that took the lives of 259 civilians. All of us in this House representing all Parties condemned that action, and correctly so. We did not hesitate when we thought through all of the important intricacies involved, and there were many, and in the final analysis said that was a morally wrong thing to do.

As I said the other day, most actions in politics, whether domestic or international, cannot be reduced to the simplicities of black and white. Most political issues are complex and involve very weighty and practical moral judgments. Occasionally you get clear-cut issues when you look honestly at the evidence. We did that, Mr. Speaker, on the opening day when it came to the shooting down of a Korean civilian aircraft. I suggest we are in exactly the same situation today regarding the clarity of the issues involved. We do not have an issue which is clouded by ambiguity. Anyone who wants to see the facts and see them honestly, I suggest, can only reach one conclusion.

In this sense, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a test for Parliament, a test of the integrity of the Members of Parliament of all Parties, to see if they can apply the same moral standard to that great democracy to the south of us when it acts wrongly, as we did in applying standards and judgments to the Soviet Union when it acted wrongly.

Therefore I would like to propose we resolve this debate by coming together on a motion today, as we did on the opening day of this session. I would like to propose that motion, and I would hope that after consideration it could obtain the support of all three of Canada's political Parties in this House. It is:

This House supports the judgment of the Secretary of the Commonwealth—

That is our Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker:

—who just recently described the invasion of Grenada as:

"A deplorable act of blatant aggression."

In the name of decency, Mr. Speaker, in the name of a fundamental commitment to democracy, in the name of a commitment to the principles of non-violence in relations amongst the nations of the world, I urge all Members of the House to support that motion.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was able to make a short statement on this matter yesterday, but considering the short amount of time allowed for that type of statement I was not able to complete my remarks. Therefore, I would like to very briefly make those same points again tonight.

I pointed out how deeply shocked I and many other Canadians were two weeks ago when the bloody *coup d'état* took place in Grenada, and how many of us would have supported reasonable international solutions to the problem which had arisen there. But we could in no way approve of the U.S. invasion of that small island which took place earlier this week. There is no doubt in my mind that that invasion, as was said by the previous speaker, is a clear violation of international law, the United Nations Charter, and in effect constituted an act of war against Grenada by the United States. If that action was merely to protect and evacuate United States citizens after other less severe alternatives had been examined, then there could be some justification for the attack. But there has been absolutely no evidence thus far that that was the case.

The other reason given by the United States Government for its action was to restore democracy or protect democratic institutions. I said that was a noble intention but very difficult to believe, Mr. Speaker, since many of the governments supported by the United States in Central America, the Caribbean and Latin America are military dictatorships. I referred to the example of Chile where there was a democratically elected government which was undermined by the United States Government and replaced by military dictatorship, and we see no signs of an invasion by the U.S. against that Government. Many other examples could be given as well.

Nor is it enough to argue that this action was necessary because of the bloody coup d'état which occurred a few weeks before. Do we forget, or do Americans forget that their very beginnings were born in bloody military revolution in 1776 when Americans took up arms in rebellion against the British?

Would it have been tolerated in principle by the Americans that there would have been intervention by, let us say, the monarchies of Europe at that time? Not at all, Mr. Speaker. That is not a legitimate excuse.

The United States action in Grenada must be condemned not only because it is a violation of international law, but also because it sets an example. It allows that a large powerful nation can invade a smaller, weaker nation, if it does not approve of its system or structure of Government, or even if it does not approve of political developments in that country. How was this any different than the reasoning given by the Soviets for intervening in Poland and Afghanistan or the actions of Libya in Chad or the Cubans in Angola?

If we do not condemn the United States in this case, Mr. Speaker, how can we ever with any sincerity, with a straight face, condemn others who would do likewise again? What hypocrisy. If the United States can flout the principle of national sovereignty when it thinks it is appropriate to do so, then so can anyone else. Some will say those others have already done so, so why not the United States? Well, we expect more from the United States. In the U.S. there is freedom to criticize, there are freely elected governments, and there is a constitution based on very high principles. We do not expect the United States to act like the Soviet Union. We expect much more than that from the United States. We expect the United States to respect principle in international relations. Once we dispense with that principle, then we accept that might is right in international relations and that smaller nations must submit to the large powerful nations. World law and world institutions then become meaningless.

● (2040)

It is encouraging, Mr. Speaker, that many countries see this situation in much the same way. Many NATO countries and allies of the United States have criticized and objected to the action taken by the United States. The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) has mentioned some of those countries which include Britain, France, Italy, Greece, Denmark and Sweden.

Another very sad commentary on this whole incident is the lack of consultation by the United States with its allies. It told some of its allies almost at the last minute what it was about to do, and it told others a few days before, but in such terms that what it was about to do could not really be understood. The United States certainly had no clear and straightforward consultations with the allies it relies upon in so many other ways in international relations.

The House and the people of Canada must certainly reject the puppet policy statement which was made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) in the House the day this incident occurred. The Leader of the Opposition was urging the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to jump on the bandwagon of the United States immediately, even before the facts were established. In responding to the Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister said at the time that he was not ready to condemn or condone the American action because he did not yet have the facts. The next day, which I believe was yesterday, the chief spokesman for the Conservative Party criticized the Prime Minister for taking the whole matter a step forward and delivering a note to the United States. He said that the Government was acting too quickly because it needed more facts and more information before it could make any statement. One wonders who really speaks for the Conservative Party on these matters.

An Hon. Member: Do you speak for the Government?

Mr. Allmand: I am touching upon sensitive nerves now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mazankowski: You're being silly.

Mr. Allmand: Canadians are asking the same question. As a matter of fact, I have received many calls today which have put that very point to me. It is very evident, Mr. Speaker, that there is a fuzzy approach on that side with respect to this whole matter. Their position would be amusing if it was not so lamentable and if the issue was not so important.

This invasion, Mr. Speaker, must be condemned. That type of action repeats all of the errors found throughout history which have led to all-out war. A small invasion here or a small incursion there are the kinds of sparks that set aflame the tinderbox of war on a worldwide scale. Countries like the United States and the Soviet Union should realize that fact, especially in an age when there are enough atomic and nuclear weapons in the hands of both sides to wipe out mankind entirely. One might call this incident in the Caribbean small, but it can be the sort of incident which can lead to much more horrible catastrophes.

After the terrible conflicts of World War II, the United Nations was established and it was established on great principles. As was mentioned, we celebrated its anniversary on Monday of this week. Although it has had its faults, and we admit that it has, it offers a much better way of resolving disputes than unilateral military action. As Churchill once said, better jaw-jaw than war-war.

Peace requires patience and wisdom, not a hasty military action like that which took place in Grenada by the United States. In particular, peace does not require actions taken by the powerful against the weak.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, a moment or two ago, the Government Whip asked me if I would defer my speech until after the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) had spoken in order to allow the Minister to speak second. That apparently will not happen, otherwise I would be following the Minister.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister was invited outside by the CBC to do a television show at 9.45 p.m.

An Hon. Member: The CBC is more important. Where are his priorities?

S.O. 30

Mr. Nielsen: As my colleagues have said, that is an indication of the priorities of the Minister.

Mr. Waddell: Where is your Leader and foreign affairs spokesman then? Where are their priorities?

Mr. Nielsen: For the enlightement of the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), I will be addressing the question of where the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) is. If the Hon. Member will recall the events today, it was after the Leader left the House to meet a commitment in the riding of the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens), our foreign affairs critic, that the Leader of the New Democratic Party came to me and sought consent for this debate. I believe I even went beyond what he asked me by consenting to the emergency debate tonight. However, that occurred after both the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and our critic had left the House. They are unavoidably absent this evening.

Mr. Prud'homme: That's the same thing. We know where their priorities are.

Mr. Gimaïel: Where are their priorities?

Mr. Nielsen: I do not think the Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaïel), who would countenance any position including the adoption of communistic stances in order to retain the Liberal Party in power, should be heard to be intervening at this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gimaïel: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaïel) on a point of order.

Mr. Gimaïel: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it clear to the Opposition House Leader that my Party is the Liberal Party, not the Communist Party as he is insinuating.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Chair would appeal to Hon. Members. If we spoke to the motion that is now before the House, it would help matters greatly. The Hon. Member for Yukon has the floor.

Mr. Nielsen: In any event, I have explained the absence of the Leader and the critic.

Before embarking upon my remarks, I would like to say that I was affected by some of the remarks made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party tonight. I find that I have to reject absolutely the principle espoused by the Leader of the New Democratic Party that at no time is an intervention to prevent the takeover of a country by a tyrant ever justified. I say that to him sincerely because I have had personal experience of what acts of war are all about.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: In answer to the groans on the other side, I have been there.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: I have seen countries like Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Denmark, Norway, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Greece and Africa succumb to that kind of action by states. There is a point—

Mr. Broadbent: They were attacked by another state.

Mr. Nielsen: Peace in our time. Since that time, I have seen the acts that were committed by Russia and Hungary and Czechoslovakia in Poland, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, so there are occasions when the justification is there.

Mr. Broadbent: What about the U.S. in Guatemala and Haiti?

• (2050)

Mr. Nielsen: Surely it is premature to come to any final conclusion when all of the facts are not in. Surely it is premature to form any final judgment on the actions that we are discussing tonight.

Mr. Nystrom: Terrible. Ask Margaret Thatcher.

Mr. Nielsen: Canada has a long history of involvement with the Caribbean countries—

Some Hon. Members: Ask Margaret Thatcher.

Mr. Andre: He listened to you.

Mr. Nielsen: —from the days when Nova Scotian two-masters carried Canadian fish and other products to the Islands, up to the present when Canadian investment in the Caribbean runs to hundreds of millions of dollars in both the public and private sector. It has been a history of trade and friendship based on mutual respect for parliamentary government in the Caribbean countries of the Commonwealth, as in Canada. On many grounds, Canada has a direct and positive interest in the welfare and stability of the Caribbean Commonwealth countries.

It must be kept in mind that the current action in Grenada was initiated by the countries of the Eastern Caribbean at the request of the Governor General of Grenada and carried out with their co-operation. In the interests of lending co-operation to our neighbours in a time of stress and difficulty, it is imperative that the Government of Canada be on top of the situation, fully informed of developments, take part in the consultations that are going on and show initiative in meeting the serious problems that are developing and which is aware are developing. Unfortunately, there is little indication that this was the attitude of the Canadian Government.

The Liberal and the NDP Parties, together once again, are trying to narrow the issue to the landing of the United States troops in Grenada along with troops of six Caribbean countries. Implicit in this narrow view is that no guilt shall attach

to those responsible for shooting down the Prime Minister and four of his Cabinet along with dozens of innocent people. In my judgment, that is not the view that will be taken by most Canadians. This view of the NDP and the Liberals totally discounts the right of the people of Grenada to freedom of choice.

Of concern to Canadians is whether a Caribbean country, member of the Commonwealth, should be turned over to the Cubans and Soviets against the wishes of its people. Premier Castro has admitted to the presence of 600 or 700 armed Cubans in Grenada. They virtually controlled the country. By no stretch of the imagination can this be made to appear as any shining example of democracy.

The Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) position would have resulted in this state of affairs continuing. It would have allowed the Soviets and Cubans to strengthen their grip on the Island. It would have perpetuated a situation where Grenadians had no rights in their own country. It would have sanctioned and approved instability and fear in the region. It appears that the Canadian Government was so anxious to maintain a hands-off attitude that no attention was paid.

We believe the Grenadians, with their tradition of Commonwealth membership, have the same right to free elections as any other country in the Commonwealth. The Government turned its back on the Caribbean situation and it was perfectly obvious that this was its attitude. This is one reason why it was neither advised nor consulted about the multinational force until the very last minute. We are now informed reluctantly by the Prime Minister that Canadian officials did in fact meet with the Caribbean leaders, including Premier Adams of Barbados, as early as last Friday at which time the possibility of intervention was mentioned.

The Government has made much of the fact that Britain has taken the same position as Canada. Even if this were so—and there are essential differences—it must be noted that Britain's situation is not in any way similar to Canada's. The Caribbean Commonwealth countries are former British colonies. Britain does not relish the liberation of a former colony by the United States.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: That was made clear. We do not consider this to be a laughing matter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Waddell: You are making it such. You are absurd.

Mr. Nielsen: If they had read the debates in the British House of Commons, that was made clear. Britain did not have troops available in the immediate area.

The Prime Minister and the Government have rejected the intervention to restore calm and public order in Grenada.

President Reagan and Secretary Shultz have promised the removal of American marines and the holding of elections within a reasonable period after order has been restored. The Governor General of Grenada will be asked to form a provisional government to act in the interim.

The United States moved in only after a request was received from the chairperson of the Organization of States in the Eastern Caribbean. These States are bound by mutual defence agreements. It should also be noted that the Eastern Caribbean States were asked for help by the Governor General of Grenada, Paul Scoon.

Tom Adams, the Prime Minister of Barbados; Edward Seaga, Prime Minister of Jamaica; Eugenia Charles, Prime Minister of Dominica, who is also chairman of the Organization of the Eastern Caribbean States, were among those who requested intervention.

Great Britain was approached and expressed doubts about armed intervention. Canada was not formally approached or consulted until a few hours before the intervention took place.

Canada has strong interests in the Caribbean. Only last February in St. Lucia, the Prime Minister committed this country to investing some $350 million in Caribbean aid. Private Canadian investment runs into hundreds of millions of dollars and of course, thousands of Canadians use the Caribbean for recreational purposes. There are many thousands of Canadians of Caribbean origin who are now making a substantial contribution in this country.

In a situation of murder and wholesale killing, the Prime Minister and three on his Cabinet shot down in Grenada, a strong Cuban military presence involving a threat to stability of the Caribbean community, the Canadian Government appeared totally unconcerned. It was caught flatfooted by events and now it is saying that it is all President Reagan's fault. Day after day, we asked questions about the Government's intentions and got no answers. Because the present Government does not have the confidence of its allies and partners, Canada was not consulted and advised about what was going to be taking place. The Government adopted its usual non-aligned posture, even to the point of not inviting consultation. Under the existing circumstances, this amounted to giving a green light to those who murdered the chief officers of the government as well as many others.

A Canadian Government with a realistic concern for Canadian interests would have taken steps to inform itself about what was going on. It would have consulted our allies and would have been in a position to offer advice and assistance. The simple fact is that we failed to live up to our responsibilities in that area. We emerged as an untrustworthy partner, one that could not be trusted to keep a secret. The Government was not informed. It was not even interested.

● (2100)

Canadians, Sir, were placed in jeopardy by the Government's lethargy and by the Government's failure to act. As a result Canada's standing in the Caribbean has diminished considerably. All of the wriggling and squirming that has been going on by the Prime Minister and his singularly ill-informed "minister of fate" cannot change those facts. Once again, this Government has let down Canada most deplorably.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

S.O. 30

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Mr. Speaker, the subject matter that has been brought before the House in this emergency debate is one of great importance and is of considerable gravity. It involves a circumstance, indeed a series of circumstances that are alien to what we have been accustomed to for the most part in this hemisphere. I would want to agree with the previous speakers to the extent that the matter is grave, but note that there is a very sharp divergence of opinion between the positions taken by the New Democratic Party, as very articulately expressed by its Leader, and the position taken by the Conservative Party.

I want to begin with something that I consider to be very important. The safety of Canadian citizens who, for one reason or another, found themselves in Grenada at the time of these happenings must be and is my prime responsibility and concern. Since the beginning of the weekend, the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin) and I have laboured constantly, often with considerable frustration, to extricate our citizens from the position in which they find themselves in Grenada. In relation to those efforts, I want to say that they have led to many difficulties and much frustration for many worthy foreign service officers. I want to pay tribute to officials at External Affairs here in Ottawa, Washington and in Barbados who, with little sleep, have sought to find their way through the web of military confusion that exists in Grenada in relation to helping our people leave the island.

I want to say also that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), who is on a very important mission in the Middle East, has stayed in contact with the situation through reports on numerous occasions each day.

The military actions I have referred to, of course, make it very difficult to communicate with Grenada because the American occupied zone is under a military commander who has priorities other than civilian traffic. There are many contradictions. We have received incorrect information on a number of occasions, and indeed to the best of the information that we can discern there is a considerable amount of scattered fighting that is still going on in areas of the island that are by no means safe.

There is no question that under such circumstances the military authorities have priorities and have their preoccupations. I believe all of those have conspired against us. I am able to report to you, Mr. Speaker, that our latest indications are that all Canadians known to be on the island are safe.

Mr. Forrestall: How about the others?

Mr. Regan: We have no indication or reason to believe that they are in any imminent danger.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Regan: We have confirmation that two Canadians have been airlifted to the United States, to South Carolina, but we are uncertain as to the exact time at which other Canadians will be able to leave the island.

We have a Canadian Armed Forces Hercules at Barbados. That aircraft has sought for the past 24 hours—longer than that, quite a few hours since the invasion—permission to land in Grenada. First we had another aircraft in mind but this one has been available to go in. We sought and finally during the night obtained permission for that aircraft to fly in today to bring out the Canadians. The aircraft finally received a time this afternoon, flew to Grenada, circled, but was unable to land. I can only report that probably for understandable reasons relating to the military operations, there is a state of high confusion in the operation of the airfield on Grenada. The aircraft was forced to return to Barbados without any passengers. We are in contact with a high source in Washington indicating our grave concern in this matter. We are confident that the Canadians who are still on the island will be airlifted from there tomorrow.

I want to say that the information that we have from the American sources indicates that Canadians had assembled and have assembled in the area of the airport, but we are unable to get any confirmation of earlier reports that a great number of them have been brought out on American aircraft.

I would like to review briefly the past events on Grenada which began to unfold from October 14. The position of this Government was that we were concerned about the political orientation of Grenada under the late Prime Minister Bishop since the coup of 1979 which overthrew the unpopular Government of Sir Eric Gairy. However, Canadian relations were maintained. There was dialogue. There was contact. Our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) asserted the rights of countries to determine their own internal affairs, as long as they did not meddle abroad, at the St. Lucia Commonwealth heads of Government meeting in February. I want to say that we adhere to that belief. I think that there can be only the growth of uncertainty and grave danger for peace if we all assume the idea that, because a country has a government of a type of which we do not approve, there is the right for military intervention to change that type of government.

If I may move on, there was shock and dismay at the brutal assassination of Prime Minister Bishop and his many political colleagues and supporters. The situation from the Canadian point of view was monitored as closely as possible, particularly in relation to the safety of Canadians, by the first secretary of the Canadian High Commission, Joe Knockaert, who was in Grenada on aid business. He, with the help of members of CIDA co-operants, expecially Allan Bodey, established contact with as many Canadians as possible with a view to calming them and making possible evacuation arrangements. Those events were made extremely difficult by the rigid "shoot-on-sight" curfew. Nevertheless, the contacts were carried out in safety.

• (2110)

It was not possible to carry out an evacuation of the Canadians as early as we might have desired last weekend because the airport was closed for a period of time during the disorder and confusion as to who was in charge on the island.

However, Mr. Knockaert worked out a plan for the evacuation of the Canadians, starting on Friday, October 21, with the existing authorities in Grenada. They again contacted the Canadians to determine who wished to leave, and a charter aircraft was arranged to come to Grenada to pick up the Canadians and a number of other foreign nationals on Monday, October 24. The High Commissioner in Barbados made arrangements for a 48-seat aircarft.

Members will be at least partly familiar with the difficulties experienced with clearance of this aircraft because of the fact that it was one of an airline owned by a number of countries in the Caribbean area and that at the last moment, after permission had been given by Prime Minister Tom Adams of Barbados, other countries objected to it going into Grenada. By the time the confusion in the communications with those far-flung islands was overcome by the helpful intervention of Prime Minister Charles of Dominica and the work of our High Commissioner, Mr. Noble Power, it was too late in the day for the aircraft to fly into Grenada on Monday. As Members of the House know, the invasion occurred early the next morning, and that made evacuation impossible from that time up until the present moment.

In dealing with the events of last weekend, may I say that on Friday, October 21, consultations were initiated with the Commonwealth heads of Government by all four Canadian High Commissioners in the region. These consultations preceded meetings of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States late October 21 and October 22 in Barbados and of the Caricom heads of Government in Port-of-Spain on October 22 and October 23. At the time of these consultations on October 21, while some Caribbean States spoke of the possibility of physical intervention, none indicated any planning that was under way of a firm nature, and there was no indication that United States involvement was contemplated. I might say that at that time some of the Caricom states strongly opposed any idea of military intervention. The result is that they were not consulted further by those who eventually became involved in the invasion.

Also Hon. Members are familiar with the timing of the military intervention. At this point I want to say that after it occurred, when I instructed our High Commissioners in Jamaica and Barbados to contact Prime Ministers Adams and Seaga, they both expressed deep concern that Canada was not consulted. At least one of them spoke on the telephone with our Prime Minister. They indicated—and we have learned it from other sources—that Prime Minister Charles of Dominica had intended to explain the OECS position to the Canadian Government. She said this on television. Apparently it did not happen because of the rapid and dramatic resolution of events.

There was an extremely serious situation in Grenada, a situation of disorder, chaos and violence which caused consternation in adjacent countries and beyond. It was the type of situation which could have endangered the lives of foreign nationals as well as Grenadian citizens. I would be quick to grant that there were many who felt that something had to be done with that existing vacuum.

The principal questions with which we are all deeply concerned, whatever may be our views in the different corners of this House, are whether the action taken was justified and all other possible solutions of a less dangerous nature had been adequately examined. I hark back to the words of the Leader of the New Democratic Party because whatever the views of any Member, I do not think it is possible to find anyone in the House who disagrees with his description of the horror of war and what it does to young making, sometimes to young womankind, and so often these days to civilians. Only when the situation in Grenada has clarified will we know exactly what sufferings may have occurred there as a consequence of the course that was taken.

We understand the concern of other countries and the concern of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. War is terrible and, what is more, war is contagious. When it is seen that military intervention, no matter how noble the purpose may seem to be in one case, can occur in one location, there may be incentive for other countries under provocation to take that action with less justifiable motives.

We believe that wider consultations should have taken place before this action of military intervention occurred. We believe that it might have been possible—who can know now?—to have found a solution to the existing situation which would not involve the shedding of blood of young people, indeed of anyone.

Sir Geoffrey Howe said in the British House of Commons yesterday:

> The United States took one view, the United Kingdom took another. It is no more for me to condemn them than it is for them to condemn us.

The Canadian position has been remarkably similar. We have said that we deeply regret that the Americans found it necessary to take that action. We regret in particular the lack of consultation. Another aspect of our position which needs to be remembered is that we have constantly said that if there is justification, the Americans have not presented it yet. There may be justification of which we do not know. I can only say that President Reagan did not present any new material justifications in his remarks tonight on television.

Mr. Broadbent: We will have to wait a long time for them.

Mr. Regan: I wonder, as we ponder this difficult problem, whether the position of the Opposition Parties might be somewhat different if they had at this moment the responsibility of office.

Again I say that we regret Canada was not consulted. We clearly were not. At seven o'clock on the eve of the invasion we were told by an undersecretary to our Ambassador in Washington, rather than a contact on a Minister to Minister or Chief of State basis, that some sort of rescue operation was under consideration and that possibly it might be of a military type. We were told that these options had to be presented to the President and that other options included an action by the Eastern Caribbean States alone. That hardly was consultation or information that an invasion would take place within hours.

Indeed, the forces of that invasion must have already been in motion.

● (2120)

Mr. Lawrence: Why did you think they did not tell you?

Mr. Regan: The Hon. Member asks why I think they did not tell us. They did not tell us for similar reasons they did not tell Mexico, or Trinidad which had also indicated its opposition to the action, and for the same reason that they did not adequately tell Great Britain or any of the other countries. Apparently they consulted only the countries that indicated in earlier meetings that they were in favour of a military invasion. They did not consult with Canada because they felt that the doubts that have been expressed in this House, and indeed the doubts that exist in the minds of many Members of the Conservative Party, would have been reflected in the advice we would have given.

Mr. Beatty: Because they did not trust you.

Mr. Regan: The Hon. Member says they did not trust us. I say to him through you, Mr. Speaker, that I would not want anyone to trust me to give a blanket endorsement of an invasion in which people were going to be killed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. I wonder if the Minister of State for International Trade might care to seek the unanimous consent of the House to continue his remarks. At the moment his time has expired.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I gather there is unanimous consent.

Mr. Regan: I am indebted to Hon. Members for allowing me the time. We believed there was an unseeming hurry to follow the course that carried hazards for civilians, including our civilians, which created an unfortunate precedent for other countries whose motives may be most worthy. I want to make it quite clear; I want no mistake about it: I admire the great republic to our south. I admire the United States and I value the friendship of the United States. But as a Canadian, I am not prepared to endorse automatically every action that they take regardless of an examination of its merit.

Since the invasion there seems to be a situation in which the understanding by the American authorities—and they chose this course to the extent of military opposition—appears to have been followed. It would appear that their intelligence indicated a much easier situation than occurred. But, of course, it is the sort of danger that comes with military intervention because intelligence can often be faulty. In that case the sacrifice or the loss can be greater than anticipated.

There are many aspects of this web that could be examined, but I am now trespassing on the time of the House. Rather than review in any more detail the motivation or the situation that has existed, I want to deal with the reality of the fact that an invasion has occurred, or a military intervention; the word "invasion" has been used by the American authorities. I want to say that the most useful thing this House can do is to direct its attention toward efforts that may help to restore peace and self-determination for the people of Grenada.

We look to the future. The Prime Minister stated in the House this afternoon that no direct request has been made to us by the Secretary General of the Commonwealth to participate in a Commonwealth peace-keeping force, but that Secretary General Ramphal had made general suggestions along these lines publicly and to Commonwealth members. The Prime Minister indicated that he has been attempting to communicate with certain Commonwealth leaders to explore the same type of idea. As Hon. Members will recall, during Question Period today he indicated he spoke by telephone to Prime Minister Thatcher of Great Britain on this and other related subjects.

If an election is to take place after the hostilities cease and the invading troops leave Grenada, quite presumably some kind of Commonwealth force will be required, the Prime Minister stated. He offered, subject to the approval of Cabinet, to participate in such an observation of an election. He further said that if hostilities are prolonged, he would even go further and suggest that we could call for a truce, ask all foreign nationals to leave and then the Commonwealth could send in an observer force to ensure that the peace is respected. This may be a direction in which Canada can be helpful.

Governor General Scoon is the continuing link with legitimacy on the island of Grenada. That is the case whether he asked for outside intervention or not, and there is considerable controversy and doubt on that question at this hour. However, the Governor General is the representative of Her Majesty the Queen in a Commonwealth country and has a legitimate position. Since 1979, no other authorities have been popularly elected on that island, although there apparently was widespread support for the Bishop Government.

Subsequent to the Question Period today, I have spoken to the Secretary General of the Commonwealth, Mr. Ramphal, by telephone. I told him on behalf of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) that we endorse his comments in relation to a role for the Commonwealth, as Grenada is a Commonwealth country and Canada is the senior Commonwealth member in this hemisphere. I conveyed to Mr. Ramphal our support and our willingness to participate in any peace force that the Commonwealth should establish to be helpful in Grenada.

I further indicated that the Canadian Government would be willing to assist in consultations with other Commonwealth countries, if that should be considered by the Secretary General to be helpful. After thanking me for our reaction, he undertook to be in further contact with us within the next few hours.

It is difficult at this point in time to know exactly what will evolve in the coming days. Indeed, the Americans, who are militarily in the island, will obviously have a point of view. We believe, however, that the sooner a healthy determination by the people of Grenada can freely take place the better, and

there may well be an opportunity and an appropriate role for the Commonwealth.

In participating in this debate tonight, I recognize the seriousness of the situation as justifying the existence of an emergency debate in the House. I commend those Hon. Members, whatever their views, who contributed to an examination of this serious situation and I express my conviction that there may well be a role for the Commonwealth in re-establishing peace and self-determination in Grenada.

• (2130)

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I intend to raise a number of questions and to make some points about this dreadfully serious matter. I will start by making the point that I wish I were as certain about anything in this whole matter as the Leader of the NDP seems to be certain about every aspect of it.

I would remind the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan) that, contrary to his expressed view that it is the Cabinet that should decide whether Canada participates in a Commonwealth force, in fact it is the House that should decide that question. I should have thought that he would respect the privilege of the House in making his points on that matter a few moments ago.

A number of people have asked where this Party stands on the Grenadian question. Consistent with remarks made by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) I would point out that this Party as of now is of the view that it is too early to make a definitive decision on this matter. We do not propose to prejudge what happened in Grenada in the last couple of days. We do not know what happened on the days when those murders occurred, or we do not fully know. We are asking the Canadian people to reserve judgment on the matter until we have some answers, as I expect we will have shortly.

Let us see what results from talking to people like the Governor General, Paul Scoon, before Canadians and this Party decide what is in the best interests of Canada in this matter. Let us neither condemn nor congratulate anyone with respect to this; let us wait a little and see what the facts are.

The motion standing in the name of the Leader of the New Democratic Party makes a number of statements. I would take issue with the motion when it states that Grenada is "an independent member of the Commonwealth whose Queen is also the Queen of Canada". I would remind them that the regime of Maurice Bishop suspended the Grenadian constitution in 1979, that a week or so ago General Austin put Governor General Paul Scoon under house arrest, and that the United States only dared to reveal that it was he who had called for aid after he was safely out of the country. I agree with the Minister of State for International Trade that at the moment the Governor General would appear to be the most legitimate focus of government in the country.

I regret that the New Democratic Party has condemned the United States tonight without hesitation after 14 days of silence about the position of Canadians on the island of Grenada.

I gather that the Liberals are disappointed that they were not consulted about the matter. The United Kingdom was consulted, Friday, Saturday and Monday, I understand, but Canada was not told until the helicopters were in the air or landing on Grenada.

One of the aspects of this matter that is so serious to me is that the Caribbean states involved thought so little of Canada that they did not even consult us. As I understand it, none of them consulted Canada to see what advice we could give.

As a Member of the Party that I believe will form the Government of this country within a year or so, I also regret that the Department of External Affairs was so little aware of what was happening in and around Grenada that it did not apprise the Government, as I understand it, of events until the time of the invasion.

And last, Mr. Speaker, our best ally and friend, our major trading partner and one of the two countries with which we share this continent, did not trust us with information and did not consult us, as we were entitled to be consulted. I hope if something like this happens in the future we will be consulted. It seems to me that the Canadian Government has suffered a rebuff from the Caribbean States and the United States and from everyone involved in the tragedy that has occurred in an area where we used to think we had some influence and prestige.

I should like to refer to a note that I made last night of what the Minister of State for International Trade said on the CBC television program "The Journal". He said that his Government is unable to see any justification for this. I think that represents an overly broad generalization but we must wait to see whether it is borne out by the facts.

At this point may I give a perspective I obtained today from a member of the East Caribbean community. It is his view of what has gone on in Grenada. I do not want to reveal his name because I do not think it would be fair to mention it in this Chamber. He made the point that he, as a member of an East Caribbean country, thought that bulldozers, etc., were the stock in trade of people who were building airport runways. We heard tonight from President Reagan that a warehouse was found to be full of weapons and that there were 600 seemingly well trained Cuban construction workers and 30 military advisers on the island. My source from the Caribbean asked what the true intentions of Cuba were in building this runway and pointed out that 600 armed men could overrun any of the member states of the Organization of East Caribbean States.

The gentleman I refer to also expressed to me his profound concern about what 600 armed people could do in that region of the world. He reminded me that about a year ago a plot was uncovered in the City of Toronto of a coup to be undertaken against Dominica. That coup was fortunately stopped. He pointed out that 100 armed men could probably seize and take control of Dominica. He pointed out that those six States, three of which have no army at all, are terribly vulnerable to an armed takeover. That is why he and many other people

were so concerned about what was going on in Grenada at the time.

I should like to turn now to the statement of Prime Minister Eugenia Charles of Dominica, who was trained as a lawyer in the City of Toronto. Her statement to the OECS Permanent Council on October 26 is quite lengthy so I shall only refer to a few points that she made. She said:

> Member governments considered that the subsequent imposition of a draconian 96 hour curfew by the military group in control was intended to allow them to further suppress the population of Grenada which had shown by numerous demonstrations their hostility to this group.

Then she said:

> Member governments have also been greatly concerned that the extensive military build-up in Grenada over the last few years had created a situation of disproportionate military strength between Grenada and other OECS countries. This military might in the hands of the present group has posed a serious threat to the security of the OECS countries and other neighbouring states.

She went on to say, and I will paraphrase it, that the military group in control under General Austin was going to consolidate the position of the regime and that the country could be used as a staging post for acts of aggression against its members. Then, referring to Grenada, she said:

> —a level of sophistication and size far beyond the internal needs of that country. Furthermore the member states of the OECS have no means of defence against such forces.

● (2140)

As Hon. Members here will know, she went on to cite Article XVIII of the Caribbean Treaty establishing the OECS, which is concerned with defence and security and indicates that members can take appropriate action.

I will raise a completely different point at this time, and that is the question of Canadians who have been taken today by American Hercules planes to North Carolina. I would put it to the Government, Mr. Speaker, that if its expressed desire that only Canadian planes should take Canadians out of Grenada had endangered the lives of those people, the Canadian people will never forgive this Government. I feel sure that when the facts come out there will be many people who will be interested in knowing whether Americans were removed from the Ross Point Inn more quickly than the Canadians who were gathered there. Given the fact that the United States offered to take Canadians out on an equal priority basis with Americans, if our Government, out of a perverted sense of national pride, kept those Canadians waiting in that hotel while Americans staying in the same hotel or nearby were removed safely, then I submit this Government will hear a lot about this during its remaining life in office. That is one of the matters which will come out in the days ahead. For the sake of those 40 innocent Canadians, I pray that this Government did not put its petty nationalism ahead of their lives and safety.

I next ask the question, why is it that Barbadian Prime Minister Tom Adams gave a speech on television last night indicating that Canada had been advised of the planned invasion of Grenada? This certainly would appear to me to contradict the statements made by the Government here in Ottawa. I would hope that that matter would be clarified in the days ahead as well.

On the question of consultation on the possible invasion, when did the Government of Canada first realize that this invasion was taking place? Was it really when the helicopters were in the air, or was it earlier? Canadians are entitled to know that, Mr. Speaker. What was it the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was getting at today when he told us that someone from the Caribbean was supposed to phone the Canadian Government to tell it what was going on, but forgot to do so? I feel that is something Canadians are entitled to know about as well. Why, for that matter, was not the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) recalled from the Middle East to try to deal with the question? He has good relations, I gather, with Secretary of State Schultz. One would wonder as a Canadian why he was not back here to deal with that important question which arose some time ago.

I ask again, Sir, why it was that after the execution of Mr. Bishop our Government did not more actively pursue the question of evacuating the men and women from Canada who were there? Was every avenue of escape investigated? Or were only avenues which involved the use of Canadian aircraft discussed? Why was it that the Canadian Government was reluctant to accept the American offer to evacuate the Canadians? When did the United States make that offer? For that matter, I do not beleive the Canadian Government has ever indicated how many Canadians are on Grenada and I would like to know why it does not know. Were the lives of Canadians placed in danger by the policies of the Canadian Government on the matter? That is something again that Canadians would like to know.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the all important question of the future. Will the Canadian Government really participate in the Commonwealth peacekeeping force? Will it take an active role in creating a new government which is broadly representative of Grenadian society? Will it give this House a chance to debate the nature and quality of such representation?

These are some of the questions which occur to me, and there are many more which may occur to other Hon. Members. I wish I were as certain about these matters as the Leader of the New Democratic Party. However, I believe that in fairness to our allies we owe it to them not to prejudge, not to decide prematurely that the United States in guilty of this or that. I believe that none of us should be making rash statements such as those made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party or the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand). We should all wait a little and act in fairness and goodwill to all parties involved in this matter. Then, and only then, should we be making categorical statements.

Mr. Pierre Gimaïel (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, I want to take the first few moments of my speech to come back to what the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) said when he referred to a speech I made in this House about two years ago. I speak in English because I want to address myself to the

people who have been subjected to the propaganda of the Progressive Conservative Party in the last months. I know that the Tories took out of context a portion of a previous speech I made two years ago. It was possibly one of the most humane speeches delivered in this assembly for many years, and that Party used it to make the Canadian people believe that the Liberals are Communists and that I myself am a Communist.

I want to tell the Hon. Member for Yukon—and the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) knows it quite well—that Communist armaments killed over 100,000 people in Lebanon, the country of my ancestors, in the past seven years. Why is he then trying to use a speech in which I was simply saying to the Canadian people that sharing is the future of our country and the future of our world to make the Canadian people believe that here on this side of the House we are Communists when we are not at all?

The Hon. Member and his colleagues, including the Hon. Member for Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney), from what they have shown in the last few days, are those kinds of people who are driving our world into the way of intolerance, which is resulting in actions like the ones which are occurring now in Lebanon, Afghanistan and, for a few days, in Grenada.

I said this in English, Mr. Speaker, because I wanted to make sure—although my English is not as good as I would wish—that people in Provinces and in areas other than mine will understand that Communism and goodwill are not the same thing.

[*Translation*]

To get back to today's debate, Mr. Speaker, Canada's position to date on the events in Grenada is in line with similar positions it has taken in the past, arising from the basic respect any political party and government must show other governments, whatever their allegiance may be.

Mr. Speaker, this last weekend was supposed to be a celebration of disarmament, but instead of showing us brotherly love, it showed us the horror of what happened in Lebanon, where young American and French soldiers who were there in a peace-keeping capacity were brutally murdered. It showed us how a small country called Grenada was ruthlessly invaded.

Mr. Speaker, the past prepares the future, and I remember a similar invasion that took place about seven years ago at the request of the government of the country that was being invaded. Seven years ago, the Syrians marched into Lebanon, at the request of the Lebanese Government. At the time, none of the Western or Eastern countries voiced any objections. Today, seven years later, the Syrians are still there. Syrian cannon and arms have thundered for months over the heads of anything that moved in Lebanon, whether Palestinians, Lebanese or others, and even more forces joined them. All this because countries throughout the world chose to ignore that act of aggression, the massive invasion of a foreign country.

• (2150)

When we refer to disarmanent, we generally mean nuclear arms and everyone knows about the nuclear arms race. A lot of people accept it alleging that, strategically, if both sides have nuclear arms, there is no danger of war. However there is another basic aspect to that famous theory which is aimed at deterring a possible enemy, and it is that in addition to having nuclear arms, both sides must show that they fully intend to use them. That is what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, because this is exactly what is going on. Both the Soviets and the Americans are now vying to show up to what length they are ready to go in their military operations. Everything began with Afghanistan. Let us see what occurred afterwards in the Middle East. Look at what happened afterwards in the Middle East. We are now speaking about events occurring very near our own country, in Central America, and the Official Opposition is asking us to endorse such an action, to endorse an aggression which can lead to a nuclear tragedy. We will not, I believe that it is too much to ask, Mr. Speaker. I believe that world leaders have to rise and say: The frontiers of any existing country, whatever it may be, have to be respected. Shall we continue, Mr. Speaker, to accept that the wars of other people be waged in countries which have neither the power, nor the will, nor the capacity to defend themselves, such as Lebanon? Are we going to tolerate such an action, even if we are a free country aligned behind the United States, a country which is proud and which plays a role in NATO, a country which is a member of NORAD, and proudly so, the second largest country in the world, a country located between the two most powerful hostile nations, the U.S.S.R. and the United States, our two neighbors? Even if we live in such a country, shall we accept that the frontiers of the weaker countries not be respected by the stronger countries? Did Canada not protest against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan even if the Afghan government had apparently requested such an intervention?

Mr. Speaker, can anyone give me one good reason which would allow us to justify and condone that kind of action? Unfortunately, on the basis of facts, there is no such reason. As I have said, politicians will have to rise and Canada will have in the years to come to remain in the eyes of the smaller countries the symbol of a nation which has always defended those who needed it, either within its own frontiers or abroad. Let us continue to view individual freedom and freedom of expression as important principles in our lives.

I watched the Members of the Official Opposition take offence yesterday because the Canadian Government had not been consulted. The explanation is simple. Canadians are not a bellicose people, they have never invaded any place, they have always gone where they were asked to keep the peace, they are always where they are needed. They never seek our permission to invade other countries, for they know for a fact that if they did, some 95 per cent of our fellow Canadians would stand up and say "no", for we know that we are not very many to

defend our huge country and that our borders are quite vulnerable. We know that we must gain the consideration of others if we want them to respect our borders. We know that we must do unto others, no matter their size, number and strength, what we want them to do unto us. That is what being Canadian means, Mr. Speaker.

I am proud tonight to see that most countries are now supporting the position which the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced in this House a few days ago. I am proud also that the British Prime Minister who visited us in the House has indicated just how important it is for our allies to continue to help one another and to stand together against all possible foes, and that the so-called Iron Lady has adopted the same course of action as the Canadian government, for we just could not let the two super-powers continue to play as they do with the destinies of lesser countries.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to emphasize to you that there are no bombs falling on either Soviet or American territories and that both sides do not test their most recent weapons over their own territories. I am saying this, while fully aware of the part we have to play as a country, and that which the United States have to play as a world power. As President Reagan was reported as saying tonight, the United States is not a small country, and I agree with him when he says that super-powers must intervene in the affairs of the other countries. And I am saying this, knowing fully well that our basic values of freedom and brotherhood, the very values of Christianity which we have forever fought for, are at the mercy of potential enemies and that the Americans, just like us, must do their utmost to protect them.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that it does not give us the right to take up arms and impose our will as if it were a matter of agreement, freedom, cooperation and fraternity. I think instead that Canada has been setting an example for a number of years. In their own country, the Americans have been giving the example for years through their domestic policy. Why not continue, Mr. Speaker? I suggest it is somewhat like in our personal lives and, if we want to be respected, we have to respect ourselves first and then respect others regardless of their size, their abilities and their strength. In that respect, I am proud to belong to the same party as the Prime Minister of Canada, who has shown once again that being a Canadian is first and foremost to believe in the freedom of expression of men, nations, ethnic groups and ideas. I am active in politics mainly because I want the situation to remain as it has been in recent years.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that those Canadian citizens who are still on that island will be able to return home as soon as possible. Let us hope that once again Canada will play the great role it has been playing throughout the world as a peacemaker along with others which will help Grenada find peace and harmony for all the inhabitants of the island.

• (2200)

[*English*]

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I listened tonight to the speech made by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) who so quickly abandoned the high road that had been taken by the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) by introducing this motion. I then listened to the subsequent speech made by the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Kilgour). I simply cannot understand why those two particular Members were chosen by the Conservative Party to lead off this debate. They have not taken any part whatsoever in the work of the subcommittee of the Canadian External Affairs Committee on Canada's relations with the Caribbean and Latin America.

Be that as it may, after listening to those two Members, it occurred to me that if they represent the Conservative Party and if, perchance, the Conservative Party forms the Government of this country, they will say that whatever the United States administration does is all right with them.

An Hon. Member: A blank cheque.

Miss Jewett: As my colleague said, it will be a blank cheque. I find this really horrifying. I have listened today to many American Congressmen and Senators, many of them who are of a conservative persuasion, lashing the Reagan administration for this invasion. I assume that Conservative Members of this House cleared the remarks they were going to make with their Leader and with their External Affairs critic, neither of whom could be here tonight, but in any event, neither of whom are here. I have to laugh, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona say that the Americans did not consult with the Canadians because they did not trust them. What Hon. Members of the Conservative Party are really saying is that the only time the Americans will consult with a country is when they know that that country will be ready to do whatever it is they want that country to do.

The Americans have forgotten completely that although they phoned Mrs. Thatcher and she cautioned them not to do it, they did not in fact take her advice. They did not call her back, they did not wait when she asked for a bit of time; they simply went ahead with their decision. So much for consultation.

What has disturbed me perhaps more than anything else since the new Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Mulroney) came into the House has been the growing disposition on the part of that Party to not make any judgments on its own account on international affairs. We do not have to wait another ten days to make a decision on this invasion. We have to get as many facts as we can about it, and we have all tried to do that. Most of those facts now seem to be available. Then we make our decision. That is what the Secretery General of the Commonwealth has done and what the majority of Latin American countries that are opposed to the invasion have done. That is what many countries in western Europe have done and many members of the American Congress and

Senate have done. They have made their decision. The Tories are still waiting to make their decision. I think that the Liberals have made their decision, although I was not entirely sure about that after listening to the Minister tonight. I hope that they have.

May I repeat for the benefit of the empty Tory benches that the motion we introduced is as follows:

This House supports the judgment of the Secretary of the Commonwealth who just recently described the invasion of Grenada as:

"A deplorable act of blatant aggression".

We all regret to say that that is exactly what it is. The Hon. Member for Yukon said that he totally and entirely disagreed with this motion. I cannot quote him exactly, Mr. Speaker, but I wrote down what he said as carefully as I could. He said that it is justified to intervene in a way similar to the intervention of the United States in order to prevent a takeover by tyrants. That is how the Soviet Union would justify an invasion. Now the Hon. Member for Yukon justifies an invasion on those grounds. I never thought we would see him taking a position that is totally immoral as well as illegal under international law and one which is in accord with the positions that we have seen taken by the Soviet Union.

The Hon. Member for Yukon made another incredible comment when he said that Britain does not relish the liberation of a former colony by the United States. Does anyone in the House think for a moment that that was Britain's concern? Does anyone think that Britain did not mind the action being taken but it simply did not like the fact that the U.S. took that action? Presumably Britain would have preferred it if another nation were to have taken that action. Apart from the fact that it is a tremendous misuse of the word "liberation," that is all that I can make of the Hon. Member's statement.

I would like to discuss the Government for a moment because the Minister is now in the House and he may wish to intervene about a matter on which the Canadian Government has not yet come clean. I hope that he will. We all understand the enormous confusion that there must be on this tiny island. The island is so tiny that one can fly over it in a helicopter in only two minutes. I understand that there must be a great deal of confusion there since all of the phone lines are jammed and so on. Nevertheless, the fact is that Prime Minister Adams, the Prime Minister of Barbados, in a speech on television last night that was referred to earlier, although this part of it was not, said that he had met with the Canadian High Commissioner, Noble Power, in Barbados last Friday at 8 p.m. at Mr. Power's request. It was the wish of Mr. Power to relay on behalf of the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada the concern about what had been happening until that point and more particularly the concern about the murder of Prime Minister Bishop and the concern for Canadians and nationals of other countries.

Last night on television, Prime Minister Adams who was in Barbados said that when he talked to Mr. Power, he told him that the only option was military intervention. He did not specify any particular nations but he did say that he had told Mr. Power that the only option for the Grenada situation was military intervention by a state or states unnamed. The report on the television program came from people who were there and who heard the comment. Perhaps it has been mixed up in transmission somehow, but it did come directly through the electronic device of television. If it has not been mixed up, it really gives me and my colleagues the concern that that was not communicated to Ottawa. I am sure the High Commissioner would have communicated that because it is quite alarming to hear that the only option in the Grenadian situation was military intervention. If that was communicated, I assume he did so probably for the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin), whom, I understand, at that juncture was acting for the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), whom we have not seen too often in the House concerning this matter.

• (2210)

We could have acted then to try to persuade the Canadians to leave. I am sure many of them would have left if they had been told that the only option was military intervention. I suggest there was Saturday and Sunday, and possibly Monday, when they could have come out. While I am aware of the difficulty in getting the regionally based airline which the Minister told us about, I am speaking about the time earlier than that.

Mr. Regan: The airport was closed.

Miss Jewett: Not on Saturday.

Mr. Regan: Yes, it was.

Miss Jewett: There are other indications that it was not.

Furthermore, there is the most interesting fact that there was another evacuation planned. I do not know if the Minister realizes this, but he has never even told us about it. It would have involved evacuating American, British and Canadian citizens on the Cunard liner *Countess*. This story is in today's *New York Times*. That ship was due to dock in Grenada on Tuesday. The article states:

American officials said that in response to a request from the American Embassy in Barbados, the captain of *Countess* had radioed that he would take on free of charge all American, Canadian and British citizens who wanted to leave the island, but had to have word if this plan were acceptable by Monday.

Perhaps we did not hear about that, but I would think that our High Commissioner would be in touch with the American Embassy in Barbados. I feel quite strongly that we still have not been told clearly that the opinion of military intervention was being discussed and that it was known Friday evening. I assume that the High Commissioner told External Affairs, so that there is either great confusion in that Department or the Minister for External Relations was excluded from any further discussion on this matter since nothing was done on Saturday or Sunday.

What disturbs me even more is that the Minister is not coming clean about this. Yet this is exactly what Prime Minister Adams of Barbados said on television last night.

We believe that the Canadians are in the hotel. We do know that the United States has refused permission for the Hercules to land. One could suspect that the Americans want to return them on their planes in order to give some additional justification to their presence in Grenada.

The American invasion of Grenada brings to mind a scenario that was written at least two years ago. An article was written by Gail Lem in *This Magazine* in March of this year. The article is entitled "The Elephant and the Mouse: What's the US Doing in Grenada?" It is very much worth reading in full, but I will quote only the three first paragraphs. She is talking about something called "Ocean Venture '81". The article states:

> Like all such displays of military might, Ocean Venture '81 was weighted with code words, jargon and in-speak, but authorities did not waste undue language skills or political sophistication to disguise the real-life target of the exercise. In the eight-week flaunting of sea power by the United States and its allies in late 1981—their largest peacetime naval manoeuvres since World War Two—
>
> As many will remember—
>
> Grenada became 'Amber and the Amberdeens'—
>
> That was the code:
>
> And 'our enemy in the Eastern Caribbean'—
>
> This is a tiny three-island state which, according to Ocean Venture '81, was:
>
> —busy exporting terrorism, subversion and anti-democratic revolutionary activity' throughout the region under the influence of a menacing 'Country Red.' Citizens of Grenada and its sister island dependencies . . . were understandably horrified at finding themselves the object of the US effort in the Caribbean and they were doubly shocked with the scenario's denouement: an invasion of the country by the US after Amber's radicals seize American hostages and 'negotiations with the Amber government breakdown.'
>
> The United States carried out a full dress rehearsal of this mock invasion at Vieques Island, the US base off Puerto Rico. Under the direction of Rear Admiral Robert P. McKenzie, commander of the Florida-based Caribbean Task Force created by former President Jimmy Carter to counter a perceived 'Soviet threat' to US interests in the region, US paratroopers staged a dawn parachute drop into Vieques. Combat troops trained for mountainous terrain provided support, followed by 1,000 amphibious marine units and air assaults.
>
> The US State Department insisted that the operation was intended only to 'develop a quick reaction capacity for a hypothetical hostage rescue mission.' Why then did the battle plan also call for US troops to remain on the island after rescuing the hostages and to seize power from the 'unfriendly' Amber government in order 'to instal a regime favourable to the way of life we espouse?'

That is the direct quote, "To instal a regime favourable to the way of life we espouse."

That was the scenario in 1981. Apart from the fact that it was not a question of hostages, almost everything else that has happened in the last few days is identical. I fear that it will escalate rather than de-escalate.

American administrations have yet not learned that it is not in the best interest of the United States, their strategic interest or otherwise, to engage in military interventions of this kind. It was not successful in Viet Nam and it will not be now. I am afraid that it will lead to tremendous escalation.

The Cubans have nationals whom they will want to protect as well. They have lost 100 already. They did not start the invasion, and this will just lead, I am afraid, to a tremendous escalation of the situation.

I agree entirely to participating in a peacekeeping effort but I really fear for what will happen before we have an opportunity to do that.

For one per cent of the cost of this massive military invasion, massive in the context of Grenada, that country could have been given an enormous contribution toward economic development, prosperity and political stability. Prime Minister Bishop had sought international development assistance and financial support for the development of the economy and particularly for building its tourist industry base. Such support was not given by the United States, just the opposite. To think that only one per cent of the cost of this invasion could have brought some prosperity and democracy to Grenada!

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) has been making a great issue of the fact that the Minister has not come clean with Canadians. I think we are all prepared to admit that the Government has not come clean with Canadians. I suggest that the fact of the matter is that the Minister has not come clean because he obviously does not have all of the facts himself. They have not been given to him. His diffidence about imparting them to us, even those that he has, is very definitely related to the fact that he has so few to impart. That is obvious. The Minister, while he was out appearing on CBC this evening, obviously did not hear the President of the United States who was talking at that time and revealing that only two hours before speaking—and that was about four hours ago—there had been discovered on the island of Grenada three large warehouses stacked to the roof with arms and ammunition. That fact the Minister obviously did not know. I think none of us have the facts that we need on which to form a judgment.

● (2220)

There are some very disturbing news reports that I understand are now on the news wires. I will not give currency to them because I have no means of testing them, but they are very disturbing.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when you consider that in all sanctimoniousness today the New Democratic Party decided, and tried yesterday, to have a debate on this matter, it can be explained if we look at the chronology of events. On October 12 we learned that the Prime Minister of Grenada had been arrested. That was a Wednesday, if I remember correctly. Over the weekend we heard more disturbing events, and on Monday morning in the House the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) asked the first question about this matter as a result of information which had reached him. That was Monday of last week. There were no questions whatsoever from the New Democratic Party. On Tuesday there was no Question Period because of a procedural problem. On Wednesday the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East asked another pair of questions. On Thursday, a week ago today, the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition led on the matters relating to Grenada, and was followed again by the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East in probing and

trying to find out what information there was. We did not know what was happening. We were not privy to the developments. We have had to read the papers and to rely on the newspapers and the wire services to get any information at all. And on that day, last Thursday, the NDP asked questions about fishermen in the north.

On Friday, the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) and I asked certain questions about recognition and consultation. There was consultation, I believe, going on at that time and we asked whether we were going to be party to that consultation. The NDP Members were asking questions about the Cruise missile, nothing about Grenada.

Then came Monday morning following that, and that was the critical weekend when the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) and the Hon. Member for York-Peel asked questions about the new regime, because we then learned that the Prime Minister of Grenada had been assassinated along with a number of members of his cabinet, or the information we had from the press at that time led one to believe that that was the case.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Member for York-Peel asked questions pertaining to these events. The NDP was asking about disarmament. Then we come to Tuesday when we learned again from the press of the landing of U.S. and other troops on the island of Grenada and the NDP was asking about the automotive industry. There were four Members of this Party who were asking questions in order to determine what the facts were. None of us on this side had the facts. That Government ought to have had them. I know from experience it has a trained Department of External Affairs which normally gets at the facts. The Department did not get them. That is one of the problems with which this Government has been faced. It is not getting facts. But as I say, the New Democratic Party Members were talking about the automotive industry.

On Wednesday, in a statement the Hon. Member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle) asked about Nicaragua. At that time on Wednesday, yesterday, came the first question on the matter by the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent). He stood up and condemned the invasion, just like that. He knew all the facts. He could decide. An outright condemnation, he suggested, and that is basically what we are being asked to debate tonight.

How did they get their facts? I spent a fair amount of time looking in *The New York Times*, in the London *Times*, the *Wall Street Journal* and in Canadian papers. The facts are not all that easy to come by. The Government is not giving them to us. I think the Government is not giving them to us because it does not know them. The Government has been denied the facts. That is the regrettable conclusion to which I come.

Then we hear from the Prime Minister of Dominica, Miss Charles, who described the operation at the beginning of the month as a preemptive defensive strike in order to remove a dangerous threat to peace and security in the region. That was a statement by someone who lives next door to Grenada where the trouble is and about which we are learning more and more, about warehouses of arms and ammunition. Why should we not listen to those who lived with the problem? They probably have greater access to the facts than we have.

Then we learn, not immediately, and I have not heard all that much from the Government on this matter, that the Queen's representative was in protective custody within Grenada, incommunicado. Somehow or other, happily, he managed to get out a message asking for help. This was the representative of the Queen, the legal representative of authority in the country. There had been a coup d'état. The Prime Minister had assumed power in 1949 by a revolt and now, by a second revolt, he was replaced. These facts are now coming out very, very slowly. The people in the area feel there is a danger to them, to their way of life and to their institutions by the establishment in Grenada of a regime which has no basis in law, a basis only in revolution. Yet we have the sanctimonious New Democratic Party Members standing up and condemning whatever has been done to help those people in response to requests from them.

Next I would like to mention a report which I read from *The New York Times* Service. It is an analysis of the situation by a correspondent named Hedrick Smith. I do not know whether the name Hedrick Smith means anything to Members in the New Democratic Party. They probably have not read his book. I woulkd advise them to read it. Hedrick Smith's book is called "The Russians". He was *The New York Times* representative in Moscow for a number of years. We can remember Djilas' book and the story of the new bureaucracy that was being developed in Yugoslavia. Now we find Hedrick Smith describing, in very intimate and detailed terms, the new aristocracy of the bureaucracy which has grown up in the Soviet Union. Obviously Hedrick Smith knows what he is talking about when he is talking about matters related to the incursions, the insidious infiltrations by surrogates of the Soviet Union into other areas of the world such as the Caribbean. The facts are still coming out, but slowly. Obviously we do not have enough facts to form the far-out judgments which were put forward by the New Democratic Party in its resolution.

● (2230)

I was quite disturbed by some of the comments attributed to the Canadian Ambassador to Washington. This morning I read an article in *The Globe and Mail* which indicated some of the things he said about the Canadian Government having doubts about the need for the United States-led invasion in the Caribbean Islands. He said that from the information available to him they do not consider the invasion to have been justified. That could very well be, on the information available to him. As I already suggested, all available information was probably not made available to him. This same Ambassador is quoted as saying:

—the United States had offered to fly out Canadians who wanted to leave Grenada as soon as it was considered safe to do so, but Canada had refused.

I would like to think that the following quotation is incorrect. I hope it will prove, in the course of time, to have been incorrect. However he said, "I told him", "I" being the

Ambassador and "him" being Mr. Dam of the State Department, "that we're a sovereign nation and that the only natural thing for us to do is to go in and look after our own people." This was at a time when a 707 was sitting on the runway in Barbados. Anyone with experience flying 707s would know that it could not have landed given the condition of the runways in Grenada. I would like to know how that planes was ever diverted to Barbados. I feel we ought to be given an explanation of that. I suppose someone on the other side ordered it to go there. When the Government orders, off goes the captain. I would not be surprised if the captain said, "There is no sense in going to the Barbados for me to take off and go to Grenada because I will never be able to land in Grenada". The Government would tell him to do what he was told. Eventually they had to get a Hercules. I gather the Hercules went there, as the Minister indicated. It was warned off and had to return to Barbados. All this time the Canadian Ambassador was saying that we were a sovereign nation, that we would look after our own kind, and that we did not need any help. That is a very strange way to look after one's own nationals.

I was glad to hear the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam mention the Cunard Line's vessel, *The Countess*, which was due to arrive in St. George's on Monday or Tuesday. It offered to take off all the Canadian, British and United States citizens who were there. However, it was warned off because of the inherent dangers in that country.

The conclusions about the operation itself are still very difficult to finalize. Perhaps we will not take that much comfort from the role of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), vaunted by himself and by his Party as being the great mediator and conciliator in the East-West talks and the North-South talks, boxing the compass, if one likes. It has been very seriously eroded in this particular operation. It is very evident that the facts were not reaching Canada as we would normally hope they would. Perhaps one day they will when we re-establish the credibility of our country. When we look over the record of the Prime Minister, it should not really surprise us. He made incredible inroads of destruction in the Department of External Affairs, in which I served, and divided the country by his policies of confrontation. Now he has eroded his own credibility.

To condemn, as this particular motion suggests we ought to do, the operation which has taken place in the eastern Caribbean in response to a request from four members of the area, I think is much too soon. As for the motion the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) presented at the end of his speech, I have yet to see the text of it but, as I listened to it, I found it even more upsetting, more hasty and based on fewer facts than are justified. While he might have been very happy to have it on the record to show, "What a fine boy am I", there is no question in my mind that it was premature. We have no position, and the Government is no help to us in putting us in a position to make judgments on the particular affair.

In conclusion, with the head of state of the country of Grenada unable to communicate with the rest of the world, with its government upset, with the countries surrounding Grenada seeking assistance and fearful of the consequences of a violent revolution in Grenada, and in the absence of more facts, we can do no more than hope that our Canadians will be brought back safely from Grenada shortly.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, it is with some personal sadness that I rise to take part in the debate on the motion brought to our attention by Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party. I welcome it in a sense because it gives me an opportunity to associate myself immediately with people around the world who have condemned, in the most forceful and justifiable terms, the events on the tiny island of Grenada in the Caribbean just two weeks ago. Their revulsion is a revulsion that I share. Prime Minister Bishop was a long and personal friend. I knew him throughout his political years. I had come to understand, in the sense that I understood the pressures under which he served his nation. There were pressures from those within his administration that would have him be less moderate than he was. There were those in his administration who would have him depart from his contact with the private sector. Others would have had him take a much more stringent, pure Marxist approach. They would have had him bind that nation even closer to Havana and Moscow.

● (2240)

I watched him resist those pressures. I watched him maintain his contacts with the western world, with western democracies. I watched him gain the respect of the Prime Ministers not just of the eastern Caribbean nations, but of the Prime Ministers of all Commonwealth countries, indeed countries within the western world outside of the Commonwealth grouping.

The lot of Maurice Bishop was not an easy one. His entry into politics was caused by his absolute frustration with the corruption of the democratically elected government led by Sir Eric Gairy. His continuation in politics was as a result of a frustration about the low standard of living under which the people of his country has to survive.

In absolute frustration some time after the death of his father, whose dedication was equal, and through the continuing legitimate concerns of his people, the Gairy Government was overthrown. That is all a matter of history. Bishop became the leader of that island nation. In the four and one half years that he was its Prime Minister, I watched the progress in medical care, dental care, education, clean water and agriculture. I watched him try and do for that tiny island that which I had come to respect in the man, an absolute desire to do good for people. I never lost an occasion, nor will I, to reaffirm to the people of Grenada the friendship and love that I and all civil and decent people throughout Canada hold for the people of that nation. Maurice Bishop did not die in vain, nor did his father, nor does any man who in fact sacrifices his life for the betterment of his friends.

The island nation is in trouble. It is not a time for Canada to cry out in condemnation of anything other than the brutal massacre of its Prime Minister, the brutalities inflicted upon him in the hours and days shortly before his death. We will learn of these things as the truth comes out. They are not fit subject matter to be discussed in the context of the debate tonight.

I want the people of Grenada to know that I share in their grief. I also share in what I know to be their joy, their relief in not having to live under Hudson Austin, self-styled "General"—killer, in my judgment. Because I know them, I know they are free people. They have been steeped in democracy. They are the students of British history, the product of British history and concern just as we are in Canada. What we do from here on in will mark whether or not Canadians deserve some of the charges being levelled against them in the Caribbean today.

I regret that we are being condemned for having abandoned the Caribbean. I say to my Caribbean friends that we have not abandoned them, nor will Canadians or decent free people anywhere in the world. We will support them; indeed we must support them. That is our responsibility.

The charges can and I believe will be refuted, not nearly as much by our words as they will by our actions. Grenadians today need medical supplies, food and clothing. I ask the Government whether plans are now in progress to meet those needs. It is the least we can do.

I was dismayed earlier last week when on two occasions I asked Canada to extend where necessary visas, student visas, or working permits to Grenadians in our country, where there might be a chance, against the uncertainty of their having to leave Canada because their visas, permits or authorities had run out. I regret that we were silent about that. I apologize to Grenadians in Canada because we would not even take that one little step. In the final analysis, I know that such extensions would have been granted, but it would have eased the anxiety of people who may have been facing that situation had that been stated. As the senior Commonwealth country in the western hemisphere, we might have said to Grenadians wherever they may have been around the world: "If you have to leave where you are and do not want to go home yet because of the instability and uncertainty, you are welcome in our country; please come". We did not do that. I extend to the family and friends of Maurice Bishop the deepest sympathies of Polly and myself. They will always have our prayers.

● (2250)

I want to join with my Leader in one other area before I sit down. I suppose that with all the uncertainty only time will prove whether there is a right decision or a wrong decision. I only know that when friends need help I like to help them. To say that the United States of America invaded Grenada out of hand on the basis of no solid information is wrong. We do not know whether they went in as a very deliberate act of responsibility in response to a clear invitation from the Governor General of Grenada, Paul Scoon.

I suggest that all the flaming rhetoric and America bashing is out of order at this time and I would reject it. I do not know the facts but it is my understanding from contacts that I have in the eastern Caribbean that in fact they did respond to an invitation. Church leaders have advised me that they are satisfied that the intervention was a direct response to a direct invitation from the Governor General who, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, is a fairly responsible person. I want to make that point.

Time will sort out the facts for us. This bashing does not serve the best interests of Grenada nor any of those tiny islands, Grenadine, St. Vincent, Barbados, Antigua, Nevis or St. Kitts that lie in the chain. It does not serve their best interests or our best interests or human interests to run around bashing others for having taken action. Whatever the motivation of the United States of America, and this we will learn as time goes by, I plead with all Hon. Members to remember that Grenada is a tiny nation. It must now restore itself. It must choose what it wants to do but it needs our help. It needs peace, it needs quiet, it needs time. Let us give it that time and assist in any way we can.

I believe we should go to the island and lend whatever assistance we can, not as peace-keepers but perhaps as truce observers, if you will. It is the farmers, the fishermen, the clerks in the stores, the men on the banana and cocoa plantations who hold civility and decency together. They will be undaunted if they know that we care. It will not be our words but our actions that will tell them how we feel. I wish that there were more we could do, more we could offer, Mr. Speaker.

We have such a Government, such a process, that we lost 50 families; we found them again, I guess, and they are back at Ross Point and comfortable for the evening. There are some Canadians who say it is all over and that they want to stay and finish their vacation or get back to work. There are already non-Grenadians who say they will remain there.

Half an hour or so ago we learned that St. George's is secure and that people are beginning to move in the streets. I gather that there are still unsecured areas to the east of the city that are not safe. Already the island is beginning to settle down, not with flaming rhetoric or with blaming anyone—the Americans, the Bajuns, the Grenadians, Marxism, Communism or whatever. Let us not interfere with the process but rather by the extension of love, peace and prayers and perhaps some medical supplies, clothing and food, show that we want to restore to the island its way of life and peace.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I commend the New Democratic Party for the timeliness of their motion to debate the matter of the invasion of Grenada by American troops. Before referring to my notes—

[*English*]

The Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) expressed sympathy to the people of Grenada and the High Commissioner. I have already expressed these feelings to

the High Commissioner and told him that I share their terrible grief.

Like you, Mr. Speaker, having experienced one war I can understand how people are relieved tonight if there is some movement on the streets of St. George's.

I should like to clarify the question about the Canadians who were lost this afternoon. They were thought to have left the island but it was found that they had not. When final arrangements were made to take the Canadians out with a high-wing aircraft that could land on Grenada, a motorcade was sent to bring them to the airport. On the way it ran into sniper fire and had to turn back with the intention of trying later. When they went back later the aircraft had landed but had taken off again because the crew was told by the control tower that no Canadians were left on the island. I am informed that finally they have been rescued.

As to the conversation that Nobel Power had with the representatives of Caricom, I should like to report the words of Mr. Thomas Adams of Barbados. Nobel Power's words will contradict the question of my colleague, the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) about whether Canada was consulted or not. This is the conversation reported by Noble Power and Tom Adams. Tom Adams said to Noble Power, "Tell the Prime Minister how very much I regret that this fissure has developed between our countries." And Noble Power says that a whole set of circumstances during which he found himself under terrible strain prevented him from consulting with Canada. This is information from our High Commissioner following a conversation he had with the Prime Minister of Barbados. I take these words as official and I have satisfied myself that this is the truth.

● (2300)

Miss Jewett: Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member permit a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The Hon. Member has the floor to make a speech. He is free to accept a question if he wishes. Does the Hon. Member accept a question?

Mr. Dupras: Agreed.

Miss Jewett: I thank my hon. friend. It was not a question of consultation I was raising. Could I ask the Hon. Member if he could confirm the statement answer I was raising, namely, the statement on television last night by Prime Minister Adams to the effect that when he spoke with our High Commissioner on Friday evening he told him that the only option in the Grenadian situation was military intervention.

Mr. Dupras: Yes, that is correct. He had that conversation with Noble Power. However, at no time did he mention the participation of the Americans. It was understood when they separated that they would have another conversation on this question. It was not the last conversation they had on this question. I feel that we have to take the word of our diplomat in Barbados when he says that he received this information from the Prime Minister of Barbados.

I am struck, Mr. Speaker, by the irony that those who attacked and isolated Maurice Bishop for years have now used his death as a pretext for invasion. There is no question that those who killed Maurice Bishop are fully accountable for their crime. I am equally certain that the atmosphere of ideological hysteria whipped up by the critics of Bishop contributed to his death. It is a great tragedy that this tiny country of 100,000 people was chosen by others for their own reasons as a testing ground for global strategies.

The legacy of Maurice Bishop is that he began to rebuild a country devastated by years of corruption and mismanagement. International development insitutions such as the World Bank and the Intra-American Development Bank closely examined the Grenadian experiment and gave it very good marks. The basic needs of the people were being met while at the same time the financial management of the country was greatly improved. In short, for all its faults, Grenada was an experiment which was working. Unfortunately, there were those outside Grenada, just as there were those inside, who did not want the experiment to work.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that a distinguished Canadian, well known in the House of Commons, visited Grenada for two weeks in 1982. He had been commissioned by a Canadian company to do a survey as to the political situation in Grenada in 1982. He left Ottawa on June 26 by Air Canada and came back on July 14. In his report he tells of the difficulty of flying to Grenada because no major airport could receive the big jets of the airlines. He had to go to Barbados and wait two and one half days before he could charter an aircraft, at great expense, to take him to Grenada. With the permission of the Chair I would like to quote some of the remarks he made in his report:

> While I could not check them out, I was advised that there were now a number of health care and nursing units scattered through the island, as well as some dental clinics. A number of these are manned by Cuban personnel, but the people in the country areas seemed to be quite thankful the service existed. The school system has been improved in various ways, including the virtual elimination of the public charge per pupil in the secondary school.

He goes on to describe in fact what he saw in St. George's of the great social improvement as well as the physical improvement of the country. He speaks of the roads and the lighting system, the sewage system and that type of thing. I quote again from his report:

> I talked to a number of businessmen and women in the private sector and learned there were a variety of opinions. In the main there did not seem to be any fear that the government would intervene, and many, particularly the younger people, thought the government people were co-operative. Some served on advisory boards set up by the government to deal with issues which arose. Some of the older people were more concerned, but I could not discover any case where there was clear-cut evidence of government takeover. The advice given to me by officials was that they were desperately anxious to preserve the private sector—

That is, the government.

> —and government would only enter into the picture to supply a service which was lacking (an opinion I have heard often expressed in government circles in Canada).

He went to see the progress of the building of the airport, and he said:

The construction work is being handled by Cubans with their engineers and technical people as well as workers. I was also advised that a large number of Grenadians were employed. A U.K. group has recently been given the contract to do the terminal and the lighting system.

All this I quote, Mr. Speaker, because I want to establish the quality of government and regime which Maurice Bishop succeeded in establishing in his country. I will try to compare that with the way he was criticized last spring by the American administration. The report also speaks of the better quality of life there, and I quote:

To start with I would judge that the great majority of the Grenadian people appear to favour Bishop over his predecessor Eric Gairy, who had dissipated the island's resources, and manipulated the electoral system to retain power (as well as employing the private roughhouse gang he kept on the payroll under the name of "Mongoose Squad") Bishop and others had sought appeals through parliamentary elections, but the prior administration held much too tight a physical control for this to happen. So the revolution.

His report concluded with the following comment:

I cannot take Ronald Reagan too seriously when he excludes Grenada from the C.B.I.—

The Canadian Basin Initiative.

—because they have discarded the Westminster system.

That is Reagan saying he excluded Grenada because they had discarded the Westminster system.

The U.S. discarded it many years ago . . . The people of Grenada are most unlikely candidates for outright Marxism—a steady and deep fundamental religious faith is clearly visible. In addition they have an ingrown attachment to individual enterprise, more so than many of the Caribbean lands I have visited.

This is a time for friendship and understanding, and continuance of some material assistance.

He ends his report with:

OTTAWA.
OCTOBER 1ST, 1982

The author of this report is our former colleague, Ged Baldwin. I take his word. He and I had discussed the situation in Grenada upon his return and he told me that he found very offensive the remarks of the Reagan administration about the administration of Maurice Bishop. Mr. Baldwin was angry because, he said, "Every time I hear these remarks it questions my intelligence and my judgment on things. Having been in Grenada I was in a position to know better than what was described on TV so often during the spring of 1983".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to meet Maurice Bishop on a few occasions, the first time in Belize and the second time in Mexico. He had an engaging and dynamic personality and he was trying to establish a political regime designed to improve the quality of life for his people. He was probably the most popular and most honourable politician ever in Grenada. My colleague from Halifax and Minister of State (International Commerce) (Mr. Regan) recalled that his father had known the same fate a few years before, that he was thoroughly dedicated to improve the living conditions of his people, and how successful he had been in his endeavours.

I should like to give some information concerning the economic activities of Grenada under the helm of Maurice Bishop, and say as well how justified he was to build the airport. I have here a list of airports in the Caribbean Islands whose population is roughly the same as that of Grenada.

In 1982, Aruba, which has an area of only 72 square miles and a population of 60,000, had an airport and a 9,000-ft. runway. The same applies to Antigua, with a population of 85,000. Barbados, which is more densely populated, has an 11,000-ft. runway. Curaçao, with a population of 60,000, has a runway of 11,187 feet. In Grenada, which has 111,000 inhabitants, engineers are building a 9,800-ft. runway, while St. Lucia, with its 120,000 inhabitants, much like Grenada, already has an airport with an 9,000-ft. runway. Nevertheless, this unfortunate country has been accused of building an airport to provide landing facilities for Russian bombers, when everyone knows it depends on the tourist trade to survive and that this was the only way to end a situation where people had to land in Barbados and wait two or three days, like Jed Baldwin said in his report, to get to Grenada, and because this unfortunate country has received aid from Cubans and Americans, because a Florida company did the initial excavation to install a sewage system and Canadians did other work, and the British who participated as well and so on, because this emerging country refused to accept the kind of society that was being forced on it and which Gairy had imposed for such a long time, it is being accused of being Communist and building an airport to receive Russian bombers. This is absolutely ridiculous!

Mr. Speaker, I would not wish to monopolize the time of the House, because I know other Members wish to take part in the debate. Nevertheless, I may say I am very anxious to hear some of my colleagues, especially the Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) who was a member of the Sub-committee, and also my colleague from Waterloo (Mr. McLean), who I hope will have a chance to speak, because he will be the only member of the Sub-Committee to have an opportunity to express his views on this very important matter of the events in Grenada.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recall the words spoken by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) at the United Nations on September 27 of this year. Perhaps I may quote him in the language in which he held his speech. He said:

● (2310)

[*English*]

One year ago, the Secretary-General inspired us to take a hard look at this Organization. We measured expectations against realities and, to no one's surprise, found ourselves wanting. We recognized that we were in the midst of what the Secretary-General called a "crisis in the multilateral approach in international affairs". We unanimously agreed on the "imperative need to

strengthen the rule and effectiveness of the United Nations." We have not yet succeeded.

It is now time to move from high-sounding generalities, on which we can all agree, to specific measures for strengthening the multilateral system.

I invite my colleagues to read again the speech made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) in September because it is very sound advice. It is almost as if he had a premonition that something serious would happen soon. We all expected something soon in Central America but not in the Caribbean. He recommended that:

—the Council should meet informally to avert potential crises by examining incipient disputes during in-camera sessions with the Secretary-General.

—the Secretary-General requires additional personnel and resources for the more effective use of his "good offices" in the resolution of disputes.

This is the crux of the problem. We have a serious problem in Central America. We have a new one in the Caribbean. But no one turned to the Secretary-General of the UN because I think we do not want him to have the resources he needs to play the role he should be playing. As we all know, he was not involved in the Falklands crisis and he should have been involved in this crisis. Of course with the limited resources he has, it has not been possible. I wish that in the near future members of the United Nations would take this advice seriously and make it possible for the Secretary-General of the UN to have more resources and personnel to assist him to use his good offices in keeping peace and bringing peace to wherever, and whenever it is necessary.

We heard the criticism of the invasion by a wide range of countries, which indicates that criticism is not based on ideology because it comes from all sides. It is based on something more fundamental, a respect for international law and order. The claim is made that the invasion was carried out to save lives when in fact more lives were lost. I feared for the Canadians, not after the assassination of Maurice Bishop, but when I learned that an invasion had taken place led by American troops.

The claim is made that the invasion was carried out to restore order when in fact it consisted of violence and terror. Finally, the claim is made that the invasion is to re-establish democracy in Grenada.

Similarly, when Argentina invaded the Falklands it did so in the name of the holy cause, reunion of the island with the motherland. What was the position of this House at that time? It was, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of Argentina's claims, the invasion was not an acceptable means of achieving the objective. Once invasion is used to achieve one's objective, it will be used to achieve another and another and another. The end result is national chaos in which the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must.

Great Britain understood all this in the case of the Falklands, and Great Britain understands that in the case of Grenada. The Canadian Government understood that in the case of the Falklands, and the Canadian Government understands that in the case of Grenada, of course.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order! I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member, but his time has expired. However, he may continue if he obtains the unanimous consent of the House.

[*English*]

Is there unanimous consent to allow the Hon. Member to terminate his remarks?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Dupras: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of the most disturbing features of the invasion is the spectacle of a great power, one of the most powerful countries in the world, invading one of the tiniest. This creates tremors of fear for many of the small countries of the world, particularly those located near giant neighbours. I can tell that from conversations of the past few days I have had with members of the Nicaraguan Government. Nicaragua, for example, is fully convinced that the invasion of Grenada is a prelude to what may happen next.

The fear is not only of enemy forces arriving and occupying the country, but economic terrorism which devastates crops, buildings and roads. These are acts which Canada has consistently condemned when committed by terrorist forces and insurgents. They are likewise to be condemned when committed by a great power.

It is now essential to move beyond the debate as to why this invasion occurred and to plan a solution to the problem it has created. I am persuaded myself that Canada, working within the Commonwealth context, has a major contribution to make. Suggestions have been made by various parties that a peacekeeping force possibly composed of Indians and an African State, maybe Zambia, or other nations from Africa and Canada could provide the means for an early withdrawal of the invasion troops. I suggest that all Parties in this House put aside their differences concerning the invasion and get together to support some practical initiative for resolving the problem. This could be done under the auspices of the Commonwealth Secretary.

Finally, the example, as I said earlier, of great powers invading small powers raises the question of whether international law and order has to be found. My own feeling is that middle powers, whether inside or outside the Commonwealth, have a responsibility to play a much more active and creative role in international affairs than they have to this point. In my view, this applies whether one is speaking of North-South relations or East-West relations. It is my hope that Grenada may be one of the first places for such a middle power strategy to be put into effect.

● (2320)

[*Translation*]

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the recommendations formulated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs

on September 27 of this year will be given very serious consideration, so that the Secretary General of the United Nations will have the resources, tools and staff to intervene personally in a peace-keeping capacity when necessary and to prevent the worst, whenever possible. I am sure that all Members would agree to providing the Secretary General of the United Nations with additional funding and resources, thus enabling him to play a peace-keeping role.

[*English*]

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this very important debate. When I woke up on Tuesday morning and heard the news on the radio and learned that the United States was invading Grenada, I was stunned. I cannot really say that I was surprised. I think that over the last few years I have become numbed to what any of the superpowers might do and particularly to what the United States has a history of doing in Latin America and the Caribbean. However, I was stunned that the United States would do something that was so patently stupid. I really wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Americans will ever learn. However, I will return to that point in a moment.

I was saddened, as I am sure were many other Canadians, the week before when I heard about the events that went on in Grenada. I, like many other Canadians, was saddened particularly by the death of Maurice Bishop, the late Prime Minister of that country. The Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) who spoke earlier pointed out that many Canadians had a certain degree of admiration for Maurice Bishop and for the type of government that he brought to the country of Grenada. Certainly we all admit that that government was far from perfect. We would have liked to see a move toward a more democratic, pluralistic society. However, there is no doubt that it was a government that was vastly superior to the one that had been run by Eric Gairy, the former Prime Minister of that country.

One wonders what might have happened if the United States had not rebuffed Bishop's persistent attempts over the last year or so to achieve some sort of a rapprochement with the United States. Events may well have been very different. However, what kind of response did Bishop get from the United States for all of his attempts at friendship? As my friend the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) pointed out earlier, the United States continued to run its annual Caribbean amphibious exercise featuring mock battles or invasions of Grenada as usual and it pursued its habitual attempts to isolate Grenada within the Caribbean community.

As the Leader of the New Democratic Party said in his opening speech on this debate, the Grenada invasion was simply an event that was waiting for an excuse to happen. I think many of us recognize the fact that over the last few years since the Reagan administration has been in office, President Reagan has been itching for some kind of an excuse to involve himself in the politics of that area. Indeed, he has been itching for some excuse to go to war in that area and to put down the type of government about which he is so paranoid, any government which is slightly to the left of what he considers centre.

What happened in Grenada on Tuesday morning was very clearly a violation of international law. It was a violation of the United Nations Charter in a number of different ways, but notably it was a violation of Article II which calls upon all nations to refrain from threat or violence against the political integrity or independence of any other nation. It was a violation of the treaty and it was a violation of any and all standards of international morality. Ironically, Mr. Speaker, it was also a violation of United States law. It did not comply with the war powers resolution of that country.

I would like to deal briefly with President Reagan's rationale for the invasion. One of his reasons was that the invasion was mounted to protect the lives of American citizens. First, as has been pointed out in debate tonight and as has also been pointed out by the press, there is absolutely no evidence that the lives of the Americans resident in Grenada at the time were in any way in danger. Indeed, American students in that country sent messages through their families to the President the night before the invasion saying that they were in no way threatened and calling upon him not to take any kind of precipitous action. As the Leader of the NDP said in his speech, American envoys were in Granada a few days before the invasion and saw no threat to the lives of Americans in that country.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Americans did not seem to make any attempts to remove their citizens peacefully from Grenada. The Canadian example was simply to ask and receive permission for a Canadian plane to go into Grenada and remove the Canadian citizens that were in that country. Ironically, it was the American invasion of Grenada that prevented that from happening. The lives of Canadians in Grenada were not threatened until the Americans invaded that country.

On the second point, Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has said that he invaded Grenada in order to restore democracy. When one looks at the American record of restoring democracy in Latin America, one does not hold much hope. During the greater part of the last century, we have seen American troops invade a number of countries in Latin and Central America. In the two most notable situations, what kind of a democratic system has been left behind? Take a look at Haiti, for instance. Papa Doc Duvalier was left as a shining example of democracy in that country. Take a look at Nicaragua where the Somoza family was left in power for some 50 years, I believe. Those men are some of the more oppressive and non-democratic despots that the western hemisphere has ever known.

I remember well that in 1965 I was a university student studying American foreign policy. At that time I watched as the Americans invaded the Dominican Republic under the pretext of saving that country or saving American lives and American interests from a Communist takeover. To this date, Mr. Speaker, some 18 years later, no objective observer has

been able to find any evidence that that Communist takeover threat ever existed.

Speaking of restoring democracy in this hemisphere, have we seen the United States land troops in Chile or Guatemala or Paraguay, that country for which the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) has such great admiration? Have we seen those countries invaded to restore democracy? Indeed, ten years ago the Americans did the exact opposite in Chile. They toppled a democratically elected régime and replaced it with one of the worst scoundrels we have ever seen, a scoundrel who as of yet has not held a election in that country and shows no signs of doing so in the near future. Many of us have been astounded for many years when we see the double standard that the country to our south applies in international affairs. It is a "do as I say, not as I do" situation.

● (2330)

I recall from my studies of American history and American foreign policy President Woodrow Wilson's 14 points which were first delivered in a speech to the American Congress in early 1918 as a way of achieving peace in Europe at the end of World War I. Those points grew to some 27, almost all of which were rejected or put aside during the peace negotiations in Versailles at the end of the war. One of those 14 points survived, as I recall, and it was the idea of self-determination of peoples. It is an idea that Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England and Clemenceau, Prime Minister of France, tried to claim originality for at the peace talks, as Wilson tried to claim its originality. But that idea, I believe, is as old as democracy. It is an idea which is included in the United Nations Charter and in the United States Declaration of Independence. But where was that great American principle of self-determination of peoples on Tuesday morning in Grenada?

I think the Americans have forgotten their own history. I believe the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) pointed out the example of American history when they achieved their independence. I wondered earlier today what would have happened if a superpower of that time, a United States of the late 1700s, had decided to move into the American colonies to forestall chaos and restore the colonial government which was the system considered normal and the approved order at that time. Where would the United States be? Where would those 13 colonies have been in 1776 if someone else had moved in to forestall chaos?

If one claims to walk the high road, one must be careful not to step off. If one wishes to be critical of another person, group or nation, then one cannot commit the same sin and still maintain credibility.

We in the West like to claim a superiority over the Communist bloc and, in many ways, rightly so. We cannot underestimate the value of the freedoms we enjoy. We cannot underestimate the value of the quality of life we enjoy. We also like to claim a moral superiority. But can we do so with justification when the leading power in the so-called western camp, the United States, commits the very sins for which we condemned the Soviet Union, the leading power of the other side? While there certainly is a difference in scale, is there a difference in kind between the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the U.S. invasion of Grenada?

Mr. Dick: A big difference.

Mr. Sargeant: Tonight we have heard Tory after Tory try to give legitimacy to the American invasion of Grenada because they were invited by the Governor General of Grenada into that country. First, we have no proof of that. Second, let us recall Afghanistan in 1979. At that time the Soviet Union said that it was invited in by the regime to help maintain order.

We condemned the Soviets at that time for that phony excuse, and rightly so. In the four years since the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, we have called upon the Soviet Union time and time again to withdraw their troops, and rightly so. But do we hear our friends over here to my right calling for the United States to withdraw from Grenada? Have we heard them discounting this excuse that they were invited into that country? We have no assurances as to if and when the Americans will leave Grenada. In 1916 the Americans sent troops into the Dominican Republic. They left in 1934. In 1915 they went to Haiti and did not leave until 1924. Today, the United States Congress voted to restrict the American occupation of Grenada to 60 days; but President Reagan has ignored the Congress in the past and it may well happen again.

I took special note today of a cartoon that appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen*. It is a picture of two halves of a face, one half is Andropov with a caption beside it stating "U.S.S.R. occupied Afghanistan" and the other half is Ronald Reagan with a caption stating U.S.A. occupied Grenada. But there is only one voice coming from this person which says: "A clearly justifiable action aimed at protecting a country from the control of a group of thugs". That says a lot, Mr. Speaker.

I also took special note of a column in today's Ottawa *Citizen* written by Anthony Lewis of the *New York Times*. He writes:

> As the invasion of Grenada went forward in secret, high Washington officials met to work on a draft of President Reagan's announcement. They had a particular concern: to make sure, as one put it, 'that this does not sound like what Brezhnev said when the Soviet Union went into Afghanistan.'
>
> But however clever the words, the Reagan action speaks louder. And there is no way to avoid what it signifies. It undermines the ability of free people to complain effectively when the Soviet Union uses force for its purposes. It legitimizes Soviet intervention in other countries.
>
> If the United States is justified in using armed force to squash trouble on a tiny island how could we object to Soviet forces marching into Poland . . . If Ronald Reagan can violate treaties and international law at will, why should anyone listen when we condemn Soviet violations of the Helsinki accords—

He goes on:

> For the sake of a tactical military and political victory, Reagan has sacrificed the enormous American advantage of legitimacy. The long-term costs are likely to be extremely heavy.
>
> Consider some of the reasons given by Reagan for the invasion: 'To forestall chaos,' and 'to assist in the restoration of conditions of law and order.' No future aggressor in the world—no tyranny of right or left—will have any trouble meeting those loose standards.

A fundamental principle of international law makes national territory inviolable and forbids intervention by other countries. To undermine that principle is terribly dangerous. And Reagan violated not only the principle but specific treaties.

The actions of the President of the United States this week have done all of us serious harm.

I would like to say that on Sunday of this week, just two days before the invasion of Grenada, I joined with all Members of the House and all Canadians, indeed with people all over the world, in sharing American feelings of shock, anger and sorrow over the deaths of so many young Americans and young French soldiers in Beirut. I think we still share that sorrow. But American actions in Grenada this week make it very, very difficult to continue to be sympathetic.

I am deeply saddened when a country like the United States which in so many ways is a great society, in so many other ways proves itself to be an international bully.

● (2340)

In conclusion, I would say that I think we all have to condemn this aggression just as we condemn any and all unjustified invasions. We have to subscribe to the motion moved by my Leader this evening and to the comments of Shridath S. Ramphal, the Secretary General of the Commonwealth, that this was a deplorable act of blatant aggression.

Mr. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the House this evening to speak in this emergency debate. I am reminded, as we have all been, that the invasion of this Caribbean Island underlines the fragility of our world and of our international systems. I am moved by this regrettable incident to join in this debate and to add my voice to those who have expressed sympathy, regret and concern, and also, in the moments given to me, to reflect upon some concerns regarding Canadian foreign policy and Canadian involvement in peace-making processes.

We have heard this evening in great detail the record of the events of the past week. We are seeking from this side of the House more clarification regarding the responsibility and the circumstances. Surely the intention of this debate is not just to beat the wind but rather that we be instruments in this Parliament and be expressive of the concerns of all Canadians that there be security and, a sense of peace and tranquility. This has been reflected in the speeches of leaders and spokespersons on all sides of the House. We heard the sentiments of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) regarding the caring which may be a part of the Canadian response to this situation.

I want to say that it was a pleasure to work in close association with the Hon. Member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras), who was for more than 18 months the chairman of the subcommittee of this House, reviewing the matter of Canada's policy in relation to Latin America and the Caribbean, and also to work with the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett), who has already participated in the debate. The overriding finding of our subcommittee, which was made up of 15 Members from all sides of the House, was that Canadian foreign policy ought to be concerned with stability in the region and that all of our efforts ought to be directed toward being an instrument of stability. We saw, not only in Central America but in the Caribbean basin nations also, the seeds of great discontent. I echo the concern of the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee when he calls upon the Government for a middle power strategy. I ask with him, where is the Government's response to the committee report? If we had been taking action through this period, tonight at midnight we would not be echoing across the nation our hurt and concern for our hemisphere. We should have taken seriously some of the recommendations and the studies. In a motion I wish to echo for the House what we heard from leaders in the Caribbean basin regarding that particular area. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that tonight we can make charge or countercharge or we can take a moment to reflect on the fragility of our world, the needs of the United Nations and the need to revamp and to reorganize the Commonwealth. We can begin to use this unfortunate incident in the life of the world to set into place some of the instruments that will lead to some sense of stability in the future that will once again show Canadian leadership, something which unfortunately since the Pearson and Diefenbaker years has gone into the distant past.

I believe it is time for Canada to come forward with a sensible initiative as a senior and influential member of the Commonwealth, one that will encourage the deployment of instruments of order in our world rather than instruments of war. The potential role of mediator that international institutions are intended to play cannot be overestimated by this House or by Canadians.

Multilateral consultations are the only reasonable means of ensuring a balanced and lasting resolution to the conflicts we are now discussing concerning Grenada, the Middle East and other parts of our world. We ought to consider ways to strengthen United Nations' efforts in peace and security matters. Nations all too frequently bypass the United Nations with no condemnation or censure from this House, the Parliaments of the world, or the middle powers. We ought to be leading middle power initiatives, as my colleague, the Hon. Member for Labelle, calls on his own Party to give leadership in doing.

Let me suggest that UN activities are also hampered by the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. No organization can be fully effective without the co-operation of two of its most powerful members. They, like all others in the world, are open to suasion, to morale and to public opinion. The Security Council needs to utilize more fully its authorities under Chapter VI of the Charter. This authority is to prevent international disputes likely to endanger international peace and security from escalating into armed conflicts and to exercise preventive diplomacy. If this authority of the Security Council were being exercised, the controversy plaguing us in this House tonight might have been averted. Canada, to its credit, once pioneered the dispatching of peacekeeping forces to trouble spots in our world. Now is the time, with other like minded nations, for Canada to pioneer a world security system. Let me suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a reliable security

system is what international relations in the 1980s demands. The events in the Middle East and the events in the Caribbean these days underline this firmly.

That machinery might, for example, include an international peace force individually recruited under the authority of an improved Security Council. Others have suggested an effective system of world courts and arbitration tribunals to strengthen the rule of law in international conduct might begin to give nations some sense and hope and recourse.

Charges are being laid in this House, around the world and in the media that world law has been violated. The Charter of the United Nations has certainly been contravened. On this we can all agree. How can we prevent this from happening again? A resolve to empower multilateral institutions with the clout they require is the key, a system of order, that can operate with the force of law rather than the force of military power.

But looking more closely at the crisis at hand, the invasion of Grenada which we are debating tonight, let us consider a means of reconciliation, acting within the structures that exist today as a part of our interdependent global network. Grenada is a member of the Commonwealth, a long standing institution of regional co-operation. It is a solid existing political mechanism through which we can find long-term solutions to the problems of the region and resist the tendency to respond with knee-jerk measures or band-aid diplomacy.

The Secretary General of the Commonwealth has a great deal to offer in the way of bringing about a peaceful resolution as opposed to a military one. Canada would be wise to seek his counsel and should have been seeking his counsel since the recommendations concerning our overriding concern for stability were tabled in this House one year ago. The result was a response from the Government to the recommendations of the subcommittee which said: "We know all about that." "Facile would be to put it mildly", was the response of the Hon. Member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras) which the committee received to that document. "We have already doing it", said the Government, "Why, we are well ahead of you". If it were well ahead of us, we would have been signalled of what was happening in Grenada. We would have seen initiative from the Government, which at least would have been attempting to respond in advance to the growing tide of tension in the basin and in Central America.

● (2350)

I believe we have an opportunity. The institution of the Commonwealth is widely accepted. It is time for Canada to take a stand in the region as a member of an association of nations and to push forward with proposals. We can press for moderation and for consultation. We can take a position that military means should only be a last resort.

I have travelled, through the region, as have other Members of the House, as a member of the subcommittee. I have met the people and seen with my own eyes the political, economic and social circumstances. I can compare them with my years of life in Africa and in other parts of the world. I have heard testimony, along with all sides of the House, from witnesses who foreshadowed this intervention and felt it was only a matter of time. They told us that as we travelled.

While in Trinidad, for example, we met with a number of regional officials of government and non-governmental agencies who, as far back as January 1982, feared such moves. Whom did we meet? We met, for example, Dr. Kurleigh King, Secretary-General of Caricom. We met with Father Peter Nicholson, editor of the *Catholic Times* in Trinidad. We met with Brian Dare, aid officer of the Canadian High Commission in Barbados. We met with William Demas, President of the Caribbean Development Bank. We met with Reverend Dr. Roy Neehall, Secretary-General of the Caribbean Conference of Churches. In the testimony of those days we find the following question, "Are there fears of an invasion in Grenada?" Also we find the answer, "Yes, events in Dominica show how easy it is to take over a government. In Grenada there is a national fear of Gairy's talks in the U.S. about invading the island". That was testimony of the officials of the Canadian High Commission. We listened to the Secretary-General of the Caribbean Conference of Churches when he indicated, "I should like you to know that the Caribbean Conference of Churches is happy about the end of the Gairy Government in Grenada. We are, however, upset that the churches in Grenada are on a collision course with Mr. Bishop. We are going to begin very soon a dialogue with Mr. Bishop regarding such questions as political prisoners, freedom of the press and elections".

I am left wondering why the Government has not taken a more active interest in the external threats to its Commonwealth colleagues regardless of where they come from. I am concerned that the Government did not seek to work within the Commonwealth structure to identify them and to avert them. Now we are going through a great smokescreen of charge and countercharge to cover up the negligence and failure to adopt a dynamic and positive foreign policy in relationship to our hemisphere, particularly to the Caribbean.

As I conclude my remarks in the debate this evening, I join in expressing sympathy to those who have lost family and loved ones and the people who find their nation island turned upside down. I join in the expression of hope that we as Canadians will continue to be open and to be responsive to human needs. I hope the House will come to the inevitable realization that the peace and security of our world hangs in the balance and that here we have a symbolic situation of much larger circumstances. We either seek political solutions to our conflicts on the international stage, or we will live in a permanent state of peril. We must come to grips with the principle of common security and join with neighbours and allies in a renewed commitment to the international institutions within which we have an honoured place. Should we not take that course, those who die in the midst of these tragic circumstances do indeed die in vain.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this most tragic and threatening situation regarding the invasion in Grenada. I appreciate the comments that were just made by

the Hon. Member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean). I think all Hon. Members of the House would want to endorse his suggestions that there should be a world security system, that we should look at political solutions to problems rather than at invasion, and certainly at the idea that Canada should take the lead in middle power initiatives to introduce some of these political solutions.

Basically the debate this evening must focus on the deplorable act of blatant aggression which is seen in the American invasion of Grenada. It is naked aggression and it has to be condemned as such. We are talking about a small nation, about 144 square miles. It is about the size of Salt Spring Island in my constituency; it is a little larger. It has approximately 110,000 people. It is about the size of many of our constituencies. It is up against one of the most powerful nations in the world. There is absolutely no justification whatsoever for the invasion, as speaker after speaker from our Party has said.

We have to emphasize that this invasion was not a spur of the moment event. It did not begin with the overthrow of Maurice Bishop earlier this month. It is something which was predetermined and falls in line with the whole tragic history of American involvement in Central America and the Caribbean basin. For example, we could go back to the 1954 invasion of Guatemala. The present genocidal practices, which are being perpetuated against the Indian people of Guatemala, can be laid directly at the feet of the United States Government when in 1954 it went in and deposed the proper Government of Guatemala at that time. That invasion has been succeeded by one dictatorship after another, brutal genocidal dictatorships. As Hon. Members of my Party have pointed out, none of these invasions have been followed by any kind of restoration of democracy.

Earlier we heard from the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) about, "War Games—Ocean Venture '81", an uncanny preview of the invasion of Grenada, a frightening preview of what in fact happened. An account of this was published last March. Some Members of the Conservative Party have raised the fact that the Grenadians and Cubans were well dug in. Is it any wonder, when this kind of war game had been played on their doorsteps, that they saw themselves targeted for an invasion? We can ask why. The reason is that some people in the United States were determined to keep the Caribbean as an American lake. Grenada disturbed that tranquil dream, that pastoral scene that the Caribbean was an American lake, in March 1979 when Maurice Bishop, in a bloodless coup, took power.

● (2400)

On April 10, 1979, the American Ambassador to the eastern Caribbean warned the new government of Grenada not to develop closer ties with Cuba. This has a disturbing echo of the words of a couple of weeks ago of Ambassador Robinson telling Canada not to let Russian jets land in Gander, Newfoundland. I thought the job of an Ambassador was to try and facilitate better communication rather than to dictate from one nation to another.

When the American ambassador told Grenada not to develop closer ties with Cuba, Maurice Bishop replied as follows:

> From day one of the revolution we have always striven to have and develop the closest and friendliest relations with the United States, as well as Canada, Britain, and all our Caribbean neighbours . . . But no one must misunderstand our friendliness as an excuse for rudeness and meddling in our affairs . . . We are not in anybody's back yard and we are definitely not for sale. Anybody who thinks they can bully us or threaten us, clearly has no understanding, idea, or clue as to what material we are made of.

Obviously Mr. Bishop's statement was not acceptable to the United States.

In a speech that Mr. Bishop made in July 1981 welcoming members of the Socialist Internationals to Grenada, he detailed some of the American attempts to destablilize the Grenadian Government. First, he talked about propaganda destabilization. He pointed to an initiative that was taken to invite Caribbean journalists from all over the Caribbean, excluding Grenada, of course, to Washington for a conference. Shortly after the conference ended, there was another vicious round of anti-Grenadian editorials in Caribbean newspapers. Bishop then detailed the economic aggression that the United States has consistently used to try and isolate Grenada from its neighbours. For example, when the Windward Islands Banana Association, which had banana farmers from Dominica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenada, requested help after a hurricane, that help was promised on the condition that no Grenadian farmers would get any help. So-called humanitarian aid was being used for economic and political blackmail.

Bishop pointed to successful United States attempts to stop the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund from funding projects even after they had been approved by technical experts. He pointed to the offer from the United States of $4 million as a grant to the Caribbean Development Bank for lesser developed countries on the condition that Grenada be excluded from any of that money. These kinds of economic pressures led Bishop to say in that speech, and I quote:

> We certainly believe very strongly that the time has now come when we must move to elevate the question of propaganda destabilization, of economic aggression, of mercenary invasion or the threat of mercenary invasion, to the same level that world public opinion has already elevated the question of the direct landing of marines. The time has now come, in our view, when international public opinion must be so mobilized that not only when marines land in somebody else's territory, but also when there is evidence of a systematic and concerted plan of propaganda destabilization, of economic aggression or of political and industrial destabilization, or of mercenary threat, there must also be a great outcry.

I believe we have to learn to listen to what the late Maurice Bishop was trying to teach. There had to be a great outcry against all attempts to destabilize nations in the Caribbean and in Central America with which the United States does not agree. We should not have to wait until the marines land before we protest the American attempts to destabilize Nicaragua.

Yesterday our colleague from Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle) spoke of the fears of the Nicaraguan people that CIA directed Contras could destroy crops which are now entering their most crucial phase in Nicaragua. Some of us heard Zabier Goros-

tiaga point out that the same pattern of economic warfare as we have seen in Grenada in the past is now being practised in Nicaragua.

The war games that the United States is carrying on in Honduras involve a similar invasion of Honduras by some enemy, presumably from Nicaragua. There would be a cry go to the United States for help and the United States would move in. This is the whole purport of those war games. There are 5,000 United States Army and Air Force personnel in Honduras at the present time.

There has been a lot of talk about the airstrip in Grenada. Several Honduran airstrips are being enlarged so that 250 foot long Galaxy transport planes can fly in U.S. military personnel. They are spending $150 million on air and naval bases on the Atlantic Coast and a new radar system is now in operation. All of this is intended to intimidate Nicaraguans, as President Reagan put it, into peace. We have seen a refusal to consider the Nicaraguan offer of non-aggression pacts with the United States and the Honduras and other countries in that area.

As we condemn what has happened in Grenada and condemn that invasion, there should also be a condemnation of all attempts to destabilize the Government of Nicaragua. Let us condemn them before they send in the marines. Let us call for a withdrawal of marine troops from Grenada, but let us also call for an end to the destabilizing efforts in Nicaragua.

We have to ask what it is the United States has to fear from these countries in Central America. It is a strong country. There is basic goodwill among their people, yet they live in a kind of paranoid fear. This underlines the basic problem of our times. Like the Korean Airlines 007 incident and the invasion of Grenada, the American paranoia about Cuba and Nicaragua underlines the fragile nature of the world society. The arms race in which both the United States and the Soviet Union are participating is destablilizing our entire world. That is the name of the game. Our entire world society is being destabilized by the arms race. It fits the kind of paranoia that leads to the shooting down of a passenger jet and the invasion of a helpless little island by the mightiest power in the world.

We have to redouble our efforts to put an end to the arms race. We have to speak out loud and clear at this time. We have to condemn the invasion and we have to call for a withdrawal of troops. We must ask the United States to recover its right mind and deal with the problems at home instead of trying to destabilize and destroy other nations.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Earlier this day it was moved by Mr. Broadbent, seconded by Miss Jewett, that this House do now adjourn. Is it the wish of the House to adjourn.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Agreed and so ordered. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock this morning.

At 12.10 a.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 28, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

WESTERN FARMERS' TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Madam Speaker, while farmers, particularly those in the West, are struggling just to survive, the federal Cabinet may actually approve a proposal which would serve to worsen the prairie producers' financial bind. As though it were not enough to propose huge increases in rail transportation costs over the next three years, the Government may now increase the cost of moving grain and other commodities along the St. Lawrence Seaway. Any such rate increase would be paid largely out of the pockets of prairie farmers. But these people absolutely cannot tolerate any further financial burdens.

Let me remind this House of the transportation costs western farmers already face. Collectively, farmers pay about $150 million each year to move their grain by rail. Under the Western Grain Transportation Act they will be compelled to pay an additional $219 million over the next three years. Add to that the $24 million which farmers currently contribute toward St. Lawrence Seaway tolls. Even a 5 per cent increase, which is within the Government's restraint guidelines, is asking too much. Indeed, Canadian farmers must be asking themselves where it will all end. Unfortunately for some of them it will end in bankruptcy, unless the Government wakes up to the serious financial problems facing Canada's farmers.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

LEBANON—OCCUPATION BY PLO AND SYRIAN FORCES

Mr. Roland de Corneille (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs): Madam Speaker, the fact is well known that Lebanon has for many years been a scene of civil war between warring factions. The fact that the heavily armed PLO has been implanted into Lebanon by the Syrians and Soviets is well known. That the PLO served as a force which finally destroyed any semblance of sovereignty and authority by the Government of Lebanon is also well known. That the PLO conducted a reign of terror over the people of Lebanon, especially against the Christians and, armed with Soviet arms, used southern Lebanon as a base from which to conduct attacks against Israel is well known. That the PLO used Lebanon as a sanctuary and, under the pretense of the sovereign borders of Lebanon, used it as a shield from behind which to conduct its raids against Israel is well known.

Mr. Prud'homme: What about Shamir?

Mr. de Corneille: That the PLO and Syria have occupied and dominated Lebanon for years as occupying powers is well known. That Israel has tried to get protection, from the terrorist attacks, from the West is well known. That the presence of Israel in Lebanon is the only hope for a deal to eliminate foreign forces from Lebanon is well known.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Shamir is well known.

Mr. de Corneille: Why then has our Department of External Affairs not moved in the past to condemn the presence of the parasite PLO in Lebanon and the Syrian invaders, and demanded the withdrawal of Syria and the PLO? Why is the double standard now once again applied against Israel? Condescending statements are made castigating Israel for its presence in Lebanon, and calling upon Israel to withdraw unilaterally from Lebanon. Madam Speaker, such an unfair, unrealistic, and bankrupt policy is a disgrace.

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Leeds-Grenville.

* * *

HOUSING

ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE ENERGY EFFICIENT HOMES

Mrs. Jennifer Cossitt (Leeds-Grenville): Madam Speaker, contractors all across Canada are being solicited by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources to build and promote super energy efficient homes under the R-2000 Program. However, we have here yet another example of the blatant mismanagement of public funds in the operation of this Program.

The federal Government's official in Toronto who was assigned the duty of co-ordinating the R-2000 homes has provided very little of the agreed upon assistance for the builders despite their repeated attempts to get the Liberal Government to live up to its end of the contract. The assistance promised to them in promoting and selling the R-2000 homes has fallen far short of its goal. The advertising for the program was held up by the Minister himself up until two

weeks ago, and will not start appearing in local publications for yet another few weeks. These homes, built by persons more efficient than the Government officials running the program, have already been open for three or four weeks in some areas. Advertising and promotion assistance will be too late to enable those contractors to take full advantage of the Fall real estate market.

This Program, designed to spark new interest in energy efficiency, has instead degenerated into a bureaucratic nightmare for its participants and disappointment for Canadians who, once again, are the recipients of the Liberal Government's inefficiency. This is yet another example of why Canadians can no longer trust the Liberal Government, and substantiates the need for a general election.

* * *

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

OBJECTION TO TESTING CRUISE MISSILE

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Madam Speaker, when they hear the strange 1984 rhetoric of the arms race, intelligent people have great difficulty understanding what is happening. Today arms control is the new label used to sell the arms race. NATO plans to get rid of 1,400 old nuclear warheads at the same time as it is deploying new Pershing and Cruise missiles. In spite of rhetoric about arms control, this has nothing to do with disarmament. It is more like trading in a couple of old rust buckets for a new car. New missiles for old is not the path to peace and security.

● (1110)

Even though a majority of Canadians oppose testing the Cruise missile, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) agreed to the tests and suggested that somehow this would help the Geneva talks. In the United States, new chemical weapons and new missile systems are being justified in the name of arms control.

What our world needs for peace and security is not some phony kind of arms control, but genuine disarmament. No new weapons should be deployed by either NATO or Warsaw Pact countries. No new weapons should be tested by either side. Existing missiles on both sides should be dismantled. If the Prime Minister wants to give real leadership to world peace, let him begin by refusing the Cruise.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR MEASURES TO FACILITATE ADOPTION OF HAITIAN CHILD

Mr. André Maltais (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Madam Speaker, I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to draw the attention of the Minister of State for External Affairs to an adoption case. A year ago, Mr. Norman Richards, one of my constituents, was trying to adopt a young Haitian girl. After all kinds of bureaucratic delay at the Department of Employment and Immigration, the Immigration Appeal Board ruled that there was no objection to the girl being adopted by Mr. Richards of Blanc-Sablon. However, since July 27, the case has been sent back and forth by Department of Employment and Immigration, the Department of External Affairs and the Department of National Health and Welfare. Now, 90 days later, the girl is still in Haiti, at a time when the parents would have liked to have her in Canada so she could start the new school year.

I cannot imagine why our representative in Haiti cannot take steps to speed up the adoption proceedings. Since the Appeal Board had made its ruling, it seems to me that now, 90 days later, the bureaucracy should have been able to settle this matter. Madam Speaker, I am therefore appealing to the Minister of State for External Affairs for his help in ensuring that this matter will be settled by next week, because I find the present situation entirely unacceptable, both morally and emotionally.

* * *

[*English*]

WESTERN ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES CONFERENCE

STATEMENT MADE BY PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference held in Calgary in 1973, Prime Minister Trudeau said, "... what the West wants is a fair deal—wider choice and opportunity within the West, and a fair chance to build a West which will be an integral part of a stronger and more prosperous Canada". Right on, Mr. Prime Minister! Why does he not practise what he preaches? Why is the Government handcuffing agriculture in the West with Bill C-155? Why are his actions not in conformity with his words?

The national energy policies all but destroyed our gas and oil industries. Bill C-155, if passed as is, will disadvantage almost every farmer in the West. Every producer will lose all freedom of choice. During the Prime Minister's tenure we have seen our hog, cattle and processing industries either reduced or moved East.

The recommendations in the Gilson Report gave us hope, but then the Government scrapped those recommendations. If the Prime Minister meant what he said in Calgary, he should amend Bill C-155 and turn to the Gilson proposals, or to the freedom of choice alternative suggested by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). He should not talk sweetly and then betray us.

DRUGS

EXCESSIVE PAYMENTS BY PROVINCES TO COMPANIES

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, it has now been confirmed by provincial Government spokesmen that provincial Governments and drug companies have arrangements which have resulted in the Provinces having paid out over $50 million in each of the last three years to the drug companies in excess of that which is necessary for the procurement of drugs for those who have received benefits through the drug programs of the Provinces. This has happened in each of the Provinces, with the exception of British Columbia and Saskatchewan.

I would like to suggest, Madam Speaker, that provincial Governments be more careful in the way they enter into those arrangements. We cannot afford to have this kind of overexpenditure take place continuously. In particular, we cannot afford to have it continue knowing that the Governments are fully aware that the expenditures are unnecessary. I would ask that the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin), in any future negotiations with the various Provinces, keep this matter in mind, and attempt to negotiate a more satisfactory arrangement in order that we do not waste the dollars of the taxpayers of Canada.

• (1115)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—SAFETY OF CANADIAN CITIZENS—AIRLIFT ARRANGEMENTS

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to one of the Ministers of State dealing with external relations. Would the appropriate Minister explain to the House what the current situation is with respect to the Canadians who are still stranded on the island of Grenada, around whom there is now grave danger and whose lives may be in jeopardy?

Would the Minister indicate to the House why, 16 days after the overthrow of Prime Minister Bishop and ten days after this matter was first raised in the House, the Government has been so totally inept that it cannot arrange an airlift that is a shorter flight than from here to Toronto, about 35 to 40 minutes? What, in truth, is wrong?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member covers a broad period of time with his series of questions. I will try to deal with them very briefly.

First, for a period of the time covered by the Hon. Member's question there was no desire expressed on the part of Canadians to leave the island. Then there was a period of time

when the airport was closed during the chaos and it was not possible to do so. Canadian officials went into the island and contacted our nationals, and for those who indicated they wished to leave, arrangements were being made last weekend. At that time permission was received from the Grenadian authorities for Canadian aircraft or another aircraft to carry out the Canadians. Charter arrangements were made for a 48-seat aircraft to do that. That would have happened last Monday if there had not been last minute interventions by some of the countries that owned the airline which, in the confusion of the time, believed that they did not want their aircraft going into Grenada.

When that was straightened out by Prime Minister Charles of Dominica with her helpful intervention, it was too late into the day on Monday for the flight and the rescue attempt to take place. The invasion intervened, making it impossible to take place on the following morning, and American military authorities, who have been in charge of the airport since that time, have not been able to facilitate the combination of a time when the Canadian Hercules would be allowed to land and a time when it would be safe to escort the Canadians to the airport.

My position is that I want every opportunity for the Canadians to be removed as long as that can be done safely. But I have very firmly said that I do not want any attempt to bring the Canadians to the airport if that cannot be done safely, and if their lives would be endangered in doing so.

After consultation with the Americans during last night, we arranged that the Hercules went in this morning and landed at 7.10 to drop off two Canadians officials, Mr. Michael Daniel and Mr. David Brisco, whose task it is today and tomorrow, if necessary, to find and contact the Canadians who are on the island, who wish to leave, and attempt to have them brought safely to the airport.

I can say further that most of the group who had been at the Ross Point Inn have dispersed to other locations, making it more difficult. I am not aware of the premise of the Hon. Member that any of the Canadians are in any danger. The state of military operations on the island is such that there is little danger unless one seeks to move on the open highway. That is the situation. It is a matter of sniper activity from settled areas on high ground. We are in the position—

Madam Speaker: Order. The Hon. Minister might have another chance to answer other questions.

NOTIFICATION OF CANADIAN CITIZENS

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. Would he indicate to the House why the Government did not simply alert the Canadians that the Hercules aircraft was landing this morning and that, if they would be available at the airport, they could be brought back to Barbados? Second, now that he has referred to the sniper fire in which Canadians

have been caught, will the Minister assure the House that none of the Canadians were injured?

● (1120)

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I am not aware of any Canadians being caught in sniper fire. I also want to say the attitude of the Hon. Member in suggesting we should have contacted the Canadians during the night to tell them to be at the airport this morning is a relatively naive appreciation of the situation on the island with respect to communications. There is chaos, and there is not a regularly operating telephone system.

Mr. McDermid: You were warned about it.

Mr. Regan: There are many difficulties in even getting straight answers from the American authorities at the airport, who are preoccupied with matters other than the evacuation.

Mr. Lawrence: Welcome to the club.

Mr. Regan: I want to say that once the Hercules went in this morning we could not have it wait to take the Canadians out because there is no parking room on the apron available to be assigned to this Canadian aircraft. The Americans instead have given us blanket approval to take the Hercules back in at any time, or on successive occasions, when groups of Canadians have been safely conveyed to the airport.

That is the situation. If the Hon. Member has ever had any connection with or any knowledge of a military operation, only then perhaps would he have an appreciation of the degree of confusion at the airport.

REQUEST THAT STANDING COMMITTEE BE CONVENED

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, in view of the continuing answers that we are getting from the Government demonstrating its ineptitude, may I put my question to the Chairman of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence? Would the Chairman immediately convene that Committee with a view to framing the Committee's own reference to look into the situation in Grenada and to find out why this airlift has been so ineptly handled and, second, why was Canada shut out of any meaningful knowledge of what has now transpired, bearing in mind that if the Government did not know about the entry in Grenada, even the *Sunday Times* last Sunday headlined it for the people of Britain to see? Would the Chairman respond to those two requests?

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Madam Speaker, it is well known when the Official Opposition and the third Party in this House express wishes as to other references for my Committee, I always consider their requests very seriously. I, therefore, intend very strongly to consider the possibility of at least calling the Steering Commitee to see what should be our next order of reference.

The Hon. Member for York-Peel, the critic for Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, knows very well that since the last days of June I already had an order of reference prepared. I was waiting for the end of this session so that in the very early days of the next session I could call my colleague from the Official Opposition and my colleague in the New Democratic Party to consider having as an order of reference a subject that is very apropos when we consider what the future will be in Grenada, namely, the peace-keeping operation, and more particularly, our role in Cyprus. I will, therefore, consider that for the weekend and advise, according to the rules of the House, my colleagues in both Parties in the Opposition.

OFFER OF PEACE-KEEPING CONTINGENT

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible at the moment for the Grenadian affair. In view of the proposals made yesterday in this House by the Prime Minister, has Canada to date made a formal offer to participate in a peace-keeping force in Grenada? If so, when, and to whom was that proposal made?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, subsequent to the Prime Minister's statement yesterday that Canada would be prepared to participate under appropriate conditions in a Commonwealth force that might have a post-hostility role in the island of Grenada, on the instructions of the Prime Minister I spoke with Mr. Ramphal, Secretary General of the Commonwealth, who had originally called for a possible role for the Commonwealth. I indicated to him that Canada approved of his initiative and that, if such a force is found to be useful and is constituted, Canada would be prepared to participate and that Canada would be prepared to be of assistance in consultation with other Commonwealth countries, if the Secretary General so desired.

Mr. Bosley: Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer.

● (1125)

PROVISION OF MEDICAL SUPPLIES

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister. Is Canada giving any consideration at the moment to what other assistance it might provide to Grenada, for instance, medical supplies? In fact, would such arrangements be made by the Government potentially through NGOs like Red Cross? Has Canada asked the Americans to deliver such supplies to the island on our behalf, since we are so inept at managing aircraft with regard to Grenada?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, if I may start with the last part of the Hon. Member's question first, I suggest that we have not been inept but have placed aircraft at the nearest position where they can be helpful. It is not we but the Americans who are in control of the airstrip. We also feel that only when

people can be safely conveyed is it wise to have them airlifted from Grenada.

Mr. Forrestall: Use a boat.

Mr. Regan: In relation to emergency assistance, once hostilities cease we would very sympathetically examine any requirements for emergency assistance. The fact that Canada is now and has been at all relevant times represented on the ground by a representative of CIDA, and now by other officials of our High Commission in Barbados, we are in a good position to appraise the type of assistance which might be required and how it could best be delivered.

INFORMATION PROVIDED BY PRIME MINISTER OF BARBADOS—TRANSMITTAL TO OTTAWA

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Madam Speaker, I, too, would like to direct a question to the Minister of State for International Trade who acknowledged in the House yesterday that on last Friday evening at about eight o'clock, three and a half days before the Grenadian invasion, the Canadian High Commissioner to Barbados, Noble Power, met with Prime Minister Adams of Barbados to seek his assessment of the Caribbean situation. At that meeting Prime Minister Adams told Mr. Power that the only solution was a military intervention. Could the Minister tell the House whether or not the results of that meeting, this assessment of Prime Minister Adams, was passed immediately on to Ottawa?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, for the Hon. Member to understand what occurred on Friday it might be useful to recount that Canadian High Commissioners in the region were instructed to contact the Prime Ministers to discuss the Grenadian situation with them, particularly in respect to what they intended to do or not do with reference to recognition of any new or interim government that existed within the chaos on the island. That discussion occurred between Mr. Noble Power, our High Commissioner in Barbados, and Mr. Adams. The discussion covered a number of matters in relation to the situation.

According to Mr. Power's report, in the course of that discussion one item mentioned by Mr. Adams was that it might be necessary for the eastern Caribbean states to consider the possibility of a military intervention. He specifically said that this was a matter which had not been discussed at a meeting of the other States, that it would have to be so discussed, that of course no decision therefore had been taken, and that there was no mention whatsoever of any American involvement.

REACTION OF CANADIAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): The Minister did not answer my specific question as to whether or not this information was immediately passed on to Ottawa. I would like to ask the Minister again whether that happened. If so, if this information was passed on to Ottawa immediately, what kind of action did Canada take? Did we take immediate diplomatic action, such as calling our allies in Washington, in London, and in other Commonwealth capitals, notably in the Caribbean, to let them know, and I quote the Prime Minister who said in the House on Tuesday, that Canada was not in the habit of supporting invasions of other countries. If we did not take any action over the weekend on this, why not?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, our allies are well aware of the fact that Canada is not accustomed to supporting military interventions. In addition, I think the Hon. Member would be quick to agree that a military invasion purportedly to be undertaken by the eastern Caribbean states on their own does not sound to be the world of reality at all, because of the very limited facilities that those people have for transportation of military people and also the lack of military forces that exists in those countries.

• (1130)

This was a question of an appraisal of a type that the Hon. Member would have made, about one comment made by Tom Adams. Had there been any mention of the use of forces from other countries, or of any serious intention to take action in that regard, I think the reaction would have been quite different. However, in view of the circumstances, the reaction was one that I consider to have been appropriate.

AIRLIFTING OF CANADIANS—REQUEST FOR AMERICAN ASSISTANCE

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for International Trade. Why is the Government so reluctant, and what does it find repugnant about asking the Americans to assist in taking Canadians off the island of Grenada? They have the forces, the facilities, and the craft. Why will the Government not ask the Americans to assist in taking Canadians off the island with their own aircraft?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, we are anxious for the Canadians who wish to leave the island to be moved to safety by any means whatsoever. We said to the Americans that we have a Hercules aircraft immediately available that has as its sole priority the removal of Canadians and any other people who want to come along with them on the aircraft. The Americans said that they would undertake to evacuate the Canadians, but they have not said when, and what priority that would receive. Members will recall that the American aircraft that are there have other priorities of a military nature. Ours has the sole priority of immediately removing Canadians as soon as they can be available at the airport. That is the distinction.

Oral Questions

TRANSMITTAL OF BARBADIAN INFORMATION TO OTTAWA

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Madam Speaker, I come back to the Minister of State for International Trade and ask him very simply the same question that I have now asked twice. Was the information that High Commissioner Power received from Prime Minister Adams on Friday night passed on to Ottawa, and when was it passed on to Ottawa?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, the report of the discussion that Mr. Power had with Prime Minister Adams covering all of the items discussed was passed on to Ottawa. It was passed on in the course of the weekend. I would have to check to find out the exact hour.

If Hon. Members will be quiet and patient, I will frankly and honestly tell them what we know. The report of his discussion was passed on to Ottawa, as is the practice. It was not passed on with any apprehension of any early military action on behalf of eastern Caribbean countries. There was mention of this remark by Tom Adams, but also many other matters that Tom Adams had discussed. I suggest for the Member to picture that Tom Adams talked only about the possibilities, at some definite time in the future, of eastern Caribbean countries considering the possibility of a military action, was something not given the high profile in the discussion by Tom Adams that he is now suggesting.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT—REQUEST FOR ACTION BY GOVERNMENT

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Employment and Immigration, who has momentarily left the Chamber, perhaps I can direct my question to the Minister of Finance. In a document on the economy prepared by the Ministry of State for Economic Development last February, and released through Freedom of Information, there appears this interesting comment:

> Large numbers of unemployed workers in major urban centres, especially young people, are presenting a dramatically different series of problems for which we are by and large unprepared.

Given the fact that youth unemployment in Canada has been hovering around 20 per cent for the past 15 months, and in light of the warnings and advice that were given to the Government in the report of the Ministry of State in February, why have there been no initiatives in the last nine months to deal with this matter? Why must we wait for another Speech from the Throne? Why, in the name of a half million young Canadians unemployed, can this Government not act now?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, this statement by the Hon. Member is rather unbelievable. He quotes a document that was prepared last February, before the budget. It was part of the preparation of the budget that was released last April. I do not know where my friend has been for the last nine months, but he should remember that in April we had a budget which contained a very large amount of economic stimulus. It provided incentives to the economy of about $4.8 billion. It provided additional funds for the purpose of direct job creation, as well as providing large incentives to the private sector to create jobs.

The Hon. Member knows that since last November Canada has been creating jobs at a faster rate than any other industrial country in the world. This has happened since last November as a result of the recovery taking place in North America and also with the policies and incentives provided by the Government of Canada in the last budget. We have taken steps to ensure that our policies try to deal with the problems as they develop, and try to foresee the problems that are coming. The Minister of Employment and Immigration indicated that, now that the level of unemployment among adults seems to be coming down relatively fast, we must give even more attention to the problem of youth unemployment. He said he will be addressing this question more particularly in the next few months.

REQUEST FOR IMMEDIATE INITIATIVES TO CREATE JOBS

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Madam Speaker, I do not know where the Minister has been because, when he brought down his budget, he provided $90 million for 31,000 jobs for young people at a time when there were 600,000 young people unemployed, a time when the unemployment rate among young people was averaging 20 per cent over the previous 12 months. Why have there been no new initiatives, given the warnings back in February and the warnings by the Minister of Employment and Immigration who, incidentally, must agree with this because he was musing on the weekend about new initiatives, but these new initiatives will not come about until the Speech from the Throne. If there are to be new initiatives, in the name of all of these unemployed young Canadians, why cannot these new initiatives be taken now?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, very simply, my hon. friend should realize that when the Government provided $4.8 billion of incentives in the last budget, these incentives were not provided by saying that the young people cannot have access to them. That money has created incentives in the economic system in Canada to help all Canadians—adults, the young, males and females. The Hon. Member is completely distorting the fact when he contends that the only amount added for job creation among young people was $90 million over and above the hundreds of millions of dollars that were already allocated for the young people.

My hon. friend has to look at the total impact of the budget on job creation in this country which is available for young people as well as for adults. The Hon. Member should realize these facts.

As I indicated in my previous answer, the Minister is also considering whether there are additional steps that can be

taken to deal with the very serious problem of youth unemployment. This is what he has been actively working on.

I have another suggestion for my hon. friend. If he is that concerned about unemployment and jobs for young Canadians, he should encourage his Party and the New Democratic Party to vote for the Crow legislation which will create 370,000 jobs in this country and create $35 billion in sales for this country.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

REQUEST FOR INTERIM GRAIN PAYMENTS

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. I would like to know how he intends to create jobs by bankrupting farmers. The Government now has in its hand over $1.1 billion of the farmers' money for grain sold. In the western Grain Stabilization Fund it has between $800 million and $900 million. Will the Government make an interim payment of the farmers' money before the end of the year? It might create some jobs.

• (1140)

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, in response to the rhetorical question that was posed by the Hon. Member, the way that you create jobs is by building a new railway to move the farmers' product to export markets so it can be sold and they can make money.

Some Hon. Members: Right on.

Mr. Axworthy: If he does not know those basic economics then he should change his seat.

On the second part of the question, the Hon. Member knows very well that just last week the Minister of State responsible for the Wheat Board announced new payments on barley coming out of that particular program. We have indicated that we are reviewing the Grain Stabilization Program. There is a legislative requirement that payments be based on a five-year average. No Government can overcome that particular requirement under the statute. However, we are reviewing it to determine whether there can be a new formula determined. Rather than sitting and making great speeches about it, the Hon. Member might be prepared to adopt such measures when and if they are brought forward.

FARMERS' CASH FLOW PROBLEMS

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Minister knows that I referred directly to the grain sold. The Minister also knows that when we were in Government we made interim payments.

Madam Speaker: The question.

Mr. Gustafson: Is the Minister going to play politics with the farmers' money and make a large payment just before the election, or is he going to alleviate the cash flow problems they have right now?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, as always we will make the decision at the most prudent time.

* * *

CANADIAN TRANSPORT COMMISSION

DOMESTIC AIR POLICY HEARINGS—APPOINTMENT OF PUBLIC INTEREST COUNSEL

Mr. Robert Bockstael (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. On September 27 the Minister asked the Canadian Transport Commission to hold public hearings on domestic air policy following the events relating to discount fares by Canadian airlines. He pointed out that there would be a counsel appointed by the Minister of Justice to represent the public interest. Could the Minister inform the House when this appointment will take place?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, first I am pleased to report to the House that the Canadian Transport Commission has decided to hold such hearings, the first of which will take place on November 15. Second, the Minister of Justice has agreed to my request and has appointed Mr. Morris Kaufman as special counsel to represent the public interest at those hearings.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

HONG KONG PROSPECTIVE ENTREPRENEUR IMMIGRANTS—EXORBITANT CONSULTANTS' FEES

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. On Wednesday he announced a policy making it easier for entrepreneurs to immigrate to Canada. Is the Minister aware of the situation in Hong Kong where a number of Canadian lawyers and so-called immigration consultants, mainly from Vancouver and Toronto, are operating out of expensive hotel suites in Hong Kong, issuing misleading newspaper advertisements, and exploiting Hong Kong business people with exorbitant fees of up to $15,000 a case for simply filling out forms, which can be done for free at the Canadian High Commission?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Yes, Madam Speaker, I have heard something to that effect of the activities of these so-called consultants, although not in the detail which the Hon. Member has described. It is difficult for us to restrict the kind of advertisements which may appear outside of the country. It is extremely unfortunate that this is taking place. We have arranged to station an increased number of officers abroad to handle the applications of the entrepreneur class which we are seeking to expand.

When we see such advertisements or activities of this kind in Canada we do investigate them with a view to seeing whether action under the Immigration Act to stop them is appropriate. I very much regret the activities that he is describing taking place. These consultants cannot provide better information or better access than that which is provided by the officers of my Department.

APPLICATION OF GOVERNMENT'S POLICY

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister. He might also want to know that the embassy has even countered some advertisements which claim that for $250,000 you can get into Canada.

A number of immigration consultants and lawyers, including the Hon. Minister's predecessor, Ron Atkey, the Conservative Minister, have been to Hong Kong to take advantage of this bonanza business. Does the Minister think that our immigration policy, which favours business investment over family reunification, can lead to inequalities, and encourages these sharks to go to Hong Kong and say that you can in fact buy your way into Canada, at a time when the Hong Kong people are very uneasy over the renewal of the British treaty with China? Is not the policy itself inherently inequitable when it leads to this kind of situation?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): No, Madam Speaker, I do not think so, for two reasons which I would like to underline. First, it is not true that anyone can buy their way into Canada. It is possible, using the entrepreneurial class, for people to come to Canada bringing investment and their administrative skills. However, there are qualifications which are attached to that, requirements which they must meet in terms of the amount of money they invest, their participation in the enterprise, and the creation of jobs.

The second point which I would like to emphasize to the Hon. Member is that in the announcement of the desirable levels of immigration quotas, we have not reduced the size of the family entrance group. There has not been an increase of projected numbers in the entrepreneurial class at the expense of family reunification. I hope that is understood. I think that the assumptions which he presented in his question are not entirely accurate and would not lead to the conclusion that there is an injustice in the way in which the system is operating.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

APPLICATION OF SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAMS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

Mr. Tom McMillan (Hillsborough): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. The national economic analysis prepared by the federal Minister of State for Economic and Regional Expansion, which has been referred to by my colleague from St. John's East, states clearly that current federal job training efforts in Prince Edward Island are "largely directed at off-Island employment opportunities".

According to the Government's own information and analysis, such programs rob the Island of its skilled young people in favour of other parts of Canada. What specific steps is the Minister prepared to take to correct this most serious deficiency in job-creation programs and job-training programs at the federal level?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, the report to which the Hon. Member is referring is one which dates back to last February and I therefore am not sure that the description which he cites is entirely accurate or appropriate to circumstances which we now face. He posed his question originally in terms of Prince Edward Island and then concluded with a more general question. I will write specifically about the Prince Edward Island situation.

We do have the Skills Growth Fund and other programs which are oriented towards creating the technological skills which he touched upon in his question. I have said to the House in the past that we have been a little bit disappointed in the take-up of some of those programs over the last year or so, since the private sector has been unwilling to accept the overhead costs which are implied in those programs. Our anticipation is that with the continuation of the recovery and the strengthening of the economy the private sector will be more anxious to take advantage of those programs which we have put in place. That is the general answer to his question, and I will return to him more specifically on the question of Prince Edward Island.

SUGGESTED CO-ORDINATION OF PROJECTS

Mr. Tom McMillan (Hillsborough): Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the same Minister. The same Government analysis to which I have made reference states that the major federal projects in Prince Edward Island have been poorly scheduled leading to "over-expansion in boom periods followed by over-capacity and unemployment". Given the millions of dollars which the federal Government is spending on Prince Edward Island on such projects as the national headquarters for DVA, the Charlottetown airport, the convention centre, and other programs, how does the Minister propose to co-ordinate those different projects to ensure maximum advantage to the local economy, especially to workers in the construction industry?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, I am a little bit puzzled. I am not sure whether the Hon. Member is suggesting that it would have been preferable if those projects had not proceeded. It is my impression that those projects are both active and of benefit to the Prince Edward Island economy. There are continuing discussions between the Government of Prince Edward Island

and the Government of Canada, under the auspices of my colleague, the Minister for Regional and Economic Expansion, about the co-ordination of development activities generally on the part of our two Governments to ensure that the programs of one are coherent with those of the other. If it is the question of the mechanisms by which that co-ordination takes place, it might be best if the Hon. Member directed that question to my colleague.

* * *

● (1150)

THE ECONOMY

HIGH INTEREST RATES—POLICY INQUIRY

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Madam Speaker, I believe if the Minister would check his documents he might find it was the summer of 1983 document, not February of 1983.

My question is directed to the Minister of Finance. The same Government documents confirm that high interest rates impact upon consumer and business confidence, consumption, and capital spending in the housing industry. Why was it that during the recession the Liberal Party adopted a policy to induce high interest rates?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, the Government did not adopt a policy during the last recession. My honourable friend is mistaken.

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: The "Economic Development Perspective" says high interest rates have been policy-induced.

CAPITAL FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Madam Speaker, I would like to go on and, using the same document, ask the Minister of Finance another question. The report goes on to state that one of the major constraints to growth as the economy moves out of the recession will be the availability of capital on favourable terms. What specific action is the Government taking to guarantee capital to small business, to farmers especially, on favourable terms?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, my hon. friend should read the document carefully and realize that indeed the high interest rates resulted from the situation determined and guided by United States policy. The Hon. Member knows that. This is recognized all around the world. This has been the subject of discussions at the International Monetary Fund meetings, at the World Bank meetings, at the Williamsburg summit and, as a matter of fact, at the summit at Montebello last year. My hon. friend will remember that this very issue of high interest rates in the United States was discussed extensively because it was creating ripple effects around the world, including in Canada.

As far as the second part of the question is concerned, I remind my hon. friend again that in the last budget I provided about $2.4 billion of incentives to the private sector, particularly small business. These measures which were contained in the budget had a bias in favour of small business, whether in the area of research and development or in the area of general financing.

I remind the Hon. Member also that we have a program of small business loans. My hon. friend may not know that the majority of these small business loans, as a matter of fact, go to farmers. So we have a program therefore under small business loans which is available to farmers as well as to small business, which has met with great success.

* * *

INCOME TAX

FEDERAL COURT RULING ON DEDUCTION OF FARM LOSSES

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. The Minister will know that this week the Federal Court has ruled that a farmer can deduct farm losses against income earned off the farm. This court case came about as a result of the insidious way some of the Minister's bureaucrats have been interpreting Section 31 of the Income Tax Act. Would the Minister be prepared to treat this case as a precedent-setting case, and instruct his Department to interpret that section of the Act in line with the way the Federal Court has just ruled?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, very recently, yesterday in fact, we received the judgment in the case of Graham vs the Crown. Obviously, before drawing any conclusions with respect to policy or the Department's administrative practices, we shall have to make an in-depth study within the Department of this judgment and also consult with officials of the Department of Justice, to find out the scope of the judgment and what repercussions it might have on the policies referred to by the Hon. Member and on administrative practice as it relates to Section 31 of the Income Tax Act.

[*English*]

DEPARTMENT'S TREATMENT OF FARMERS

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Madam Speaker, I thank the Minister for that answer. However, surely the very least we could expect is that in the meantime, when the Department is carrying out a re-evaluation and looking at the "ambit", to use the Minister's word, the Minister would be prepared to instruct his Department to cease from prosecuting and collecting money in the very insidious way his Department is interpreting those rules. Will the Minister instruct his

Department that the evaluators must cease collections and cease harassing farmers under that section of the Act?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Madam Speaker, I do not think we can conclude on the basis of a single judgment that all cases covered by Section 31 of the Act are similar to the case involved here. It will be necessary to consider the nature of the case, the scope of the judgment and also whether present policy and practice should be revised, and that is the exercise we shall be conducting in the weeks to come.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—INFORMATION RECEIVED ON POSSIBILITY OF MILITARY INTERVENTION

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, I would like to go back to the question of Grenada, with the Minister of State for International Trade. Is there any possible or reasonable explanation of why our High Commissioner, having been told by the Prime Minister of Barbados that the only solution as he saw it was military intervention, did not consider that to be of some vital importance and did not recognize the necessity to inform the Government of Canada that this was in the minds of those people in the Caribbean? As a result of that we were unable to move to safeguard our people in Grenada and, more important, we were unable to move to try to intervene and stop the proposed aggression.

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, in answer to the last related question, I can now tell you that the telex from Mr. Noble Power was received Friday evening at approximately 8 p.m. That telex did not portray events as the Hon. Member suggests. If the Hon. Member wants to make a judgment as to what was said in the conversation between Mr. Power and Tom Adams, I would like to tell him that the absolute and final answer as to the accuracy of what Mr. Power reported is the fact that, subsequent to the invasion, Prime Minister Tom Adams has apologised to Canada for the fact that it was not possible to consult, that it was not possible to have told us what was going to happen—

Mr. Stevens: Why?

Mr. Regan: —and if indeed what he had suggested was such that it was going to indicate to Canadians the urgent possibility of military intervention, then Tom Adams would not have found it necessary to have apologised after the fact for the situation in which Canada was not consulted.

Mr. Stevens: Why could he not tell us?

Mr. Regan: Events moved so fast and security was of such paramount importance that it became almost impossible to consult.

GOVERNMENT'S ACTIONS FOLLOWING RECEIPT OF INFORMATION

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. Now that we understand that the Government of Canada had in its possession the communique from our High Commissioner indicating that there was the possibility of armed intervention, why did the Government of Canada not take steps right then and there, immediately, to contact our allies—

Mr. Lalonde: Do not be ridiculous.

Mr. Deans: —in order to try to find a way to stop that before it occurred?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member must remember that the Opposition cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Deans: I can have it the way I am asking.

Mr. Regan: It cannot say on one hand that we were consulted and therefore we should have done something, then, on the other hand, say we were not consulted because we were not trusted.

Mr. Deans: Answer my question.

Mr. Regan: We either were or were not. The Opposition had better get its story together. That is the first thing I want to say.

The next thing I would like to say to the Hon. Member is that the problem is in his question, not in our answers. He continually says that we were told there was a possibility of an invasion. That is not the case at all. What Tom Adams said to Noble Power was that some of the eastern Caribbean states were interested in the possibility of a military intervention. It had not been discussed by them at any meeting. This was just one of the possibilities. Surely the Hon. Member is not going to try seriously to portray to the Canadian people that he believes there was a potential for the eastern Caribbean countries to carry out an invasion by sea or air.

• (1200)

Madam Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon on a supplementary.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I have a point of order.

Madam Speaker: I am sorry, I thought the Hon. Member was rising to ask a question. Points of order are not entertained during Question Period and I had intended, because there are a few here who are asking for supplementary questions, I presume on this matter of Grenada—

Mr. Kilgour: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Very well. The Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

CANADA'S RELATIONS WITH CARIBBEAN STATES

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for External Relations. Will the Minister not agree that the events of the last week show that Canada was trusted with respect to Grenada by neither the Caribbean states nor the United States? Will he not agree that the lesson is that if you try to ride all horses simultaneously, you end up being trusted by none? Will he also tell us why the Minister responsible for international trade is responding to questions on this subject rather than himself?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I am responding to questions on this matter as Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs. In relation to what the Hon. Member has said, surely, Madam Speaker, he is perceptive enough to know the reason we were not consulted was because of the fact we are known to be a country which is seeking peace and is hesitant about becoming involved in any military intervention.

I point out to the Hon. Member through you, Madam Speaker, that once there had been a meeting of the Caricom nations, and once Trinidad and Belize indicated their opposition to military intervention, even though Trinidad is the nearest possible country to Grenada and it was not consulted, no one was consulted except those countries in the area which had already indicated they were in favour of an invasion. They did not want to consult with anyone who was going to slow down the process or ask that remedies other than an invasion be carefully examined.

TEXT OF TELEX COMMUNICATION FROM BARBADOS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Madam Speaker, first of all would the Minister be kind enough to facilitate the House by the tabling of the telex to which he referred? Also, who in fact is not telling the truth? He or Prime Minister Tom Adams, whom I have known for a long time, and his father before him, is an honourable man. He says he did advise our High Commissioner in Barbados that military intervention seemed to be the only answer.

Mr. Pepin: By whom?

Mr. Forrestall: Tell us who in fact is telling the truth. The Minister or Mr. Adams?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I have known Tom Adams for a long while. He was on my committee when I was chairman of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I have a very high regard for Prime Minister Tom Adams. I do not think it is a question of who is telling the truth. I want to tell the Hon. Member to read the different versions of the New Testament by the different Apostles.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Regan: He will see how different people recollect the same situation in different ways, and from different perspectives. I suggest that what you have here is a situation that in a discussion Noble Power had occasion, as our High Commissioner, to note carefully, as High Commissioners are trained to do, the contents of the discussion and report them immediately. That is contrasted with Tom Adams' recollection a few days later, after the very important other matters he had been involved in as a participant in the invasion.

Mr. Mulroney: Madam Speaker—

Madam Speaker: I will be lenient because it is the Leader of the Opposition, but I must tell him in advance that I have to allow only one question because Question Period is over.

REQUEST THAT TELEX BE TABLED

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, St. Francis of Assisi may never recover from what the hon. gentleman just said. Lent is coming in a hurry, and there is going to be a lot of penance on the other side to be paid for this kind of answer.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: The Minister made specific reference to an important telex in which an officer of this Government was apprised of an important fact by the Prime Minister of Barbados. Will he table that and related documents in the House immediately, so that Members of this House can pass an objective judgment as to which of the Apostles is telling the truth?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I would have thought that the Right Honourable—excuse me, the Leader of the Opposition—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stevens: You are right.

Mr. McDermid: It is coming.

Mr. Regan: Madam Speaker, I had in mind that the previous Leader of the Opposition was Right Honourable. May I say I would have thought that the Leader of the Opposition, from his education at St. Francis Xavier University, would have learned that St. Francis was not one of the Apostles.

Mr. Mulroney: I never suggested he was.

Mr. Regan: I have to say that I am somewhat shocked. I knew the Honourable Leader was deficient in some other knowledge, but I thought he might have known that. I think it is more likely that he is here portraying the doubter, Saint Thomas.

I say to the Hon. Member that reports by High Commissioners and Ambassadors to the Government, as the Hon. Member will perhaps learn after some time here, are not the type of documents customarily tabled in the House.

Mr. Stevens: You read from it.

Mr. Regan: I certainly did not read from it, whatsoever.

Mr. McDermid: You did so.

Mr. Regan: The Hon. Member can contend that I did. I am saying that I did not read from it.

Madam Speaker: Order. Will the Hon. Minister come to the point because, as I said before, it is past the hour.

Mr. Regan: I say to the Hon. Member that I believe the appropriate and prudent course for me in such a situation would be to bring his request to the attention of the Secretary of State for External Affairs—

Mr. McDermid: Wherever he is.

Mr. Regan: —who returns to Canada tomorrow.

Mr. Nielsen: Point of Order—

Madam Speaker: I will put an end to Question Period before I entertain a point of order in the way that I sometimes do when I have reports of petitions, and I certainly have some today.

* * *

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Madam Speaker: With the exception of 11 petitions, I have the honour to report to the House that the petitions presented by Hon. Members yesterday meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form. Those who do not meet the requirements as to form are the following: two presented by the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen), two presented by the Hon. Member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Patterson); two presented by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight); one by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski); one by the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong); one by the Hon. Member for Red Deer (Mr. Towers); one by the Hon. Member for Erie (Mr. Fretz); and one by the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson).

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. NIELSEN—REFERENCE TO TELEX BY MR. REGAN

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I do not believe the Minister has the luxury of hiding the telex from the High Commissioner to Barbados, which he is attempting to do. We all saw the Minister, in response to questions, quoting at some length from that telex, if he says—and we must accept his word in this House—that he was not reading from the document, he certainly referred to it at some considerable length. I would like to draw to the Chair's attention Citation 327 of the Fifth Edition of Beauchesne which stipulates that:

> A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper not before the House, unless he is prepared to lay it upon the Table.

That is equated to the same rule of evidence in courts of law which requires production so as to enable all sides to a dispute to have all the evidence in order to come to a value judgment. Citation 326(2) reads:

> It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the Table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest.

It submit the public interest demands that all the facts be known since the lives of some 50 Canadians were placed in jeopardy by the Government's ineptness.

The other citation I wish to quote is to be found on page 103 of the same edition of Beauchesne.

● (1210)

It might be argued that a Minister must either cite or quote specifically from the document before that rule applies. I have made this argument previously in the last three and a half years, Madam Speaker, and I must say that I have not been too successful in the outcome. However, I maintain and so submit that this rule does come into play when a Minister of the Crown refers to a document in his hand as being an official communication, in this case from the High Commissioner in Barbados, and when he is seen by Hon. Members of the House while answering questions to be referring to the document.

I cannot say that the Minister was reading because he said that he was not and I must accept his word. However, he was seen by Hon. Members to be holding that document up. He was seen by Hon. Members to be quoting or citing at length from that telex which he held in his hand. In the observance of all Members, it is quite clear that he was at the very least referring to, if not reading from, that document. On the basis of the clear perception of Hon. Members who saw him doing this, I suggest that he is now under an obligation by virtue of our practices and precedents to table that document. He cannot seek refuge by the application of any fine and stringent interpretation of Beauchesne.

It would be gravely disappointing to us, Madam Speaker, if in response to this situation you were to say that the Minister has said that he did not read and therefore we cannot compel him to table a document, or that the document was not cited from because the Minister said he did not read it. We all clearly saw him do this. I submit, Madam Speaker, that if there ever was a clear case for the application of the practice of Ministers being required to table such documents, this is certainly the case.

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, I wish to be very exact on this point of order. I am certainly in the hands of the House, but it is my recollection and my strong impression that I did not read from the telex. I have in front of me personal notes as well as a telex. In the course of Question Period, I did consult the telex. The Hon. Member said that I read at length from it. I have checked the telex and found that I have only used three or four words that are contained within that document. I paraphrased—

Mr. Nielsen: That is enough.

Mr. Regan: I said that I used the words, I did not read them.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Regan: I was consulting from my personal notes. I am obviously totally in your hands, Madam Speaker, but in my view I did not read from the telex. I felt that I should stand and make it clear that the telex was on my desk along with my personal notes, and if that requires its tabling, then I would obviously be in the hands of the House. However, I do not feel that that is the case and I do not feel it is appropriate policy for such documents to be tabled unless I am clearly in the position that a rule of the House does require that I table the document. I was not reading from it.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I have now a specific citation to refer to the Chair in view of the admission made by the Minister. I refer to Citation 327(5) which reads as follows:

To be cited, a document must be quoted or specifically used to influence debate.

While we saw what we saw, Madam Speaker, the Minister has now admitted that he cited four or five words from the document.

Mr. Evans: It was from his notes.

Mr. Nielsen: No, he said that he cited four or five words from the document. That is what I heard him say and that is what we all heard him say. I would ask the Chair, Madam Speaker, to apply Citation 327(5) to this situation.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, you may recall a ruling made by the Chair involving paragraph (5), where you changed a word in Beauchesne, and the Chair is to be congratulated for having done so. Paragraph (5) reads in the published edition:

To be cited, a document must be quoted or specifically used to influence debate.

In one of your rulings, you substituted the word "and" for "or". Perhaps I could be more specific about dates, but I made a note in my copy of Beauchesne when you made your previous ruling. Therefore, the Chair must conclude that if the Minister used the telex, which is not the case, he did so in order to influence debate. But aside from that, and I just mentioned it for the sake of argument, the Minister was very clear about the facts. He did not quote the telex. He mentioned that he had some personal notes in front of him, that he may have been using two or three words that appeared in the other document, but a Minister has the right to quote from personal notes, without having to table them, and since he said clearly that he neither read nor quoted from the telex, he is not obliged to table it.

[*English*]

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, I would recall for the House the circumstances that led up to the Minister referring to the telex and, as he has said, using the three or four words from that telex. You will recall that he was attempting to confirm his version of the actual message from Prime Minister Adams of Barbados. We have another version. He was attempting to influence the debate by saying that he had a telex and he waved that telex around. He used the words that he has now admitted to using and he made a biblical reference in order to confirm that his version was perhaps different from our version of what Prime Minister Adams had said. It is a clear example of why the tabling of such documents is required.

Madam Speaker: I believe that it is quite clear from Beauchesne that a Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other state paper that is not before the House unless he is prepared to lay it upon the Table. The reasons for that are quite obvious. If a Minister is using a document in order to enforce an opinion or an idea, Members should obviously have access to that document.

As well, Citation 327(5) of Beauchesne reads as follows:

To be cited, a document must be quoted or specifically used to influence debate.

As I was listening to the arguments made by both sides, I felt that there might be a single restriction which might be put on this, and that is if it can be done without injury to the public interest. The Hon. Minister could have said to the House that something in that particular document should not be published in the interests of public security. However, on his own admission, the Minister did read from the document since he said himself that he used two or three words from it.

I cannot determine whether or not the Hon. Minister read from the document if he tells the House that he did not read from the document. However, he has now told the House that he read from the document—

Mr. Pinard: He did not say that.

Madam Speaker: I think that two or three words means—

Mr. Regan: I "used" them. On a point of order—

Madam Speaker: Sorry. He quoted the document and that is sufficient to have it tabled. It is clear to me that the document was read from and quoted in part and therefore the rules should apply.

Point of Order—Mr. Hawkes

I can look at the "blues" to see if there are any other points that would allow me to change my mind, but the Hon. Minister has offered to look at the document to see whether it is possible to table it without any injury to the public interest. Perhaps in the meantime, I can look at the "blues" after giving the House at this time my preliminary impression about what has just taken place in the House. That would allow the Minister time to reflect upon the nature of that document and tell the House whether or not he feels that it can be published without any injury to any matters of public interest.

MR. FLIS—PRESENTATION OF PETITION

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I stood up on a point of order right after you made your ruling on petitions, Madam Speaker. I would first like to thank you for ruling the petition I presented yesterday in order.

I draw your attention to yesterday's *Hansard*, Madam Speaker, where the Hon. House Leader of the Official Opposition got up on a point of order after I presented my petition. He said:

● (1220)

Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I did indeed inspect the petition. It was not signed by three Members of Parliament. It has to be, to be in order.

Knowing the parliamentary gentleman that the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is, I wonder if he would stand up in the House and withdraw those words. Or do petitions require three signatures by three Members of Parliament, as the House Leader of the Official Opposition got up in the House and said yesterday to try to discredit my petition by making that statement?

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, the Chair has ruled on the advice of her officers. I always respect those rulings and the advice which you receive.

MR. HAWKES—ALLEGED ERROR IN GOVERNMENT PUBLICATION

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have in my possession a Government document which was issued this morning. On page 2 of that document it makes clear that unemployment insurance payments by employees and employers go up 10 per cent. On page 1 it indicates—

Madam Speaker: What is the point of order?

Mr. Hawkes: The point of order is that this is the earliest opportunity for the Government to correct an error that cannot co-exist with the facts at the same point in time.

Madam Speaker: I know that was the Hon. Member's question during Question Period. He was waving that document at me during the Question Period. He is just trying to put in a question that he was not able to put in a few minutes ago. We will not have that.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

PRESENTATION OF TWENTY-FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, I have the distinct honour to present the twenty-fourth report of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs in both official languages.

[*Editor's Note: For above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

PETITIONS

MR. FULTON—PORNOGRAPHY—CALL FOR AMENDMENT OF BROADCASTING ACT

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Madam Speaker, I have received from the length and breadth of my constituency, petitions of concern about the degradation and exploitation of women, children and men through pornography, most recently from Telegraph Creek and the Queen Charlotte Islands. Today I have the honour to table petitions on this matter from Terrace residents.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to demonstrate its opposition to the denigration of women by enacting an Act to amend the Broadcasting Act, as introduced by the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) on March 8, 1983. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ALTHOUSE—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Madam Speaker, I have a petition from the residents of the town of Strasbourg in Saskatchewan to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the town of Strasbourg in the Province of Saskatchewan who do now exercise their right to present a grievance humbly sheweth that we do not need any more nuclear weapons or Cruise missiles and we call upon the Government to refuse to test the Cruise missile. Your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

MR. BENJAMIN—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Madam Speaker, I have the privilege and the duty to present a petition to the House of Commons assembled by the undersigned residents of Canada from the towns of Beausejour, Swan River, Lac du Bonnet and Ottawa, some 36 names, who say that western Canadian farmers paid $131 million to move export grain under the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. This grain in turn contributed $6.3 billion to Canada—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Will the Hon. Member simply read the title of the petition and the prayer.

Mr. Benjamin: The undersigned believe that this is the farmers' fair contribution. Wherefore the undersigned will pay one times Crow and your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory grain Crowsnest Pass rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—CALL FOR PASSAGE OF BILL C-678

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, I have the pleasure to stand here today to present to the House of Commons a petition signed by residents of the Province of New Brunswick who support the passage of the Private Member's Bill standing in my name, Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone.

The petitioners believe that testing the Cruise missile in Canada escalates the nuclear arms race and is therefore a serious threat to the peace of the world. The petitioners stress that Canada has a traditional—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Will the Hon. Member resume his seat. I have to remind Hon. Members that what is allowed in the course of presenting a petition is a reading of the title and the prayer. No argumentation should take place in the course of reading a petition or using "whereas" to justify the particular petition.

I warn Hon. Members that if they have several petitions they should file them all when they are recognized, because I will not recognize Members twice on petitions.

Mr. Anguish: I find that a very strange ruling.

Madam Speaker: Order. Will the Hon. Member read his petition. That is what he is recognized for.

Mr. Anguish: The petitioners stress that Canada, as a traditionally peaceful nation, can and must play a crucial role in achieving multilateral disarmament—

Madam Speaker: Order. I am sorry to tell the Hon. Member that he does not seem to be listening to what the Chair is saying. I just told the Hon. Member that he should not be giving any more details than the title and the prayer. He continues exactly where he left off. If that is the way the Hon. Member pretends to obey the Chair, I must tell him that he does not have a clear notion of what parliamentary behaviour requires of Hon. Members.

Mr. Anguish: They believe that the passage of Bill C-678 will allow Canada to act as a mediator along with other countries that wish to participate in the world-wide nuclear disarmament process. And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

I have some other petitions here this afternoon so I should present them at the same time and I will just being to go through them.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With great respect, the Standing Orders do not support the contention that a Member rising to present a petition must present all of the petitions that a Member might have in a bundle, whether they be two, three or a dozen.

Surely the Standing Orders support the Member's right to rise and present a petition which may deal with the two I presented yesterday, for instance, about the Yukon placer mining industry. If they have a petition with respect to the state of the egg industry in this country, they are entitled to present that separately. If they have some other subject matter from another part of the country, they may present that separately.

Surely the time-honoured right of presenting petitions is the right of the citizen in the various parts of this country to be heard in a distinct and separate fashion. The Member who rises to present that petition is honouring that right of the citizen in presenting the petition in that fashion.

I would therefore suggest that while the process could be speeded up somewhat, nevertheless the right remains in the citizen, really, to have a petition signed by a particular group of citizens submitted by a Member quite distinctly and separately from any others. If the rule were to be otherwise, we would have occasions when we would be duplicating some instances in the House which the Chair has frowned upon in the past with respect to petitions that are two or three blocks long with signatures attached to them. I suggest that while it is not our intention to engage in this process this day, Members should be entitled to proceed by presenting their petitions individually.

I believe the Chair is correct in restricting the presentation of petitions so as to exclude any debate thereon, certainly to exclude reading them because the rules do not permit that. The rules, however, do go slightly beyond the reading of the title and the prayer. The rules stipulate that the nature of the petition can be explained by the Member presenting it, for instance. There are other criteria set forth in the rules. If the rules were to be applied strictly to the petitions, I would have no problem with their presentation in accordance strictly with the rules. But you do get into the nature of a petition and you also get into the purpose of a petition under the Standing Orders. That is permitted, in my reading of the Standing Orders.

• (1230)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, under the Standing Orders, petitions may be either presented orally or laid on the Table of the House. Of course, Members who want to waste the time of the House may present their petitions orally.

The Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) was presenting another petition when you interrupted him to explain that you were not going to allow Members to present more than one petition unless they did so the first time they were recognized, and that this was the Chair's ruling. The Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake rose to object to this ruling, and he had the floor for barely two seconds. However, the Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) rose and the Chair gave to the Hon. Member the floor for two minutes to criticize the same ruling. Now, I wonder why the Member for Yukon would be more equal than the Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake? The former has been wasting the time of the House for weeks, and it would seem that just because Member for Yukon can outshout other Members, he enjoys privilege of being allowed to explain his arguments. I therefore wonder whether he is not more equal than others. When the Chair makes a ruling, it applies to all Members, including the Member for Yukon, and if the Chair did not allow the Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake to criticize its ruling, I do not think the Member for Yukon was entitled to the two minutes he was allowed.

Madam Speaker: I may point out to the Hon. Minister that as far as the Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake is concerned, it seemed to me that he was objecting to a procedure I was suggesting in order to speed up the process of presenting petitions. He then started reading all over again exactly what I had asked him not to repeat. That is why I was a bit strict with him.

As for the Member for Yukon, he was entirely justified in raising a point of order. I heard him, as is my duty to do so. He criticized a ruling! Well, I do not know whether he was criticising, but in any case, he did not attack the Chair. He seemed to be giving his interpretation of the Standing Orders, and I do not disagree with the Hon. Member for Yukon, in that he also felt that I was right in wanting to speed up the process. He agreed with me on that point. Where I did not agree entirely was when the Hon. Member argued that citizens have the right to present petitions separately. He seemed to be arguing that if I ask a Member to present all petitions when he or she is given the floor, the petitions are no longer presented separately. Well, they are separate, since all petitions are separate entities and the Member in question may read them one right after the other. So the argument raised by the Hon. Member for Yukon is not valid.

I also wish to point out to the House, as was done by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard), that if the Chair finds that too much time has been spent on petitions, it has the discretion to ask Hon. Members to lay their petitions on the Table of the House instead of reading them in the House.

Mr. Pinard: Absolutely!

Madam Speaker: It is allowed, it is part of parliamentary practice, but the Chair nevertheless has some discretion in such matters. I would therefore ask Hon. Members to speed up the process so that we can go on to other business, without spending too much time on petitions. It is clear to anyone who follows the proceedings of Parliament that on days that Hon. Members are presenting flocks of petitions, something unusual is going on, and the Chair is well aware of this. It has noticed that on occasion, presentation of petitions is being used to delay the business of the House. Anything is legitimate, up to a point. That is why the Chair has discretionary powers.

The Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake has the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Anguish: Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. The difficulty I have is that in this House—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Did the Hon. Member want to rise on a point of order or to read his petition?

Mr. Anguish: On a point of order, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: The point of Order is finished. I have made my comments. That is finished. If the Hon. Member wants to read his petition, I have recognized him for that purpose. If he wants to raise another point of order, I will recognize him for that purpose as well.

Mr. Prud'homme: Just read your petition.

MR. ANGUISH—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Madam Speaker, the second of the many petitions that I have here today calls upon the House of Commons to find a solution to the grievance that the petitioners have put forth. They ask first that the Crow rate, the statutory rate, be maintained and that the railways of all of Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system. Under no circumstances should the Crowsnest freight rate be changed. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—CALL FOR PASSAGE OF BILL C-678

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, this petition I would like to present to the House of Commons today is one signed by some 60 residents of the Brockville, Ontario area, all of whom call upon Parliament to debate and pass a Private Member's Bill standing in my name, Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone.

I am pleased to say the signatures were obtained after a Brockville resident visited Ottawa and the Parliament Hill peace camp where he was able to see and obtain a copy of my petition. The petitioners call upon Parliament to recognize that the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada escalates the nuclear arms race and is therefore a serious threat to world peace. They call upon Parliament to pass Bill C-678 so that Canada can act as a mediator along with other countries that wish to participate in a world-wide nuclear disarmament process.

MR. ANGUISH—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, the next petition I have is sent to me by residents of the Lloydminster and Marshall area. They call upon this House to seek a solution to their concerns. The undersigned have carefully considered the alternate plan put forth by the New Democratic Party. They want the Crow rate to be maintained, as we have insisted in the many debates in this House of Commons; that the railways of all of Canada be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system. The undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party's alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Prud'homme: God has forgiven you, you have prayed enough.

Mr. Anguish: Only a few more, Marcel.

Mr. Speaker, the next petition I have is signed by residents of Marsden, Saskatchewan. They call upon the House of Commons in Parliament assembled to find a solution for their concerns and hope that this honourable House will provide a remedy. The undersigned want the statutory Crow rate maintained without question, without alteration, and that the railways of all Canada, especially those branch lines in western Canada so essential to the movement of grain, be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system. The undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party's alternate plan which will have no change to the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

● (1240)

MR. ANGUISH—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition this afternoon which calls upon the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Town of Colonsay in the Province of Saskatchewan, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that they are opposed to the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada. They call upon the Government to refuse the testing of the Cruise missile, since they view it as a serious escalation of the nuclear arms race and to ensure that we become a nuclear weapons free zone to allow Canada, as well as other countries, to participate in a mediation role between the superpowers and other countries which currently have a nuclear arms capability, because it seems that they enter into conflict, not meaningful consultation or disarmament talks. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—CALL FOR PASSAGE OF BILL C-678

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I also have the pleasure to present a petition signed by residents of Calgary, Alberta. The petitioners wrote me through Mr. Richard Collier of Mount Royal College, Calgary. They say that Canada must somehow turn back the tide of potential world destruction and express their fears of the deployment of the Cruise and Pershing II missiles. The petitioners stress that the testing of the Cruise missile escalates the nuclear arms race and is therefore a serious threat to world peace. They call upon Parliament to debate and pass Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone, which would allow Canada to act as a mediator in the world along with other countries that wish to participate in the process and to work toward a world-wide nuclear disarmament process.

MR. ANGUISH—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition which is signed by residents of the Marshall and Lashburn area. They call upon the House of Commons to find a solution to their concerns and ask that our honourable House will therefore provide a remedy for their concerns arising from Bill C-155. They want to impress upon the House the importance of preserving and maintaining the statutory Crow rate. Further, they want to see the rail transportation system in Canada improved and upgraded and especially their branch lines preserved because they are so important to the survival of their communities. The undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternate plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rates. And as in duty bound your petitioners ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—CALL FOR PASSAGE OF BILL C-678

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have a fairly lengthy petition which gives me a great deal of pleasure to present. It is signed by some 216 residents of the Province of Alberta from such communities as Medicine Hat, Calgary, Banff and Red Deer, all of whom support the passage of the Private Member's Bill standing in my name, Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone. The petitioners believe that the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada escalates the nuclear arms race

and is therefore a serious threat to world peace. The petitioners urge Parliament to recognize that multilateral nuclear disarmament must occur in order to secure world peace and that Canada, as a traditionally peaceful nation, can play a crucial role in achieving multilateral disarmament by becoming a nuclear weapons free zone, thus allowing it to act as a mediator between countries with a nuclear weapon capability along with other countries that wish to participate in the process.

Those are all the petitions I have to present at the present time. However, I have some more which I will present in following days. I appreciate the indulgence of the Chair in allowing me to present these petitions this afternoon. They were sent as a result of very serious concerns on the part of the people who signed them. Whether they be on the issue of disarmament, statutory freight rates, pornography or whatever, it is very important for people to be allowed to express themselves through Parliament by the presentation of petitions through Members of Parliament should they choose to do so.

MR. WADDELL—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have only two petitions to present to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The first petition is from the undersigned residents of the Town of Viscount, in the Province of Saskatchewan, and of the City of Ottawa, in the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance. They humbly sheweth that if the United States wants to test Cruise missiles, it can be done in its own country, not in ours. They call upon the Government to refuse to test the Cruise missile in Canada. The petitioners are duty bound and will ever pray. There are a number of petitioners in this case, about 20 people from those particular towns. I would like to sign and table that petition.

MR. WADDELL—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my second petition is from the Town of High River, a well-known town in Alberta.

An Hon. Member: A great town.

Mr. Waddell: Yes, a great town, as my friend says. The former leader of his Party came from that town; I hope he supported him. This petition is from residents of High River, Alberta and of Ottawa, Ontario. It is to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. They exercise their right and humbly sheweth that the removal of the Crow rate will see its replacement by rates which will impose higher freight costs of five times the present Crow rate and higher by 1990, that such increases are being imposed at a time when prices for producers' grain are now at 1974 levels, and that the calculations show, finally, that the rate of 5.1 times the Crow rate will cost the community of High River alone $732,500 in payments for grain freight, which otherwise would have stayed in that community, based on actual deliveries of 1980-81 crop. It is signed by some 19 people from High River, together with three people from Ottawa. The petitioners pray that this House will listen to their pleas. I would like to sign that petition and to file it.

MR. HEAP—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present a petition from undersigned residents of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario. They now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. This petition humbly sheweth that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) presented to the United Nations in 1978 the strategy for nuclear suffocation, that testing of the new Cruise missile in Canada is inconsistent with this strategy, and that Canada's NATO partners, Belgium and The Netherlands, have refused to have Cruise missiles deployed on their soil.

Wherefore we the undersigned humbly pray and call upon Parliament to request the Prime Minister to refuse to allow the testing of this new generation of weapons on Canadian soil. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. Having signed this one on the back, I present it for tabling.

MR. HEAP—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition which was signed by some 59 or 60 residents of several different parts of Ontario. To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternate plan presented by the New Democratic Party, that the Crow rate must be maintained and that all railways of Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system.

Wherefore we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternate plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. Having signed this one on the back, I am prepared to have it tabled.

• (1250)

MR. HEAP—CALL FOR IMPROVED TRAIN SERVICE IN NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by residents from many parts of Ontario, especially northern Ontario, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their

ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that people in northwestern Ontario sometimes have to wait in unheated shelters for infrequent trains up to four hours late in wintertime.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to improve train service with modern, reliable and comfortable trains. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. Having signed this petition, I will now give it to the Clerk.

MR. HEAP—INCOME TAX CLAIMS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition which is signed by some 20 people and addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who do now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the specific requirements for documentation from income tax claimants for non-resident dependants have been unfair and have imposed great hardship on some countries where such help is needed most. The Government of Canada has removed this claim from the 1982 tax year.

Wherefore we the undersigned do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to petition the Minister of National Revenue to cease all audits against such claims for 1979, 1980 and 1981. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. Having signed this petition, I will now present it to the Clerk.

MR. HEAP—SALE OF MILITARY PRODUCTS TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present another petition from a number of residents of Ontario to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who do now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that Canadians are greatly concerned about the possible use of Canadian-made military products in Latin America military adventures or by the dictatorships in Latin America.

Wherefore we the undersigned do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to refuse applications for DIPP and PEMD assistance and as well to refuse export permits to companies for the sale of military products to these Latin American dictatorships. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—AID TO HONDURAS AND NICARAGUA

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from a number of residents of the Province of Ontario to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents, who do now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that Canadians are greatly concerned about the presence of large numbers of American military advisers in Honduras and El Salvador and that Canadians are greatly concerned about the present training and other assistance being given to Somocista forces both in Honduras and in the United States.

Wherefore we the undersigned humbly pray and call upon Parliament to condemn at the United Nations and through other diplomatic channels such interference in both the sovereignty of Nicaragua and the just struggles of the Salvadoran people. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. Having signed this petition, I now ask the Clerk to receive it.

MR. HEAP—ASSISTANCE TO GOVERNMENT OF NICARAGUA

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled from a number of residents of Ontario who do now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. This petition humbly sheweth that Canadians are greatly concerned about the lack of support being shown by the Canadian Government for the Nicaraguan Government in its efforts to reconstruct their country and provide a decent standard of living for all Nicaraguans.

Wherefore, we the undersigned do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to establish a program of generous assistance to the Nicaraguan Government and to pressure the Government of United States to reinstate its purchase order for Nicaraguan sugar at the previous level of 58,500 short tonnes. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. Having signed this petition, I present it to the Clerk.

MR. HEAP—SALE OF NUCLEAR REACTORS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who do now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the expenditure of government income on subsidization of the sale of nuclear reactors constitutes a theft from the social services needed for Canadians.

Wherefore we the undersigned humbly pray and call upon Parliament to cease the sale of nuclear reactors and reallocate the money saved to such services as daycare centres, social housing and health care for Canadians. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. Having signed this, I now ask the Clerk to receive it.

MR. HEAP—HIRING OF VISIBLE MINORITIES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): I have, Mr. Speaker, a petition from a number of residents of Canada. The undersigned do now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. This petition humbly sheweth that affirmative action programs regarding the hiring of visible minorities by the departments of the federal Government have been sadly neglected.

Wherefore we the undersigned do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to petition the Minister of Employment to encourage the hiring of visible minorities and to undertake studies dealing with the problems faced by visible minorities. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. Having signed this petition on the back, I call upon the Clerk to deliver it.

Perhaps we can call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker. I have more petitions to read.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member has suggested that the House call it one o'clock. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

MR. HEAP—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I had been reading a petition when it was time to call it one o'clock, and as I explained to the Speaker then under the new rules I have some other petitions as well.

It is my honour to present a petition to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that western Canadian farmers paid $131 million to move export grain under the Crow rate in the 1981-82 crop year. This grain, in turn, contributed $6.3 billion to the balance of trade, that the undersigned believe that this is the farmers' fair contribution to the Canadian economy, and that western farmers will pay one times Crow rate, no change.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory grain Crow rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the testing of Cruise missiles in Canada compromises the integrity of Canada in striving towards peace.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to refuse to allow the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—PRODUCTION OF MILITARY PRODUCTS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there have been great public concerns regarding the use of substantial portions of Canadian human and materiel resources for the production of military products for use by dictatorships, that there has been great public concern regarding the corresponding lack of support for Canadian industries producing useful goods for Canadians.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to institute an industrial plan to convert those productive facilities presently involved in military production to the manufacture of goods to be enjoyed by Canadians. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The undersigned citizens and constituents of Burnaby have asked me to present this petition because they now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. This petition humbly sheweth that, in the opinion of your petitioners, successive Liberal budgets impose undue and unfair hardship on low and middle-income Canadians, that the

budgetary policies of this Government have served to increase the miseries of inflation and unemployment rather than reduce them, that budgets fail to reduce interest rates which thereby prohibit any economic recovery, that the citizens of Burnaby wish and need to be consulted about matters of public policy affecting their well-being.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to be dissolved in order that a general election may be held immediately. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—SOCIAL HOUSING

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the present lack of affordable housing for families in Canada constitutes a threat to the social well-being of millions of Canadians, that there are thousands of unemployed construction workers across the country presently dependent on Government assistance for survival.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to institute an expanded program of construction of social housing. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—IMPORTS OF CLOTHING AND TEXTILES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that imported clothing and textiles are threatening the viability of Canadian manufacturers and putting Canadians out of work.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to limit imports of clothing and textiles to 20 per cent of the Canadian market. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—REMOVAL OF OAKALLA CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. This petition is signed by residents of Burnaby in the Province of British Columbia who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. This petition humbly sheweth that the Governments of British Columbia have in the past assured citizens of Burnaby that all prisons on the Oakalla lands would be phased out, that the citizens of Burnaby feel that the Oakalla buildings have outlived their usefulness and are not compatible with abutting parkland uses, and that Burnaby Municipal Council has expressed its desire that the facilities be phased out.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to urge the Province of British Columbia to undertake no further construction of prison facilities in the Oakalla lands and ensure the early removal of the Oakalla correctional facilities. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that language training skills are only available to one member of an immigrant family upon arrival in Canada and that immigrant women cannot participate in the work force of the community without the necessary language skills.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to request the Government to provide funding to community and social service agencies to establish language training programs with daycare facilities to prevent these women from being isolated in their new homeland. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—SALES OF NUCLEAR MATERIEL

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there is uncertainty as to whether uranium sold by Canada to the United States and other countries is being used for strictly peaceful purposes.

Wherefore we the undersigned, do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to cease its sales to the United States and other countries until it is proven beyond doubt that no Canadian materiel is being used in the manufacture of nuclear weapons. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

• (1410)

MR. HEAP—CLAIMS FOR REFUGEE STATUS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of

Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will now provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that Canadians are greatly concerned about the lack of safe haven for persons persecuted in Central American countries for their political beliefs and about the difficulties and dangers such persons have in making contact with the appropriate Canadian authorities to make a refugee claim.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to establish a well publicized program, in conjunction with international aid organizations, to assist persons wishing to escape repression to safely make known their desire to claim refugee status in Canada, and to be expeditiously accommodated. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—INTEREST RATES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there is great public concern regarding the present interest rates and their inflationary effect on the Canadian economy.

Wherefore, we the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to legislate a maximum interest rate of no more than 1 per cent above the rate of inflation. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES FROM FASCIST COUNTRIES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition which I will now present to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. This petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that immigrants and refugees from countries ruled by Fascist dictators are not given equal opportunity with immigrants from Communist countries, and that these immigrants suffer the indignities of torture, repression and imprisonment.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to request the Government to review its policies regarding immigrants and refugees from these countries. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. This petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that immigrant and refugee groups strongly feel that the recent consultation process on immigrant settlement programs did not permit sufficient time for proper input.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to petition Cabinet to make no decisions concerning the policy framework for resettlement, integration, adaptation and language training prior to additional consultation among representative constituencies of the non-governmental agencies, the Provinces and the federal Government, and, further that the consultation process be extended until the resumption of Parliament for the fall session. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—CALL FOR MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR CHILDREN

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that presently no one federal department or Minister is responsible for the needs of children and their families.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to appoint a Minister responsible for children to ensure that their futures are protected. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that whereas there is a dearth of secondary manufacturing industries in Atlantic Canada, we, the undersigned, do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to promote the expansion of light manufacturing industry and other industries based on fishing and other maritime resources in Atlantic Canada in order to provide work and income security and to preserve the seagoing way of life. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—PUBLIC OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF COMPANIES

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and

undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that Canadians are concerned about the massive lay-offs in the nickel industry and the apparent inability or unwillingness of business dominant in that industry to plan their operations to benefit Canadian workers.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to immediately bring Falconbridge Limited and the International Nickel Company of Canada under immediate public ownership and control. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition of the undersigned residents of Canada to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. These petitioners, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that in times of high unemployment the Armed Forces should not be used as a means of relieving unemployment among young Canadians.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, do humbly pray and call upon Parliament to request that the Minister of Employment and Immigration seek more creative methods of providing employment for the young. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HEAP—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) presented to the United Nations in 1978 a strategy for nuclear suffocation and that testing of the new Cruise missile in Canada is inconsistent with this strategy, and that Canada's NATO partners, Belgium and The Netherlands, have refused to have Cruise missiles deployed on their soil—their soul, too.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to request the Prime Minister to refuse to allow the testing of this new generation of weapons on Canadian soil. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

● (1420)

MR. FULTON—OFFSHORE OIL EXPLORATION

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, relates to the proposal by Chevron Oil to conduct offshore oil exploration on the West Coast.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament that there be full and complete public hearings into supply and demand for energy and the socio-economic and environmental aspects of offshore development before the moratorium is lifted. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. That petition is from residents of the south coast of B.C.

I have another petition, Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, relates to the question of the federal Government's new energy legislation.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament that there be full public hearings into the demand for energy and the socio-economic aspects of offshore development. That petition is from residents of Saanichton and Victoria on Vancouver Island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair is informed the Hon. Member has already been recognized for petitions today and the practice of the House will not be to recognize an Hon. Member twice on the same day for a group of petitions.

Mr. Nielsen: New ground being broken.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt but this is the practice that Madam Speaker indicated would be followed. If there are other Hon. Members rising to introduce—

Mr. Benjamin: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the Chair announced earlier this day that only one Member would be recognized to present petitions. That was after a number of Hon. Members had been recognized.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The ruling of the Chair is that a Member will be given an opportunity once in a particular day's sitting to present petitions. Are there other Hon. Members—

Mr. Benjamin: Point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please sit down? That is a ruling of the Chair. Are there other Hon. Members seeking to be recognized for petitions? The Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong).

Mr. Benjamin: Point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is seeking to reflect on a judgment of the Chair. I call to his attention that this is not permitted. The Hon. Member for Regina East.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, the Chair informed the House that it would only recognize—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please sit down? The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Regina East.

Mr. Benjamin: Another point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: He may have a new point of order. He might.

Mr. Benjamin: Point of order. I know, with all due respect, that the Chair would never countenance or take part in changing the rules in the middle of a procedure.

Mr. Axworthy: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is reflecting on a judgment of the Chair.

Mr. Benjamin: Exactly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: He has repeatedly done this.

Mr. Benjamin: Exactly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair does not feel obligated in the circumstances to recognize him again on the same point of order on which a ruling has been made. The Chair now recognizes the Hon. Member for Regina East.

If the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has an observation, the Chair is always prepared to listen. But the Chair is asking in the circumstances if the Hon. Member for Regina East can be recognized. The Hon. Member for Yukon wishes to be recognized.

Mr. Nielsen: The only observation I have to make, and I do not want to appear to be bailing out the NDP, is that I did not hear enough of the point of order of the Hon. Member for Regina West, even though it is not my responsibility to do so. I heard one sentence. It may well be that he is going to get into an area reflecting on the judgment of the Chair and the Chair at that point would be quite correct in curbing it. But I can think of a point of order he could raise legitimately—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member for Yukon, we cannot deal in hypothetical situations.

Mr. Nielsen: Let us hear it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon is an experienced Parliamentarian, and the Hon. Member for Regina East has been recognized for the purpose of petitions.

Mr. Nielsen: He has a point of order we have not heard, for heaven's sake.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Four times we have heard it.

MR. DE JONG—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from people in and around the Swift Current area. It is addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan proposed by the NDP.

We, the undersigned, urge the Parliament of Canada to immediately adopt its provisions in order that the Crowsnest Pass freight rates may be maintained and the railways of Canada may be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transport system.

MR. DE JONG—REMOVAL OF OAKALLA CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Burnaby, British Columbia, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted rights thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the Government of British Columbia has in the past assured citizens of Burnaby that all prisons in the Oakalla lands would be phased out. They feel that these buildings have outlived their usefulness and are not compatible with the abutting park land uses. Burnaby Municipal Council has expressed a desire that this facility be phased out.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to urge the Province of British Columbia to undertake no further construction of prison facilities on the Oakalla lands and ensure the early removal of the Oakalla correctional facilities. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the constituency of Burnaby, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth—

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can get some guidance from you as to the accepted pronunciation and customs of the House. Mr. Speaker, is it "showeth" or "sheweth"?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member, as a Member of this institution, will surely be well aware of the proper style at this stage, having presented many petitions.

Mr. de Jong: All right, humbly sheweth, but "sheweth" sounds like a shoe.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member will please read his petition as best he can.

Mr. de Jong: It might be my immigrant background.

• (1430)

It is the opinion of your petitioners that successive Liberal budgets impose undue and unfair hardship on low and middle income Canadians and that the budgetary policies of this Government have served to increase the miseries of inflation and unemployment rather than to reduce them; that the budgets failed to reduce interest rates which thereby prohibit an economic recovery and that the citizens of Burnaby wish and need to be consulted about matters of public policy affecting their well-being.

Wherefore we, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to be dissolved in order that a general election may be held immediately. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Parent: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps the Chair could clarify something for me. Is it the understanding of the Chair that all of these petitions have to be read or can they simply be tabled in the House without being read?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Certainly the opportunity is offered for Hon. Members to leave petitions with the Clerk at the Table but the Chair cannot deny Hon. Members who insist upon reading petitions their right to read the petitions. However, if they choose to bear in mind the time of the House and the circumstances and allow their petitions to be placed with a Clerk at the Table, that option is certainly open to them.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. de Jong: It sounds like there is an atheist or some such creature over there.

An Hon. Member: It takes one to know one.

Mr. de Jong: Is that a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: At this point the Hon. Member is dealing with petitions. Would he care to proceed with the petitions that he is presenting?

TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that I wish to present to the House and to Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Town of Elrose in the Province of Saskatchewan, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the Cruise missile should not be tested in Canada and call on the Government to refuse to test the Cruise in northern Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since Elrose, Saskatchewan, is my home town, I wonder if the Hon. Member could tell me how many people signed that petition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member can merely present his petition at this point. If he chooses to indicate the petitioners' communities, it has been recognized that he can do so and he can also roughly indicate the number of signatures. However, at this stage there is no exchange or questions permitted, nor is examination of contents permitted.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I will continue reading my petitions. I suggest to the Hon. Member that he should go back to Elrose sometime and visit his own constituency a bit more often.

Mr. Speaker, I do have another petition addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) presented to the United Nations in 1978 a strategy for nuclear suffocation and that the testing of the new Cruise missile in Canada is inconsistent with this strategy and that Canada's NATO partners, Belgium and The Netherlands, have refused to have Cruise missiles deployed on their soil.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that this morning, Madam Speaker and yourself pointed out to the Hon. Member, who is a good friend of mine, that he should not be reading and giving us facts. He is still doing that, and although I find it very interesting, it is not what should take place at this time. He is supposed to read the title and to give the prayer—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The point of the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) is well taken. I shall quote from *Hansard* of April 12, 1973, the remarks of the previous Speaker of the House:

> Order, please. The Hon. Member knows that under the terms of the Standing Order he can only lay the petition on the table and not make a speech or present argument in support of the petition.

I call that passage to the attention of the Hon. Member.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on that same point of order. I am glad you limited the ruling to that extent because I do not think it need be denied that the nature and the purpose of the petition may be stated in its delivery.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) will recognize that the Chair has permitted this, but I think the Hon. Member for Yukon will also recognize that the Hon. Member who is presently on his feet is going a little beyond the scope which is normally permitted.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish to apologize to you and to the House if I am breaking any rules or straying from the—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member will please read his petitions.

Mr. de Jong: Wherefore we, the undersigned, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to request the Prime Minister to refuse to allow the testing of this new generation of weapons on Canadian soil. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—OFFSHORE OIL EXPLORATION

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition which is mainly from residents of Vernon, British Columbia, and it is addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of British Columbia and other Provinces, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth—and I will try to make this brief, Mr. Speaker—that the oil companies, particularly Chevron, are considering a resumption of offshore explorations, that the federal Government is considering lifting the moratorium on offshore explorations, and that any future benefits to British Columbia are in question because of the federal Government's new energy legislation.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that there will be full and complete public hearings into the supply and demand for the energy and the socio-economic and environmental aspects of offshore development before the moratorium is lifted. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that I wish to introduce to the House. It is a petition that is mainly from people who live in and around the Swift Current area. We, the undersigned, have carefully considered some of the alternatives proposed by the Pepin-Gilson Report and we urge the Parliament of Canada to immediately adopt some provisions other than the Pepin-Gilson provisions in order that the Crowsnest Pass freight rate agreement may be maintained and to ensure that the railways of all of Canada may be upgraded.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to retain the Crowsnest Pass freight rate agreement.

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has considerable misgivings concerning points of order during the presentation of petitions. If the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) has a point of order, the Chair is prepared to hear it. However, it is very difficult to conceive of a point of order under these circumstances.

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to enter into debate or to cause problems. I simply want to make a correction. I understood the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) to say that he was presenting a petition from Melrose, Saskatchewan. I come from—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, he is not making a point of order. The Hon. Member for Regina East.

● (1440)

MR. DE JONG—EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that I wish to introduce to the House. It is addressed to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that whereas the number of unemployment people in Canada far exceeds the present demand for workers and the number of people whose Unemployment Insurance benefits become exhausted each month and who are subsequently forced to exist on inadequate welfare benefits is a national disgrace, therefore we, the undersigned petitioners, call on the Government of Canada to extend the length of payments of Unemployment Insurance benefits to those who qualify for major claims by a further 52 weeks.

MR. DE JONG—STUDENT LOANS

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that whereas under present regulations people who are graduating from or leaving post-secondary educational institutions and who have taken out Canada student loans are required to begin paying back those loans within six months of leaving full-time study, and whereas with the present and projected level of unemployment at such a high rate many students find themselves without employment and in severe financial hardship for extended periods after leaving school, therefore we, the undersigned petitioners, humbly pray that the Government of Canada amend the Canada Student Loans Act to extend this grace period to 18 months.

MR. DE JONG—CALL FOR AMENDMENT OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition that I wish to present to the House. It is addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that whereas under present regulations Unemployment Insurance benefits are paid on the basis of 60 per cent of the recipients' insurable earnings, and whereas this regulation severely hampers the ability of lower paid workers to maintain a reasonable standard of living during their term of unemployment, we, the undersigned petitioners, call on the Government of Canada to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act to allow benefits of 90 per cent of insurable earnings up to the current maximum to be paid to recipients. Most of the petitioners are from the Province of Ontario.

MR. DE JONG—SALMONID ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition which is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that whereas the continued existence of the salmon fishing industry on the West Coast of Canada is dependent upon the revitalization of the stocks, and whereas the Salmonid Enhancement Program has shown to be a viable vehicle for accomplishing this objective, therefore we the undersigned, your petitioners, call on the Government of Canada to continue and increase funding for the Salmonid Enhancement Program.

MR. DE JONG—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition I wish to present to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Town of Govan in the Province of Saskatchewan, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that, no way, it is our country and not theirs. If they must, let them foul their own nest. We call on the Government of Canada to refuse to test the Cruise. And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—WEST COAST FISHERIES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that whereas there are a substantial number of vessels, both domestic and foreign, fishing the waters off the West Coast of Canada without the presence of Department of Fisheries and Oceans observers to monitor their catches, and whereas it is essential to the health of the fishing industry in Canada that commercial stocks be closely monitored, therefore we the undersigned, your petitioners, call on the Government of Canada to provide adequate funding to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and to ensure the implementation of an observer program for West Coast fisheries.

MR. DE JONG—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition I wish to present to the House of Common in Parliament assembled, mainly from petitioners in and around Swift Current, Saskatchewan, who have carefully considered the alternative plan of the Pepin-Gilson Report concerning the Crow's Nest Pass Freight Rate Agreement. They urge that the Parliament of Canada immediately adopt its provisions in order that the Crowsnest Pass freight rate may be maintained and ensure that all the railways of Canada may be upgraded and developed to modern and efficient transportation for the benefit of the whole country.

MR. DE JONG—NANOOSE BAY NAVAL BASE

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by the residents of Canada to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that whereas the Minister of Defence has indicated that he does not know whether or not submarines frequenting the U.S. naval base at Nanoose Bay, British Columbia, are equipped with nuclear arms, therefore we the undersigned, your petitioners, call on the Government of Canada to insist to the Government of the United States that it remove and prohibit any further use of this base by submarines which are nuclear powered or contain nuclear weapons. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—DEPLOYMENT OF SS-20 MISSILES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that whereas the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has complained that Canadians have not been vocal in criticizing the deployment of SS-20 missiles by the Soviet Union, and whereas the Prime Minister is the chief elected spokesperson for Canadians, therefore we the undersigned, your petitioners, call upon the Government of Canada to instruct the Prime Minister to condemn on behalf of Canadians the deployment of those missiles. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—U.S. INTERFERENCE IN EL SALVADOR

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now

exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that whereas the Government of the United States continues to support financially the daily murders and repression in El Salvador, therefore we the undersigned, your petitioners, call upon the Government of Canada to demand in the strongest possible terms that the United States cease its interference in the affairs of El Salvador. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—STUDENT LOANS

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition I wish to introduce in the House. It is addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that under the present regulations people graduating from post-secondary educational institutions and who have taken out Canada student loans are required to begin paying back those loans within six months of leaving the full-time studies.

● (1450)

I wish to withdraw this petition, Mr. Speaker. I believe I have already introduced it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That seems a reasonable ground. Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to withdraw his petition?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Petition withdrawn.

MR. DE JONG—HOME OWNERSHIP STIMULATION PLAN

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have another petition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Has the Hon. Member checked that this petition has not already been introduced?

Mr. de Jong: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I apologize, and I will take special care to make certain that I do not duplicate my petitions to you this afternoon.

This petition is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The Government of Canada in its budget of April 19, 1983 made a commitment to extend funding for the Canadian Home Ownership Stimulation Plan until May 1, 1983. An increase in activity in the housing construction industry is of great importance to economic recovery in Canada and in particular to British Columbia.

We, the undersigned petitioners, call upon the Government of Canada to consider further extensions to this program. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—U.S. INTERFERENCE IN NICARAGUA

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition I wish to introduce. It is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, mainly living in the City of Ottawa, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the Government of the United States has cut back drastically on imports from, has refused foreign aid loans to, and has continued to financially support and anti-Government guerilla army in Nicaragua.

Wherefore the undersigned petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to demand in the strongest possible terms that the United States cease its campaign to undermine the Government and the economy of Nicaragua. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—JOB-CREATION PROGRAM WAGES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce another petition. This petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise the right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that whereas wage restrictions in the various government job-creation programs have not increased in relation to the increasing cost of living, and whereas these wages are far too low to support even a small family in any reasonable manner, we the undersigned petitioners call upon the Government of Canada to increase the wage allowance that is paid to workers on job-creation programs in order to reflect the increased cost of living. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

This is like signing my Christmas cards, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member will confine himself to reading petitions.

MR. DE JONG—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, a petition signed by the residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to prevent a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternate plan presented by the New Democratic Party and that the Crow rate must be maintained and that the railways of all Canada must be upgraded and developed into a most modern and efficient transportation system serving everybody.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternate plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass Freight Rate Agreement. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—CALL FOR AMENDMENT OF BROADCASTING ACT

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned constituents of the riding of Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain, Province of Saskatchewan, and other concerned citizens, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission television broadcasting regulations do not extend to women the same protection against abusive comment or abusive pictorial representation as now exists for racial and religious groups; that the concerns of citizens have been recently heightened not only by the so-called adult programming on pay-TV but also by the proliferation of pornography in various media; that the degradation and exploitation of women, children and men through pornography is abhorrent to all people; that the Minister of Communications has been willing to empower the CRTC to regulate broadcasting to ensure Canadian content but has yet to intervene to ensure the protection of women against abuse. It is Parliament's responsibility as provided for in the Broadcasting Act to strengthen, enrich and safeguard the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to demonstrate its opposition to the denigration of women by enacting an Act to amend the Broadcasting Act as introduced by the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Miss McDonald) on March 8, 1983. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Parent: Send some over here and I will do some for you.

An Hon. Member: The Libs want in on the action.

Mr. Benjamin: Why don't you do your own?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

MR. DE JONG—OFFSHORE OIL EXPLORATION

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): I wish to introduce a petition to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that oil companies, particularly Chevron Canada, are considering a resumption of offshore exploration for oil and gas on the West Coast, that the federal Government is considering lifting the moratorium on offshore exploration on the West Coast and that any further benefits to British Columbia are in question because of the federal Government's new energy legislation.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament for full and complete public hearings into the supply and demand for the energy and the socio-economic and environmental aspects of offshore development before the moratorium is lifted. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. DE JONG—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have one more petition I wish to introduce to the House today. It is a petition mainly from residents of the Town of Cupar, Province of Saskatchewan, who now exercise their right to present a grievance and humbly sheweth that it is time their feelings be known about this important issue, that they do not agree to having the United States of America test the Cruise missile in Canada, and they call upon the Government of Canada to refuse to test the Cruise. And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

MR. SKELLY—CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour today to present a petition which has been produced and addressed to the House of Commons. It is to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your Honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. They indicate that thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of industrial benefits are not accruing to Canadians because Canada lacks a marine industrial strategy; that the federal Government has by and large failed to enact or implement a coherent Canadian marine industrial policy, although it promised to do so over a number of years; and that economic growth in Canada and the wellbeing of the country are in jeopardy because of Government inaction. Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that the Government be encouraged immediately to implement a sensible and effective marine industrial policy which will result in the creation of a Canadian merchant marine and the expansion of Canadian shipbuilding industries. I have the honour to present this petition which was signed by individuals from Toronto, Peterborough, Thorold and numerous other locations in southern Ontario.

● (1500)

Mr. McDermid: You have never been there.

Mr. Skelly: On the contrary.

MR. SKELLY—PORNOGRAPHY—CALL FOR AMENDMENT OF BROADCASTING ACT

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, also I have the honour to present a second petition which is addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned constituents of the ridings of Broadview-Greenwood and Spadina in the Province of Ontario and other concerned citizens, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus

to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the CRTC television broadcasting regulations do not extend to women the same type of protection against abusive comment or abusive pictorial representation as now exists for racial and religious groups, that the concerns of citizens have been recently heightened not only by the so-called adult programming on pay television but also by the proliferation of pornography in various media, that the degradation and exploitation of women, children and men through pornography is abhorrent to all people, that the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) has been willing to empower the CRTC to regulate broadcasting to ensure Canadian content but has yet to intervene to ensure the protection of women against abuse, and that it is this Parliament's responsibility as provided for in the Broadcasting Act to strengthen, enrich and safeguard the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to demonstrate its opposition to the degradation of women by enacting an Act to amend the Broadcasting Act, as introduced by the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald) on March 8, 1983. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. Of course this was signed by numerous residents of Toronto.

CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a third petition from numerous residents of the Province of British Columbia, representing the communities of Victoria, Steveston, Richmond and Vancouver. Their petition is addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial benefits are not accruing to Canadians because the Government has failed to implement a comprehensive and effective marine industrial strategy, that it has failed to enact the appropriate legislation to ensure that offshore oil and gas development benefits will accrue to Canadian industry and Canadian workers, and that Canada's economic growth is in serious jeopardy because of Government inaction in this very vital area.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to encourage the Government to implement immediately a sensible and effective marine industrial policy which will result in the creation of a Canadian merchant marine and the expansion of Canadian shipbuilding and allied industries. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition to present on a related topic. It is somewhat similar. It expresses very serious concerns. It is addressed to the—

[*Translation*]

—the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled.

The petition of the undersigned citizens of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a common grievance, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that Canadians have been deprived of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial spin-offs because we have no industrial maritime strategy and the federal Government has neglected to provide Canada with a consistent maritime policy, although more than two years ago it promised to announce such a policy, and that the Government's action is endangering Canada's economic growth. Therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government be asked to adopt forthwith a consistent and effective maritime policy, resulting in the creation of a Canadian merchant marine and expansion of the Canadian shipping industry and related sectors. As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

[*English*]

This petition is signed by numerous residents of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present another petition of a similar nature. As a result of the very vigorous efforts of members of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Transport and General Workers who sought to present this petition in the Parliament of Canada, signatures have been obtained from residents of Elmira, Kitchener, St. Catharines and Waterloo, in the Province of Ontario. Essentially their petition is to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that because of a very serious omission in the development of a Canadian marine industrial strategy, Canadians are now losing thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in possible benefits; that the federal Government has failed to take the initiative to implement a coherent Canadian marine industrial policy, although such a policy was promised more than two years ago; and that this country's economic growth is being jeopardized because of inaction.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to encourage immediately the Government to implement an effective Canadian marine industrial policy which would see the creation of a Canadian merchant fleet and the expansion of Canadian shipbuilding and allied industries. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

● (1510)

Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition which comes from the riding of a colleague in the House, North Vancouver. A large number of people have signed this petition. It is addressed to

the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. They are very concerned about the nature of shipbuilding and allied industries on the West Coast of Canada. They have made their thoughts known through the petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that billions of dollars in industrial benefits are not accruing to Canadians because Canada lacks a comprehensive marine industrial strategy, with the result that thousands of jobs are being lost to Asia and Europe by the failure to implement this strategy and that the federal Government neglected to implement such a coherent policy is, therefore, deliberately aiding and abetting in the loss of employment and economic opportunities in this vital sector and the economic growth and wellbeing of this country is in serious jeopardy because of the Government's inaction.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to enact soon the legislation required to implement a Canadian marine industrial policy and to develop a Canadian merchant fleet. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

It is probably relevant to pray now that the Gallup poll shows our colleagues to be at 62 per cent. The intervention may be worthwhile. We should probably pray together.

Mr. Speaker, I want to present another petition from the Province of Quebec. This petition has been gathered by the Syndicat international des marins du Canada.

[*Translation*]

To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned citizens of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a common grievance, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy.

Humbly sheweth that:

Canadians have been deprived of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial spin-offs because we have no industrial maritime strategy and the federal Government has neglected to provide Canada with a consistent maritime policy, although more than two years ago it promised to announce such a policy, and that the Government's action is endangering Canada's economic growth.

Therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government be asked to adopt forthwith a consistent and effective maritime policy, resulting in the creation of a Canadian merchant marine and the expansion of the Canadian shipping industry and related sectors.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

[*English*]

This is signed by numerous individuals in the Province of Quebec in many of the communities which depend upon shipbuilding and the allied industries for their basic livelihood. I would put my signature on and submit this for the consideration of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to present another petition from residents of Burnaby, B.C., who have put forward this petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada and Parliament assembled in the hope that Parliament will give consideration to the matter which they have raised. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that throughout Canada on the East Coast, along the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes and on the West Coast of Canada, and in the North along the MacKenzie delta, there have been thousands of jobs lost and billions of dollars of industrial benefits forgone. They have not accrued to Canadians because Canada lacks a coherent and effective marine industrial strategy. Canada's economic growth and wellbeing is jeopardized because of the Government's inaction in this area.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government be encouraged to implement immediately a sensible, effective and direct marine policy that will result in the creation of a Canadian merchant fleet and the expansion of the Canadian shipbuilding and allied industries. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. As I mentioned before, this is signed by numerous residents of Burnaby, B.C.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour once again to present a petition which has been gathered by the longshoremen's union. They have obtained many signatures of residents of the communities of Vancouver and Burnaby, British Columbia, and many areas in the Lower Mainland where marine activities associated with port facilities are of serious concern to these people. They have indicated that they are addressing their petition to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial benefits are lost to Canada each year because Canada lacks an intelligent marine industrial strategy and that the federal Government for many years have neglected to develop and implement a coherent marine industrial strategy, even though that promise was made to the Canadian people many years ago, that Canada's economic growth and wellbeing are in serious jeopardy because of the Government's inaction.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government will immediately implement a sensible and effective marine policy that will result in Canada having a merchant fleet and expanded facilities for shipbuilding and allied industries. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Petitions

● (1520)

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by the residents of the communities of New Westminster, Nanaimo, Vancouver. I am looking for one from Rosemond, Alberta, but there does not seem to be one here. Certainly communities such as Richmond and Delta are represented, and so is North Vancouver once again. There are very large populations and areas which are dependent upon the ocean and marine activities for their way of life. They have addressed their petition to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial benefits are not accruing to Canadians because we lack a coherent and effective marine industrial strategy and that the federal Government has neglected to implement a coherent Canadian marine policy although it promised to do so. Canada's economic growth and wellbeing is in jeopardy because of the Government's inaction.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament that the Government be encouraged immediately to implement a sensible, effective, direct marine industrial policy that will result in the creation of a Canadian merchant marine and the expansion of Canadian shipbuilding and allied industries. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

This is an expression of very serious concern from the residents of Langley, British Columbia, Richmond, Vancouver, Surrey, Delta and New Westminster.

MR. SKELLY—APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN TO THE BENCH

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to introduce another petition. This is an expression of concern by many residents of Ontario. They have addressed their petition to the Honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that only 3.7 per cent of judicial appointments in the past year were awarded to women, that recent judicial decisions such as the Leatherdale and Brown point to a desperate need for a more balanced perpective on the bench. Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to get cracking and to guarantee that all subsequent federal judicial appointments adhere strictly to the affirmative action program whereby as vacancies on the bench develop women and men will be appointed on an alternating basis. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. This is a very serious expression of concern that Parliament should address very quickly.

MR. SKELLY—CALL FOR ABOLITION OF SENATE

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to introduce to the House the concerns of a number of residents of the Province of Ontario in the city of Ottawa. This petition is addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the Senate has become a retirement haven for political appointees and that the salary paid to Senators is in all probability less than—I cannot make out this word here, but at a time when the old age pensions are limited to six and five, the petition does express some concern about the salary paid to Senators.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to abolish the Senate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

This is the sincere expression of concern of many residents of the Province of Ontario, and undoubtedly in most Provinces of Canada, and I suspect it would be the majority.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)): The Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) on a point of order.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago one of the Members raised the point of how you pronouce "sheweth". As an old, old schoolteacher, and after having verified by the Oxford Directionary I can say that the proper pronunciation is showeth.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)): It is hardly a point of order, and the Hon. Member for Bow River is not as old as he pretends.

The Hon. Member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Cosgrove) on a point of order.

Mr. Cosgrove: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as I have the honour of serving as the joint chairman for the Joint Committee on Senate Reform, I would like to have the opportunity, with your concurrence, to receive a copy of the last petition introduced. This Committee has been seeking the opinion of the public, and we have sought opinions from coast to coast, on the subject of Senate reform. We would be very pleased to have a copy to consider the thrust of whatever body of opinion there is in support of the petition last filed with the Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)): The Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River on a point of order.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite disappointing that the Committee would continue to seek opinion when probably the solution is self-evident and the institution should have been abolished years ago.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)): The Hon. Member for York-Scarborough (Mr. Cosgrove) can,

upon directing a request to the Table, obtain a copy of that particular petition.

Mr. Skelly: One further point of order, Mr. Speaker. It pertains to the previous comment by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). Certainly I concur with the Chair that the age is certainly overestimated and some of the ideas come out of the—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)): The Hon. Member is beginning to be facetious. The Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River had the floor.

The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme).

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. PRUD'HOMME—SIGNATURES ON PETITIONS

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to direct my observation to one Member in particular. Out of curiosity and for my own enlightenment I have read some of the petitions being presented to the House. I intend to make a further study of most of these petitions over the weekend, but I would like to remind Hon. Members of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, at page 257, Citation 334 (1). I will read it because I think you will see exactly where I am leading. It reads:

A petition must have original signatures or marks, and not copies from the orignal—

I attract your attention to the following, Mr. Speaker.

—nor signatures of agents on behalf of others, except in case of incapacity by sickness;

Mr. Speaker, prima facie I am under the impression, having rapidly read a couple of them, that some of the petitions have been signed by the same people. I will double check that, but I would just like to remind Hon. Members that if such was the case it would be totally unacceptable to receive these petitions if they have been signed by one person with the same ink, with the same handwriting. This is against the rule, to say the least. I will say more on Monday, or next week, but I would like to remind Members of Citation 334 of Beauchesne, where it is absolutely clear that each signature must be made by each individual person.

● (1530)

Mr. Mayer: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me what is going on here today is simply the presentation of petitions. Surely, after they are presented, Mr. Speaker, and sent to the Table, it is then up to the Table officers and the Speaker to rule whether they are in order to be received by the House. I believe the concern which the Hon. Member is raising is already looked after, in fact, after the petitions are presented.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. Each day the Chair announces to the House its ruling as

to whether or not a petition is in proper form. It is up to the Chair and its advisers. It is not up to the Hon. Member to decide whether or not there is some kind of prima facie evidence of duplication or same signatures. Surely that is up to the Chair and the Chair's advisers and no one else.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to my good friend in the New Democratic Party, it is not my understanding of the rules. I would like a ruling from the Chair about that, if not today, then at some other time. The Table is only asked to receive petitions and see that they are in the right form. It is not the duty—unless I am convinced otherwise—of the Chair or of the officers at the Table to check if the names are factual or if the names do exist. That is not their duty. Unless, I repeat, I am convinced otherwise by Your Honour, it is not the duty of the officers at the Table to check if the name exists or if it is a duplicate. Their duty is to receive or not to receive petitions and to check them as to their proper form. That is their only duty. It is the duty of the Hon. Member, I contend Mr. Speaker, who presents the petition, to be very careful to make sure that it is acceptable and that there are not two signatures of the same person. That is my point of view and I invite the Chair's comments on the point I am making.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to speak to the point of order with respect to the comments made by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer). He said that what we have here is a simple presentation of petitions. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have here a total hijacking of Parliament. The Canadian people should be aware that this has nothing to do with the presentation of petitions. It is simply a way of totally wasting the time of this House and the taxpayers' money. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we subject these petitions to the most rigorous test so that the Canadian people will know exactly how Hon. Members opposite are totally destroying this institution.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the point of order raised by the Hon. Member concerning the signing of petitions, very simply, what I said was that what we are going through as far as procedure today is concerned is the presentation of petitions. It is then up to the Chair, as I understand it, to decide whether in fact the petitions were presented in such a fashion as to be found to be in order. In fact, Madam Speaker did find that some of the petitions presented yesterday were out of order. We do not need any lessons or lectures from the Minister of Transport as to what is going on in Parliament when he has to bring in closure to ram through a Bill which affects the Minister's own part of the country. We do not need any lectures from that side on what this Government is doing or is continuing to do to Parliament, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. Although a debate which is based on points of order made on the subject of the legislation which would be before the House on some other day may be more interesting than petitions, nevertheless I do not believe the Chair is in a position to allow the debate to take place, based on points of order.

Mr. Axworthy: At least it makes a change.

Mr. Taylor: Why did you sneak it in on Private Members' day? It was a dirty trick.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Some Hon. Members have indicated that at least it is a change. I agree. However, I do not think I should recognize other Hon. Members if what they want to do is to contribute to debate. The point of order is—

[*Translation*]

—a point of order—

[*English*]

—an appeal to the regulations of the House. I will recognize Hon. Members but I would ask them to stay within those limits.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I did not catch what you said at the end, but I would like to say, on the same point of order, that it is not a hijacking of Parliament, and it has been the New Democratic Party—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. What I was attempting to say to all Hon. Members is that a legitimate point of order has been raised as to how petitions are to be seen, how they are to be reviewed, what are the responsibilities of the officers at the Table and the people in the Chair. Those points of order which refer to issues on the Crow Bill or anything of that nature are not legitimate points of order. I would ask Hon. Members to stay within the limit of the matter of petitions and how they are dealt with.

Mr. Anguish: What I intend to address exactly, Mr. Speaker, is the point of order concerning petitions and the form and relevancy of them. First of all, I would like to point out that there is an urgency in presenting petitions because many of the petitions I have received deal with pieces of legislation which are possibly before Parliament. We all know that this session of Parliament is coming to an end very soon and that the Government wants to start a new session. Therefore, these petitions from my own constituents and from constituents all across Canada, which have been sent to us, need to be presented at this time because they will not be relevant after the new session of Parliament begins, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. There is no dispute as to the urgency, in the view of the Hon. Members of the House of Commons or anyone else. The only issue is the form. I might simply indicate that the responsibility of the Chair and of the Table is to establish that any given petition is acceptable in its form. I feel, perhaps, that the issue has been sufficiently ventilated. However, I understand that the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis wants to look further into it. I would reserve his right to do that and to pursue the matter further if he so wishes. No one is disputing whether or not these petitions are urgent.

Mr. Pinard: I rise on a point of order. I just want to confirm very clearly that the order of the day on Monday will be Bill C-155. I mention that now because I feel it is important that the Opposition Members do not find some other pretext on Monday to try to waste the time of the House, like it did yesterday and today, when the Government is attempting to create hundreds of thousands of jobs in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Axworthy: It hurts, does it not?

An Hon. Member: Is that a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Partly.

Mr. Anguish: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the Government is creating hundreds of thousands of jobs I would like to know what it is doing to create these hundreds of thousands of jobs. The way we see the present legislation—

Mr. Axworthy: Order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, you know I have been an Hon. Member of the House for 20 years. That is the reason my approach to this debate is more kind than partisan, in my view. I would just like to remind Hon. Members of the rules. After reading them a little more I am afraid that the rules are much more severe than I expected, even though I thought I knew them well. With all kindness to my colleagues who are at the moment presenting petitions—and I am not singling one out in particular at this time—I reserve my right to look at all petitions which were introduced this week. However, I already have one in my hand which, as I said, prima facie, appears to be signed by the same person for many names.

An Hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Prud'homme: I do not want to say "shame" as my good friend and neighbour did. I would like to remind my colleagues that it is not the duty of the Table officers to check if the names are the same or are a reproduction. It is their duty to receive the petitions.

● (1540)

I will read, without comment at this time, from the Nineteenth Edition of Erskine May, at page 141. The heading is:

Presenting Forged, Falsified or Fabricated Documents to Either House or Committees of Either House.

Mr. Benjamin: You had better put your name on the line here.

Mr. Prud'homme: I am reminding Members—

Mr. Benjamin: Careful.

Mr. Prud'homme: I am more careful than you think.

Mr. Benjamin: Are you accusing anyone?

Mr. Prud'homme: I think you did not listen to me, sir, but if you force me to become partisan, I will.

Mr. Benjamin: You are such a neutral Liberal.

Mr. Prud'homme: I said I will, and if the attitude of the Hon. Member is such, I may become more partisan and do today what I may do on Monday.

Mr. Benjamin: Then you might show up in the House?

Mr. Prud'homme: It says:

> It is a breach of privilege to present or cause to be presented to either House or to committees of either House forged, falsified or fabricated documents with intent to deceive such House or committees or to subscribe the names of other persons or fictitious names to documents intended to be presented to either House or committees of either House, or to be privy to, or cognizant of, such forgery or fraud.
>
> Examples of this kind of contempt are:
>
> Forging signatures to petitions or subscribing fictitious signatures thereto (*Pilkington's Case*, C. J. (*1825*) 445;

There are many other cases cited. I just want to put that on the record. Members should follow what I have just said and be absolutely sure about some of the petitions presented. I did not make an accusation about any Member, I just read from Erskine May. If the Hon. Member wants to come with me, we will examine one petition and he will come to the same conclusion that, *prima facie*, I have doubt on at least one petition. That is all I want to say, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon the Member who just spoke, not any other Member, to present evidence, if he has it, of illegality or forgery or whatever. Until he does that, I invite him to finish reading the whole rule book, all of Beauchesne's and everything else, and he can take up the rest of the afternoon. We will be glad to listen to him.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, as a Member who had the privilege of presenting five petitions yesterday, I just want to make it very clear that I would be really concerned if I put forward a petition not in the proper form. I think a Member has his pride to contend with when he is presenting petitions. I suggest that is the issue, and the Table and Speaker's staff will find out whether the petition is in proper form. I think your own pride as a Member is at stake when you are using the petition process.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely think the point raised by the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) is most serious. What he has said should be examined very carefully. I would like that some of those petitions tabled today be looked at in light of what the Hon. Member has said, because we would like the rules of the House to apply. What he was quoting was a clear indication of what can be and what cannot be done in this place. I have not examined the petitions but he has referred to some existing doctrines and I would like those who examine the petitions to take into serious consideration the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis before next Monday.

Point of Order—Mr. Prud'homme

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair has a difficulty. I have to respond to the point made by the Hon. Member or Saint-Denis by indicating I would be concerned as well if indeed petitions are presented in a manner not consistent with the spirit of parliamentary rules and the purpose of petitions. That could be a fairly serious problem.

I will recognize other Hon. Members on points of order in that regard, but I must say that the Chair can make no decision now because these petitions have not been examined as to whether or not they are in the proper form. That decision will be made probably by Monday.

Mr. McGrath: At the next sitting of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): At the next sitting of the House. But in the interim if there are serious problems with respect to form, perhaps Hon. Members might want to reconsider their presentation of petitions. I am in no position to give decisions one by one on these petitions. They will be done, as the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) has said, probably at the next sitting of the House on Monday, or not later than another day.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, this is a spurious point of order because clearly it is the responsibility of the Chair under our rules to examine petitions as to their proper form, as you just indicated. Quite frankly, I do not believe this is a point of order at all.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I would not want to comment because it is perhaps beyond our capacity at this point to do so, but I do not want the point of order to go by without raising an observation with respect to the procedure now being followed. Those who are watching us can draw no other conclusion than that motives have in fact been imputed, which may or may not have validity. To use the floor of the House of Commons to question another Member seems to me to be quite improper and somewhat outside of our practices, and I wish that practice to be stopped now.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I agree entirely with my deputy House Leader. I find it unfortunate that these kinds of allegations would be made. I know I have had an opportunity to present many petitions, and the practice and right is as ancient and as fundamental to parliamentary democracy as anything else. It is one thing to talk the procedure of presenting petitions, but another thing to talk about the collection process as far as signatures are concerned. I would feel very sad if in fact that is the kind of allegation made. I certainly speak for myself and everyone on our side when I say that in the many times I have had the chance to present petitions, that certainly has not been the case at all.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) has made some points. It is his suggestion that the Table officers take the weekend to consider them. I sought your attention to simply put on record one caution I would like to be exercised. The allegation is that one person has written a number of names. In the name collection

process of petitions I have been involved in, such as the use of metric in auction markets, the petition was thumb-tacked to a bulletin board. I noted that with some frequency people would write Mr. and Mrs. and then the name, perhaps including children's names, all done in one pen and one hand. I think it is one thing to find a person is fabricating names, if that is the contention, but it should be noted that there is sometimes a duplication of names simply because of the close relationship of the people involved who are of the same opinion. They are separate, and I would not want them to be categorized in such a way as to say that one person cannot sign for his spouse or siblings.

Mr. Pinard: Each case would be looked at on its merits.

● (1550)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): At this point, I would ordinarily recognize the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) because of the number of occasions on which he has risen. However, I am not sure whether he is rising on a point of order or whether he is rising on petitions.

Mr. Skelly: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In that case, the Chair will now recognize that Hon. Member on that point of order.

There are a great many other Members who are rising on points of order. I leave it to each individual Hon. Member to decide whether the subject has been aired sufficiently or whether they wish to continue this particular point of order.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to lay this question to rest. The petition sheet, on which this issue was called into question, contains some 30 additional pages of a petition that was circulated in the newspapers and mailed back. Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, these are tabled—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I do want to try to contain the debate on this point of order. The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis did not raise an objection, and he specifically so indicated, against any one particular petition.

Mr. Skelly: Then, Mr. Speaker, he does not have a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In that case, I think it is out of order to refer to an argument on any one given petition.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, do we really have a point of order before us? The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) stood up in the House and gave notice of an admonition to the House, but he did not in fact in my opinion raise a valid point of order.

An Hon. Member: It was a broad brush smear.

Mr. Skelly: It was not a broad brush smear. He certainly expressed some concerns, but I am not certain that those concerns might exist other than his indicating that he had some evidence that he might wish to raise on Monday. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that we do have a point of order before us until the Hon. Member makes some kind of a specific accusation in the House. I think you should dispense with it, Mr. Speaker, and move on. I think that your original thoughts on this matter were probably the best for the direction of the House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I thank the Hon. Member for the compliment but I cannot refuse to see another Hon. Member on a point of order.

Mr. Thacker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme). I think it is appropriate to note that the vast majority of petitions are from people in western Canada. That is no accident because it flows out of what so many people in western Canada do say in response to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy). It is when the House is sitting that the West is being oppressed and attacked, whether it is by the National Energy Program, the Crow—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member is entering into debate. A small voice in my ear indicated that I ought to correct myself about not being able to refuse to recognize Hon. Members on points of order. Of course it is possible that at some point the Chair may have to declare that there is an end to hearing points of order.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two comments with respect to petitions. First, if anyone decided to write a petition and one person signed it on behalf of many others, that would be a complete fraud.

The second point I wish to make is that I see some petitions signed in front of me, but hundreds and thousands of them come through the mail. There is no way that I can swear an affidavit that any one particular person signed that petition. However, I have to give some credence to the credibility of the people of the country. They are not illiterate. They will not sign a petition unless they believe in what it calls for. It is an ancient right of the people to present a petition to their Parliament through their representatives. I do not think Hon. Members of the House should be questioning that right to sign a petition.

Thousands of these people have signed these petitions. They are very concerned. They are so concerned that they sign petitions and send them to their Members, many times even putting stamps on the letters. I think we should accept these petitions for what they are, and I wish the Government would realize that these petitions mean something. The Government should try to reflect the thinking of the people, as indicated by these petitions.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I think a very important point was raised by the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme), and although it did not deal with a petition that I had tabled, I did go with him to look at the prima facie evidence that he alluded to in his point of order.

I think it is important that Hon. Members of the House know just what it was the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis was talking about. It was a petition provided to the Members of the House by the Seafarers' International Union and it is clear on the surface, at least to the eyes of the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis and to my eyes as well, that the same hand put a number of signatures and addresses on the petition. However, I do not think it is for us as individual Members or for the Chair to decide. Perhaps it is for the Table officers to decide. It may well reflect upon what kind of meeting it was. Perhaps it was a meeting at which a great many handicapped people were present. Perhaps there was some reason why that was done.

I believe that the manner in which the point was raised has cast some doubt in the minds of those people who are watching this as to whether or not some kind of falsified petitions are being put forward. I think it should be clear to all Hon. Members and to the Chair that I went with the Hon. Member from the Government side and looked at the petition. That appears to be the case on that one petition and only for a limited number of names on a very extensive petition, which obviously contains a great many other bona fide signatures.

I do not think the people should feel that some kind of scam is going on whereby petitions are being tabled that have been put together fraudulently or by forgery. I agree with the prima facie point raised by the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis but I do not think that the idea should be left in the House that there are some kind of fraudulent activities going on.

* * *

PETITIONS

MR. SKELLY—CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to have the honour to present 25 pages of petitions all dealing with the same subject sent by the Seafarers' International Union. I believe that these petitions match those for which there is presently concern. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial benefits are not accruing to Canadians because we lack a marine industrial strategy, that the federal Government has neglected to implement a coherent marine industrial policy although over two years ago it promised to develop such a policy, and that Canada's economic growth and wellbeing is in jeopardy because of the Government's inaction.

Therefore your petitioners humbly pray that the Government be encouraged to implement immediately a sensible and effective marine policy that will result in the creation of a Canadian merchant marine and the expansion of Canadian shipbuilding and allied industries. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

These signatures, Mr. Speaker, are those of people from virtually one end of the country to the other. The petition appears in both languages and is signed by numerous people and by thousands of different hands. I think this would probably reassure the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis that this is a bona fide petition and addresses a very sincere and serious concern of thousands and thousands of people in the country. If that will lay his mind to rest, I would offer him the weekend to examine this petition and examine the issue which gave rise to his point of order. I hope that it will help him.

MR. SKELLY—PROVISION OF INFORMATION FREE OF CHARGE

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Moving right along, Mr. Speaker, I again have the honour of presenting another bona fide petition to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the intent of the Freedom of Information Act was to make Government information and files more accessible to the public and that plans to charge outrageous fees for information requests would undermine the spirit of the Act as well as make it inaccessible to less affluent persons.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to provide information under the Freedom of Information Act free of charge. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. SKELLY—SEXUAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present another petition that deals with a very vital and important question. The petition is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that all persons, regardless of sexual orientation, should have the right to employment, housing and social services.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to include sexual orientation in the Canada Human Rights Act and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms as a prohibited ground for discrimination. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

• (1600)

MR. SKELLY—REJECTION OF BOUNDARY AT 49TH PARALLEL

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present another petition which is addressed to the Honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. It is signed by a number of residents of Ottawa in the Province of Ontario.

The petition of the undersigned residents, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain

assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that negotiations between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada in the 19th Century regarding the demarcation of the boundary between Canada and the United States were conducted under duress, and that the boundary fixed at the 49th parallel north of the equator has no force in law, and that the area bounded by the 42nd parallel north of the equator and the 49th parallel north of the equator and west of the continental divide does not legitimately belong to the United States although that country now defines this region as comprising the States of Oregon, Washington and Idaho.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to urge the Government of Canada to unilaterally reject the treaty that fixed the boundary between Canada and the United States at the 49th parallel north of the equator and undertake negotiations with the United States for the return of Oregon, Washington and Idaho according to the norms of international law that were so grievously violated in the nineteenth Century. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. SKELLY—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the present arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union is sheer madness, that Canada should not allow itself to be pressured into following American foreign policy.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to state outright now that Canada will not allow Cruise missile testing over its soil nor the manufacture of any components for the Cruise missile. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. I would like to recommend that petition to the House.

MR. SKELLY—DISCRIMINATION ON POLITICAL GROUNDS

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to introduce a further petition to the House of Commons which all Parties, especially the Government, should consider. It is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that a person's political beliefs should not be used to justify barring a person from housing, employment or social services.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to include political beliefs in the Canadian Human Rights Act and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms as a prohibited ground for discrimination. As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. SKELLY—CALL FOR SALARY INCREASES FOR MP'S STAFFS

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, the petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that, whereas the salary budget for staff of Members of Parliament is frozen until August 3, 1984, under the six and five program, and that MP's were not informed of the freeze until well into the first year of the program, and that as a result most MP's staffs will not receive any salary increases during 1983 and most of 1984, therefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to increase salaries of staffs of Members of Parliament so that these employees are able to meet the financial arrangements they entered into based on salary increases MP's and staff were led to expect. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. This is signed by a number of residents of the Province of Ontario.

MR. SKELLY—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition which is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the western Canadian farmers paid $131 million to move export grain under the Crow freight rate in the 1981-82 crop years. This grain, in turn, contributed $6.3 billion to the balance of trade. The undersigned believe that this is the farmers' fair contribution to the Canadian economy and that western farmers will pay one times Crow, no charge.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory Crow grain freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

This is signed by numerous individuals from across the Province of Saskatchewan, and in order to reassure the Hon. Member for St. Denis (Mr. Prud'homme), let me say that, to the best of my knowledge, the signatures are all different.

MR. SKELLY—OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to present another petition on a matter of vital concern to residents on the West Coast of Canada. It is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that oil companies, particularly Chevron of Canada, are considering a resumption of offshore exploration of oil and gas on the West Coast. The Federal Government is considering lifting the moratorium on offshore oil exploration on the West Coast that has existed there for many, many years, and

any future benefits to British Columbia are in serious question because of the federal Government's new energy legislation. There are obvious dangers to the environment which will affect the basis of the economy of the West Coast and the fishing industry.

• (1610)

Therefore, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament that there be full and complete public hearings into the supply and demand for energy and the socioeconomic and environmental aspects of offshore development before this moratorium is lifted, and in duty bound your petitioners ever pray.

This petition was also signed by numerous people with different hands from the communities of Half Moon Bay, Seashelt, British Columbia, Gibsons, North Vancouver and downtown Ladysmith.

MR. SKELLY—PROPERTY RIGHTS

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that inclusion of enjoyment of property in the Charter of Rights would have a serious implication for environmental rights, Indian land claims, workers' rights, etc.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to ensure full consideration of property rights, both in the House and in the Justice Committee, and to allow the public the broadest opportunity for input, and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

That is a very sound recommendation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SKELLY—CALL FOR INCREASE IN OLD AGE PENSION

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition which is addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the application of the six and five program to old age pensions is obscene in that it hits out at our elderly citizens, many of whom can barely subsist on existing pensions.

Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament not to limit old age pensions to six and five, and instead to increase old age pensions to a minimum of 50 per cent of the average industrial wage. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. SKELLY—DECLARATION OF CANADA AS A NUCLEAR WEAPONS-FREE ZONE

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present another petition to the House of Commons. It is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present their grievance, humbly sheweth that the present escalation of the military buildup by both the United States and the Soviet Union constitutes a no-win situation while draining public funds from social programs and job creation.

We, therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to declare Canada a nuclear weapons-free zone, and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. SKELLY—CALL FOR INCREASE IN FAMILY ALLOWANCES

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the Honour to present another petition. It is addressed to the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the application of the six and five program to the family allowance program undermines the principle of universality and hits hardest at those who can least afford it.

Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament not to limit the family allowance to six and five and instead to re-establish the original base for the program and to make retroactive compensation payments to Canadian families. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

This petition is signed by a number of residents of the Province of Ontario.

MR. SKELLY—UNIONIZATION OF PARLIAMENT HILL EMPLOYEES

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition addressed to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the existing denial of the right to unionize by all Parliament Hill employees contravenes the spirit and intent of the Canadian Charter of Rights and offends against our democratic sensibilities. Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to extend to all Parliament Hill employees the right to organize and the right to collective bargaining. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

That petition is signed by a number of residents of Ontario.

Petitions

MR. SKELLY—REVISION OF CONTEMPT OF COURT PROVISIONS

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition. It is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present their grievance, humbly sheweth that the existing contempt of court provisions are anachronistic, and that the greater role to be assumed by the judiciary under the Charter of Rights underlines the need for the public to have confidence in the judicial system.

Wherefore the undersigned your petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to revise contempt of court laws in the next Parliament, and in the process to allow the public to make representations on the matter. And as in duty bound your petitioners ever pray.

MR. SKELLY—ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH ISLAND-POWELL RIVER

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition of very serious concern to residents of Gibsons, British Columbia, Langdale, British Columbia—the sunshine coast. The petition is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the recommendations of the Electoral Boundaries Commission of British Columbia are that the area of the Sechelt Peninsula be placed in the electoral district of Capilano-Howe Sound; that the residents of the Sechelt Peninsula share a common interest with the residents of the proposed electoral district of North Island-Powell River by reasons of geographical boundaries and by communities of interest, including common transportation concerns and a common economic base; that the residents of the Sechelt Peninsula have very little community of interest with the residents of the electoral district of Capilano-Howe Sound, that electoral district being principally an urban one; and that the inclusion of the Sechelt Peninsula in the electoral district of North Island-Powell River will not create an imbalance of population.

● (1620)

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the House of Commons will recommend to the Electoral Boundaries Commission of British Columbia that the residents of the Sechelt Peninsula remain within the electoral district of North Island-Powell River. As I pointed out, this was signed by a number of people from the Sechelt Peninsula.

CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present a petition addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition is from a number of residents of North Surrey and Vancouver, British Columbia.

Mr. Friesen: Bob Wenman would not like that.

Mr. Skelly: Maybe they feel that another presentation is required. At any rate, the petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of industrial benefits are not accruing to Canadians because they lack an industrial strategy, that the Government has neglected to implement a coherent industrial strategy although it promised many times in the past to do so, and that Canada's economic growth and wellbeing is being jeopardized by Government inaction.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government be encouraged to implement immediately a sensible and effective marine industrial policy which will result in the creation of a Canadian merchant fleet and the expansion of Canadian shipbuilding and allied industries.

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present another petition signed by individuals from Oshawa, St. Catharines, Scarborough, Downsview, Bellechasse and Montreal. This petition deals with the topic of a sensible and effective marine industrial strategy for Canada. It is addressed to—

[*Translation*]

—to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned citizens of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a common grievance, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy.

Humbly sheweth that:

Canadians have been deprived of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial spin-offs because we have no industrial marine strategy and the federal Government has neglected to provide Canada with a consistent maritime policy, although more than two years ago it promised to announce such a policy, and that the Government's inaction is endangering Canada's economic growth.

Therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government be asked to adopt forthwith a consistent and effective maritime policy, resulting in the creation of a Canadian merchant marine and the expansion of the Canadian shipping industry and related sectors.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present a further petition, addressed to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to

your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that because of the lack of a marine industrial strategy, Canadians are subject to substantial unemployment and tremendous loss of industrial spin-off benefits to Asian and European countries; that the federal Government over a number of years has failed to implement an effective Canadian marine industrial policy, although there was a solid commitment for years and years to do so; and that it is obvious Canadian economic growth and development has been severely harmed by Government inaction in this area.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government move quickly to implement the effective development of a Canadian merchant fleet and the expansion of Canadian shipbuilding and allied industries. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of being invited to present a petition which is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. It contains a substantial number of signatures of citizens of Lakeshore Road, Toronto and Mississauga, in the Province of Ontario, which appear to be in order. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial benefits are being lost each year to Canadians because the Government of Canada has failed to develop a Canadian marine industrial program, that the federal Government failed over many years to develop a coherent Canadian marine policy although it promised to do so, and that the Canadian economy has been harmed because of Government inaction.

● (1630)

Therefore your petitioners humbly pray that the Government be encouraged immediately to implement a sensible and effective marine policy that will result in the creation of a Canadian merchant fleet and the expansion of Canadian shipbuilding facilities and allied industries in Canada. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

[*English*]

MR. SKELLY—ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NORTH ISLAND-POWELL RIVER

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition addressed to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. This petition is presented by a number of residents in the community of Grantham Landing, British Columbia. The petition basically recommends to the House of Commons that the Electoral Boundaries Commission of British Columbia take into consideration the fact that the Sechelt Peninsula has a large number of common interests with the proposed electoral area of North Island-Powell River. The petition requests that the Sechelt Peninsula be included in that electoral district rather than being moved into the electoral district of Capilano, which is the current proposal.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that the House of Commons will recommend to the Electoral Boundaries Commission of British Columbia that the residents of the Sechelt Peninsula remain within the electoral district of North Island-Powell River.

MR. SKELLY—PORNOGRAPHY—CALL FOR AMENDMENT OF BROADCASTING ACT

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of pleasure in presenting a petition that is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition is from the undersigned residents of Canada in the Province of Ontario, who now exercise their right to present a grievance. There is grave concern about the growing amount of pornographic material available in the community in many forms, especially the increase in violence depicted in pornography, degradation and sexual exploitation of children. There is increasing evidence of the direct harmful effects of pornography in sexual and other assaults and in child abuse. The Canadian obscenity laws are woefully out of date and inadequate for dealing with current problems.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to revise the obscenity laws to reflect community concerns about excessive violence and degradation of the human person, sexual exploitation of children and the portrayal of coercive sexual relations by imposing serious penalties for violations. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

CANADIAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present another petition that is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition is from the undersigned residents of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. This petition deals with the question of the marine industrial strategy of Canada. It indicates that there has been an enormous loss of income to Canadians, an enormous loss of unemployment and that this country has generally been harmed economically because of the lack of the Government's initiative in this area. The federal Government

has neglected to pay attention to this area for decades. As a result, the Canadian economy has suffered and Canadian workers and businesses have been placed in severe jeopardy because of the Government's inaction.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government be encouraged to move immediately to implement an effective policy of marine industrial development and the development of a Canadian merchant marine fleet and the expansion of shipbuilding and allied industries.

This is signed by people from the Province of British Columbia, White Rock, Port Langley, Surrey, Delta, Coquitlam, New Westminster, Haney, Port Moody, Aldergrove, Sardis. It essentially covers many areas of the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I have an excellent petition to present addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The signatures gathered in this petition will interest the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme). They are those of the Seafarers' International Union of Canada on Homer Street in Vancouver, B.C. All the signatures appear to be in order. They are extremely concerned. They addressed the petition to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition is from the undersigned residents of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. They outline in very explicit detail that the Seafarers' of Canada have lost enormous employment opportunities. This country has suffered the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenues because the Government of Canada has failed to develop a Canadian merchant fleet. The petitioners humbly pray that the Government immediately move forward to develop a Canadian merchant fleet, which would obviously result in the expansion of shipbuilding and allied trade in this country. It is my pleasure to present this petition on behalf of those individuals.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is brought forward and I have the honour to present it to this House. It is from St. Catharines and Windsor, Ontario, areas in which many individuals have suffered as a result of the failure to implement a marine strategy. It is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there has been a tremendous loss of employment opportunities and an incredible amount of money in lost revenue for Canadians. That has taken place because the Government has failed to develop an industrial policy in this country, has neglected to implement such a policy for decades, and has placed in severe jeopardy many of those shipbuilding operations across Canada that are facing very bleak prospects because of Government action.

• (1640)

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament that the Government be encouraged immediately to implement a sensible and effective marine policy that will result in the creation of a Canadian merchant fleet and the expansion of Canadian shipbuilding and allied industries.

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present another petition from a number of residents of the Province of British Columbia who have expressed their concerns. This petition has been gathered by the CBRT and General Workers Union and they express their concern through the following text.

The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of industrial benefits are not accruing to Canadians because we lack a marine industrial strategy and that the federal Government has neglected to implement a coherent marine policy, although it promised to do so over two years ago, and that Canada's economic growth and wellbeing is in jeopardy because of the Government's inaction.

Therefore, your petitioners humbly pray that the Government be encouraged immediately to implement a sensible and effective marine policy that will result in the creation of a Canadian merchant fleet and the expansion of shipbuilding and allied industries.

Mr. Speaker, I again have the pleasure to present a very important statement by way of a petition from residents of Lauzon, Quebec. They have addressed their petition to the House of Commons and have indicated the following.

[*Translation*]

To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned citizens of Canada who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a common grievance, in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy.

Humbly sheweth that:

Canadians have been deprived of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial spin-offs because we have no industrial marine strategy and the federal Government has neglected to provide Canada with a consistent maritime policy, although more than two years ago it promised to announce such a policy, and that the Government's inaction is endangering Canada's economic growth.

Therefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government be asked to adopt forthwith a consistent

and effective maritime policy, resulting in the creation of a Canadian merchant marine and the expansion of the Canadian shipping industry and related sectors.

As in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I have examined this petition and have found it to be in pencil, which worries me somewhat. It may be that this will be called into contest, but I certainly think it is appropriate to give it consideration and the benefit of the doubt. It is signed by residents of Surrey, British Columbia, Maple Ridge and other places where the recession has hit very hard. It is addressed to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners with the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in industrial benefits are not accruing to Canadians because we lack a marine industrial strategy and that the federal Government has neglected to implement a coherent Canadian marine policy, although it promised to do so more than two years ago, and Canadian economic growth and wellbeing are in jeopardy because of the Government's inaction.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the Government will be encouraged immediately to implement a sensible and effective marine policy that will result in the creation of a Canadian merchant fleet and the expansion of Canadian shipbuilding and allied industries. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

I wonder if we might get a ruling from the Table at some point on whether the pencil is okay.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I seek unanimous consent that we proceed to Orders of the Day.

Mr. Skelly: You cannot even get it from your side.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I see why the Hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) did not rise on a point of order, but simply rose for recognition. It makes an interesting procedural point as to whether or not he acquired the floor without a point of order, and he did. Technically, in that sense, he is able to seek the unanimous consent to move to Orders of the Day. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It is not agreed. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River in order that he may continue with his petitions. But first I recognize the President of the Privy Council on a point of order.

Point of Order—Mr. Pinard

[*Translation*]

POINT OF ORDER

REGISTRATION OF NAMES

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The President of the Privy Council on a point of order.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to take down the names of all Opposition Members who said no and who, consequently, do not want Parliament to operate normally and would rather prevent the Government from creating hundreds of thousands of jobs in this country and spending billions of dollars in Western Canada.

I think that for two days now the Progressive Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party have been quite irresponsible and that their objections ought to be recorded. They are the ones who do not want us to create hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout Canada; that should be made public and they ought to be officially censured by having that fact recorded in *Hansard*. Mr. Speaker, my request is simple: on a point of order, I ask that all Members who object to the Government creating hundreds of thousands of jobs through Bill C-155 give their name to the Clerk before we adjourn.

• (1650)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Perhaps the President of the Privy Council would refer the Chair to the particular Standing Order to which he refers.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon the Government to decide the Orders of the Day, as set forth in Standing Order 23(2). Now then, we have been trying for two days to debate Bill C-155 which will enable us to spend billions of dollars in Western Canada and create hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout the country, but owing to the dilatory tactics of the Opposition, we—

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I believe the President of the Privy Council knows I must interrupt him in this regard. If he is referring to Standing Order 23(2), which entitles the Government to establish the Orders of the Day, that does not translate either into a right or an obligation on the part of the Chair to entertain a procedure which would cause all Hon. Members present in the House to register themselves in some fashion.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I would have appreciated being heard on that point. However, since you have disposed of it in a very able fashion, before hearing representations, I might suggest there is a way out of the dilemma which the President

of the Privy Council suggests we are in. In order to establish the view, the national collective view, call an election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pinard: We will certainly call an election. However, I do not know when. Certainly, we have always respected the Constitution of this country. We intend to keep on doing that. I do not want the Hon. Member for Yukon to turn this into—

Mr. Huntington: Hang onto your jobs while you can.

Mr. Pinard: —a joke. Our request is serious. There are over a million unemployed in this country who are watching the Tories and the NDP—

Mr. Nielsen: Who caused the unemployment?

Mr. Pinard: —wasting the time of the House of Commons.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) has the enormous advantage of being in my immediate vicinity so that I tend to recognize him very often. I would ask him, in return for his recognition, since he is rising on a point of order, that he apply himself to the Standing Orders.

Mr. Mayer: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the request of the Government House Leader that the number of Hon. Members who are in the House be recorded, I suggest there is a way out of that dilemma. If the Speaker would accept a motion of non-confidence we could vote on it and everyone would know who was in the House at this particular time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kristiansen: Mr. Speaker, it is a point of order. I understand the difficulty which the Chair finds itself in with some Hon. Members being closer to the Chair than others. However, the President of the Privy Council rose to his feet, apparently not on a point of order, and was still recognized and allowed to set forth an option or a request for unanimous consent. At the time the President of the Privy Council rose, not on a point of order, my colleague, the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River, was still being recognized by the Chair, was still on his feet. He was still in the process of presenting petitions. If the President of the Privy Council did not rise on a point of order, how then, I must ask, did he ever gain the floor? If he did not gain the floor, then how could we have points of orders interjecting his participation in the proceedings of the House this afternoon? I am left in a quandary. I tried to raise this point at the earliest possible moment. I find it passing strange to realize how we got into the situation we are now in. If anyone, Mr. Speaker, is wasting the time of the House on matters which are certainly frivolous, not germane and totally out of order, it is the President of the Privy Council, and he ought to know better.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member makes a very serious point of order. He is wondering how I could be recognized while one of his colleagues had finished reading a petition and was signing it. It is very simple. Every Hon. Member has the right to rise in this House and present petitions. We have seen that for the last two days. When I rose and you recognized me, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River had finished presenting his petition and was in the process, perhaps of considering raising another one. Therefore, I believe I was very much in order. I would not like a precedent to be established that one could not rise, other than on a point of order, in between two petitions. I believe it is within the discretion of the Chair to recognize any Member in his place during the presentation of petitions or at any other time. I believe the Speaker recognized me in accordance with the Standing Orders.

That is, perhaps, a very serious answer to a very serious point of order. When my colleague says that he thinks I have been wasting the time of the House, I do not feel he can be serious. I can excuse him if perhaps he was using some kind of dry humour. Certainly, he will realize that for the last two days his Party and the Conservative Party have been preventing Parliament from working, and have been preventing Government from creating hundreds of thousands of jobs in the country.

Mr. Kristiansen: Since Madam Speaker earlier today—

Mr. Pinard: It is Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kristiansen: —made a ruling. I am not sure if it was Mr. Speaker or Madam Speaker at that time.

An Hon. Member: Madam Speaker made the ruling.

Mr. Kristiansen: Madam Speaker made the ruling. As I thought, my recollection was correct. She made the ruling that Hon. Members presenting petitions would have to do so continuously and that if they gave up the floor they could no longer continue presenting what petitions they had, which are certainly considered to be rather urgent by those Canadians who have forwarded them to their Member of Parliament, or other Members of Parliament, for presentation. If the President of the Privy Council is suggesting that someone can intervene other than on a point of order while someone continues to have the floor and is presenting those petitions, in the only way Madam Speaker ruled today that they could, then the President of the Privy Council is obviously out on cloud nine and out to lunch, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest we go back to the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River. He still has the floor in my view and, quite frankly, because of that I do not know what I or any other Hon. Member is doing participating in debate on a point of order at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): There are three minutes remaining to the House and it seems to me to be open to Hon. Members as to which way they wish to proceed. At the request of Hon. Members, the Chair will either, first, rule on the points of order; second, recognize the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River to continue with his petitions, as I gather

he indicated he wishes to do; or, third, recognize any Hon. Member who rises on a point of order.

An Hon. Member: We want Skelly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): If an Hon. Member stands, I will recognize him.

Mr. Pinard: I would just like to draw to the attention of the House Standing Order 71(1) which is brief and reads:

A petition to the House may be presented by a Member at any time during a sitting of the House by filing the same with the Clerk of the House.

Therefore, the Hon. Members could have filed their petitions with the Clerk of the House during the last two days without wasting the time of the House. The Hon. Member's colleague does not have to be penalized because he is interrupted. He still has the right to file his petitions with the Clerk of the House. This procedure allows Hon. Members of the Opposition and Hon. Members on this side as well to do that. That is my point. It is very clear that Standing Order 71(1) applies. Hon. Members opposite cannot complain that they lose their rights if they are interrupted. They have always the right to file their petitions with the Clerk of the House. If they had done that, we would have saved two days. Parliament would have worked. Canadians would have been proud of their Members and we would have succeeded in creating hundreds of thousands of jobs in Canada, which the Opposition is now preventing.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Government House Leader quoted Standing Order 71(1). I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Standing Order 71(2) which says:

Any Member desiring to present a petition in his or her place in the House must do so during Routine Proceedings and before Introduction of Bills.

All that our Party has been doing is what Standing Order 71(2) says we should do.

An Hon. Member: According to the rules.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would ask that the Chair and the Table consider over the weekend the Citation 682(2) at page 211 of Beauchesne. And I ask that a ruling be made on the nature of the petitions which are being put before the House. Citations 682(2) says:

(2) A petition should seek the redress of grievances and should refrain from expressing an opinion with regard to the House, the Government or the positions taken by Members of the House. Expressions which would be in order from a Member of the House may not be in order when presented as a petition.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, after listening to petitions for the last two days, many of the petitions put forward, especially the ones put forward by the Official Opposition yesterday regarding the calling of an election and the crisis in Government, are definitely, in my opinion, and I would ask a ruling of the Chair and the Table officers, expressions of opinion. If they are, then they should be ruled out of order by the Chair.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It is five o'clock. I indicated earlier to the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) that there may be cause to examine the petitions. I think that he or any other Hon. Member has the right to do so. That will be looked at over the weekend. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary makes a similar request as to the nature and the matter of arguing the content of a petition. I hope the Hon. Member will give us a little more time than just over the weekend. If he would do that, perhaps I might wish all Members a good evening and a good weekend.

At 5.01 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Orders.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 31, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Monday, October 24, 1983 consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motions Nos. 47 and 49 (Mr. Benjamin), and Motion No. 48 (Mr. Mazankowski).

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, when debate finished on Monday a week ago at one o'clock, I was making the point that Motions Nos. 48 and 49 were important because they allow for considerably more time for debate on regulations which the Administrator would recommend than do the Government's proposals. The Government has suggested that one hour is sufficient time for Parliament to take a good look at those regulations.

Officials of the Ministry of Transport admitted that the ability of the Administrator to make regulations which could be brought before the House and passed was very important. In fact, it was admitted that it was so important that they thought it could not be done entirely by Cabinet but that it should have some relationship to Parliament. Because it was so important for this to be referred to Parliament, they implied that it would be wrong to apply awards and sanctions by way of Order in Council and that it therefore should be brought to Parliament. I do not have his exact words before me, Mr. Speaker, but an official of the department indicated that the applications of awards and sanctions were so important that they should not be left to Cabinet but that Parliament should be allowed plenty of time to look into the matter.

To Members on the Government side, "plenty of time" appears to be one hour because that is what was put into the Bill. The Government has allowed a one-hour debate on the matter. Conservative Members went one step further. Through Motion No. 48, they suggested that the opportunity for debate should be extended to three sitting days. We can accept that and would support that, Mr. Speaker. However, Members of the New Democratic Party have gone even further through Motion No. 49 which stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). That motion would extend the debate on that issue to an unlimited time until the House had decided that the debate was adequate.

Perhaps this is a pretty good indication of the value the three Parties put on the parliamentary process. Liberal Members would allow for one hour, Conservative Members would allow for three days and New Democratic Party Members would allow for full, responsible Government as indicated by unlimited debate.

The esteem Liberal Members have for Parliament is pretty well indicated by that particular clause in this Bill. Their arrogance and disdain for Parliament has been further strengthened by the very fact that they have now taken this Bill out of public debate by closure and will give Parliament two more days in which to find out what the country wants. It is not that they do not know how the majority of people in the country feel about this Bill. It had ample opportunity to find out and discovered that it did not have a consensus in the West which it promised it would get before it moved on this particular Bill. This has always been a bureaucrat's Bill and now that closure has been imposed we see that all the hearings and the shows the Government has put on in the West have had no real impact on the content of the Bill.

• (1110)

The essence of good government is consent. There has been no consensus with this Bill and there clearly has been no consent on the part of the Government because the people who are most affected by it do not want this Bill to be passed. Therefore the implication of that is that there is no way this Bill can reflect good government.

One only needs to ask the former Minister to see the indication of just exactly what western Canadian farmers feel about this Bill. For every letter he received in support of the Bill he received 561 letters opposing it. In fact, he received 38,713 letters opposing the passage of this Bill and only 69 letters in support of its passage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair hesitates to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to make some comments with respect to the

amendments that are before us today. Before doing so, I would like to express my concern about the fact that the Government has seen fit to invoke closure on a Bill which is of so much vital concern to the grain producers in western Canada. I think it is safe to say that the vast majority, if not all, of the grain producers in western Canada are concerned about the impact of this Bill and even more concerned that closure has been brought in to prevent a proper and intelligent discussion of the various amendments that were put on the Order Paper.

Having said that, I would like to make some comments regarding the three motions before us and Motion No. 48 in particular. This motion was proposed by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) and it seeks to extend the debate from one hour, as limited in the Bill, to three days. The debate that is referred to concerns the regulations made under Clause 21(a). These are very important regulations because they set forth the performance objectives and pertain to awards and sanctions by the various system participants in the grain handling and transportation system. These three types of regulations are of utmost importance.

• (1115)

What happens under the Bill as presently constituted is that the regulations are prepared, they are laid before the House in accordance with Clause 22 and within 20 sitting days 15 Senators or 30 Members may request the referral of these regulations to a committee. I have no argument with the 15 Senators or 30 Members as the NDP has. I think 15 Senators or 30 Members is a fair representation. The matter goes to the committee for a period of 30 days and the committee reports back to Parliament. At that point in time Parliament does not have the power to take any action. For example, if the committee said "We do not agree with these regulations, they are wrong," there is no provision whereby Parliament can deal with them at that time. The Minister, despite the committee's report on the regulations, can go ahead and prepare the regulations and put them into force. Having been put into force, they are laid before Parliament within 15 days. This Bill provides for a one-hour debate only on the regulations that have been promulgated by the Minister by Order in Council.

As I said at the outset, these regulations are very important. It seems to me that a one-hour debate with a ten-minute speech limit is very inadequate. What can this House do in one hour with a series of ten-minute speeches, which means six speeches? This is why the Hon. Member for Vegreville put forth amendment No. 48 which provides for a three-day debate with no ten-minute limit. In that three days it seems to me many Members will have the opportunity to express their views on these regulations.

Members of the New Democratic Party have said there should be no time limitation but we are dealing with regulations, not with a Bill. In my opinion and in the opinion of the Members of our Party we feel that three days is adequate. With this in mind, I would recommend to Members of this House that when this motion comes to be considered and voted upon, Members of all Parties give it their support.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, I want simply to follow up on the comments made by my distinguished colleague, the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), concerning the amendment put forward to Clause 24 of the Bill. What we have in terms of Clause 24 in this Bill is what I refer to as a rubber-stamp review of regulations on a very important element of the legislation. It gives you some sort of idea as to what this Government's attitude is with respect to western Canada, and what sincerity the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in the last Speech from the Throne had when he made reference to the fact that, although there are no Members in the Liberal Party elected in western Canada of any consequence, he would want to listen to representations made by Members on this side of the House from western Canada on the legitimate concerns of people in that area. It is a demonstration of the Government's view of western Canada. It is that western Canada is worth one hour of debate on this piece of legislation respecting the performance of the railways; that is all, one hour. That is all the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party think is appropriate in terms of an important piece of legislation which affects what has been termed the Magna Carta of western Canada.

• (1120)

We have quite a different view of the matter. We think there should be some reasonable opportunity for debate in the House of Commons on legislation which affects the very substance and essence of a particular region of Canada. I feel rather strongly about the proposition of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) with respect to extending debate for at least three days. We have to understand that the motion is now being considered in the context of closure being imposed by the Government on the legislation. This gives us three days to consider every element of the remaining legislation, although we have not been able to discuss the most important parts of it. By virtue of the Government majority, we are being given only three days to discuss the remainder of the legislation on the floor of the House of Commons. For the Government to come forward now and suggest that one hour of debate in the House of Commons concerning the provisions of the Bill relating to the performance of those elements involved in the grain delivery system, the system participants, is simply outrageous and offensive to any thinking person, particularly those persons involved in the production of grain in western Canada.

I rise to debate this particular provision with a sense of anger and disbelief that the Government has taken such a draconian step as invoking closure to bring the debate to a close. I know the feeling in my part of the country about the activities of the Government. I know what are the provisions of this legislation with respect to the operation of the system proposed by the Government. Complex to a degree, unequalled by any other legislation, the Bill is indecipherable to people, even those involved in the industry and legal scholars. I venture to say that it will cause us nothing but grief and difficulty, not only in western Canada but across the country, simply to determine what the Bill means. When we come to

the provision for a review of the regulations being promulgated under a piece of legislation which in my estimation is impossible to understand, we have a double whammy. We have limited opportunity to consider the matter. All we have is a motion which will be placed before a committee and subsequently before the House of Commons. The motion is simply that we either accept or reject the regulations. It is an either/or, black or white proposition. There is no opportunity for us to work in a constructive manner to improve those regulations which may require improvement or delete provisions we think are harmful or difficult. We either accept or reject the whole package. That is what is indicated in the provisions of the Bill; that is what we are being asked to consider in one hour on the floor of the House of Commons.

I do not think people fully understand about what we are talking. We are talking about the livelihood of people in all parts of this country; the grain producer, the cattle producer, the transportation workers, those involved in the manufacture of farm equipment and rails for our railways, those involved in manufacturing in both central and eastern Canada. We are talking about the capacity of our ports on the West Coast and at the Lakehead. All these people are concerned with respect to the operation of this legislation, yet the Government says it is going to make regulations as to how the system is going to operate, that these unknown regulations will be promulgated and Members will be given an opportunity to look at them in the committee structure.

• (1125)

When it comes to debate and discussion on the floor of the House of Commons, there are serious constraints on what can happen. First and foremost is that there will be only one hour to discuss it. How can we carry out the responsibility placed on our shoulders by the Prime Minister in the first and only Speech from the Throne that we have had in this Parliament? How can we properly articulate the concerns of our people when Members will be vying for that sacred ten-minute slot in the one hour? How many Members of Parliament will be able to tell the Prime Minister what they think about this policy?

I am somewhat more sanguine than one would think about this provision. I can stand here and rest assured, as the people of Canada will rest assured, that there is a good prospect for an upcoming election and this crowd which has foisted this undesirable, badly thought out, wrong-headed legislation upon us after that election will no longer be seated on the government side. The few remnants of them will be over on this side wondering why they did not have the courage to stand up and fight the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and the Prime Minister when they brought forward this legislation. This kind of arrogance and disregard for important parts of the country will be the downfall and demise of the Liberal Party of Canada.

In the past, the Liberal Party had fine traditions and a fine sense of national purpose. At one time it had representation in western Canada. This outfit has frittered away its mandate. It has dissipated the fortunes of that Party in almost every part of Canada, particularly western Canada. I believe if the Liberal leaders of yore could see what is happening to the Liberal Party and the way it is conducting the affairs of this country, MacKenzie King, Laurier, and other Liberal leaders would be whirling in their graves wondering what has happened to the once great Liberal Party.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, we live in a country without a government. We live in a country where government is not here by mandate. It does not reflect representation of the peoples of the broad expanse of this country. Instead of a government running Canada, we have a club, a group of people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. With respect to the Hon. Member, the debate at this point should be relevant to the amendments before us. I invite the Hon. Member to bear in mind that we are discussing Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, no one is more thoroughly aware that we are debating Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 than I am. I am talking about Motion No. 48 which tells us that we do not have a government in this country. What we have is a club. That is what I started to say and that is what I will continue to say because it relates to Motion No. 48.

I come to this Parliament from a Province that sends 21 Members of Parliament here to face a government with only that many Members of Parliament from eight Provinces and two Territories. The rest of their Members come from two Provinces, Quebec and Ontario.

• (1130)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, this is a general observation and the Chair has difficulty relating it to Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, if you do not know we are on closure, I know we are on closure. I am talking about Motion No. 48. What we are talking about here today is a Government that does not have licence. Motion 48 of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) would give us three days to debate the regulations. I am telling you, Sir, that the Government would prefer that we have one hour on a question that affects us because the Government does not have regional relevance. It is a Government that has no representation west of Winnipeg, a Government that threw away its representation.

This Government in 1968 had 48 Members in western Canada; today it has two. Motion 48 is a most justifiable motion which states that we have three days for debate on an issue that deals with transportation objectives and all sectors relating to transportation. That requires more than an hour of debate.

Those who think this club which has been formed of a few people from central Canada can take a decision on a question which is not just transportation policy are wrong. This is not just a question of who drives the train and how much the

driver gets, but even more a question of economic development for the entire West. It has been narrowly prescribed as simply a western issue. It is not just a western issue. This is an issue that affects central Canada. It deals with the automotive industry, the farm machinery industry, the fertilizer industry and manufacturing. Crow rate and manufacturing should be synonymous. If you steal money from the farmers of western Canada and from the treasuries of the western Provinces, central Canada feels the pinch and the pain. A regulatory measure that relates to transportation objectives requires more than one hour of debate, because it has a tremendous economic impact on all of Canada. Yet this club thinks it deserves only an hour, knowing full well in that hour that it is simply yeas or nays to a majority, where there is no chance for public opinion to reach for their telephone. Three days does not give enough time to reach for a pen and write, with a postal system like we have today. Motion No. 48 makes a reasonable request of the Government in asking for the opportunity to allow a reasonable amount of time for debate.

The NDP's response to the motion is that it be without limit. It may be argued that it ought to be a little longer than three days, but obviously within the framework of Parliament it could never be without limit.

Again, I submit to you that our motion is a reasonable one in light of the fact that we are facing one of the most major economic development pieces of legislation ever to face the Parliament of Canada. It is big in scope and its impact. It is also complicated. The fact that it is complicated requires that there be more than a one hour debate.

As one who comes to this place from the regions of Canada, I face a Government whose members are all collected around industrial Canada and which believes that the western people can be shunted aside and run over. This is because the Government is not regionally relevant; it does not represent the regions. Yet the economic impact on the regions of this legislation is such that if they misstep in putting the Crow in place, whether it be changed or otherwise, the impact falls back economically and heavily upon the industrial manufacturing base of central Canada.

One of the facts that I have observed is that any time a farmer in western Canada has extra money in his bank account he does what every other Canadian would do; he spends it. If he buys a new Canadian-made refrigerator it is made in central Canada. If he buys a new Canadian-made car it is made in central Canada. If he buys a new Canadian-made tractor it is made in central Canada. The clause that we are talking about now which deals with the performance objectives of transportation, which is what brings money to western Canada, is a clause that says we are dealing not just with transportation but with a whole economic development program for all of Canada. The magnitude of that program requires more than an hour of debate.

The Government's intent to limit debate to one hour is not just an insult to the West; it is an insult to—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for London-Middlesex (Mr. Bloomfield) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Bloomfield: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Hon. Member would not want to mislead the House. I think it is well known that one of the tractors that is built in Canada is built in Winnipeg, that being the Versatile.

Mr. Malone: I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, what point the Hon. Member wants to make. If he is trying to say that because there is one tractor company located in western Canada, somehow the development of our regions does not have an impact on the whole country, what an insult that that Member represents for his people here.

The fact of the matter is that we should not be talking in this House about western Canada, eastern Canada, central Canada, English Canada and French Canada. We should be Canadian. If the Government opposite realized that it could be more than just a little club in the middle, if it could reach to its two oceans as the Latin words on our Dominion emblem say, "From sea to sea", then we would not have to face a Government which thinks it can point out because there is a tractor company in Winnipeg, therefore the Crow rate is not relevant to them. We are all interdependent on one another. That is what makes this country.

Some of the Hon. Members opposite would like to form us into some kind of economic community with eastern Canada, central Canada, Prairie Canada and British Columbia as members. The truth of the matter is that because we are a country we should have an economic concept of total development. That is why Motion No. 48 is important. It is important because it asks for an appropriate amount of time on an issue that is big enough to demand that amount of time and for the reason that it would impact on all of us. We need not be insulted by a Government that has run this country like a club, a little group of people at the middle who think somehow they can govern without representation. They never once mentioned the Crow rate in the last election. It was three and a half years ago, in April, 1980, that we had the last Speech from the Throne. This country is bigger than that. This issue is bigger than that. It needs more than an hour of debate. It needs a minimum of three days so that we can have a proper airing of the issues.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, before the House today we have three motions. I know the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) was speaking basically about one of them. The first motion is in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). It is a motion which would amend Clause 22 of the Bill and I want to say a few words about that.

Clause 22 of the Bill talks about what will happen when regulations are made under Section 21(1). This subsection gives the Minister through the Governor in Council the power to establish regulations. You have been here roughly as long as

I have, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you realize that when we give this kind of blanket power to a Cabinet Minister, we give him a lot of discretionary power to decide what the regulations may be. One of my frustrations with this place and I know one of the frustrations of the Hon. Member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) is that this institution is often not very democratic. We tend to give a blank cheque to a Minister.

• (1140)

Sometimes the blank cheque is a good one because we have a Minister who is responsible and sensitive and who does a good job; but sometimes we have a flop as a Minister and someone who does not do a good job. Sometimes, even, the Minister does too good a job. I see the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) in the House and I remember the excellent job he did with the Indian people of the country, but because of that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) threw him out of the Cabinet. That is a shame.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With due respect to the Hon. Member, he appears to be straying from the motions before the House.

Mr. Nystrom: I would never challenge you, Mr. Speaker, as you have a lot of experience here, but I want to show what can happen when the House gives so much power to the Prime Minister's office or so much power to a Minister's office, as would be the case with Clause 21(1). As it stands it would give them the power to establish any regulation they want under this Bill. Clause 22 of the legislation provides that within 20 days of proposed legislation being laid before either the Senate or the House of Commons, 30 Members of Parliament may sign a request that there be a debate in the Commons Transport Committee, or 15 Senators can sign a request which would be referred to the relevant committee of the Senate. That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

I want to oppose that section of the Crow Bill very strongly, Mr. Speaker. I want to urge all Members of the House—and I am sure the Conservatives will agree—to vote for Motion No. 47 which would improve things marginally. It would change the number of Members of Parliament required to request a special debate in the Commons Transport Committee from 30 to 15. Why should only 15 Senators be required to request a debate? They are not elected and are not responsible, in any direct sense, to the people of Canada. They are not responsible in any way whatsoever. Why should 15 Senators be able to file notice for a special debate yet it would take 30 MPs to file for a special debate?

Mr. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): It is a smaller House.

Mr. Nystrom: I do not care what the size of the House is, it is an undemocratic House. It is a disgrace in the 1980s to have a legislative body that is not elected, that is not responsible. It is a house of patronage for the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must call to the attention of the Hon. Member that he seems to be straying from the subject matter of the motions before us.

Mr. Malone: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I know you brought me to attention when I was speaking a few moments ago, but I must say that under closure surely Members should have more leniency on an issue as important as this. I believe, since it is a Member from another Party who is speaking—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is raising a point of order. What is before us is a debate on Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49, at report stage of the Bill. The fact that time allocation has been adopted is not the issue before the House; that was debated under a separate motion and was adopted.

The Chair is in the hands of the House. The rules of the House say that we are at report stage and we are debating Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49. I did call the Hon. Member to attention and he very politely conformed to the request of the Chair and found that he was able to make some very good points with regard to the motions. I am sure the Hon. Member who has the floor will be able to follow his good example.

Mr. Malone: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the Hon. Member making the same point of order? It is irregular to raise the same point of order.

Mr. Malone: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Hon. Member is making a new point of order the Chair will listen, but the Chair asks the Hon. Member not to simply repeat his point.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, the point I want to make is that there are important amendments but they do not necessarily all follow, seriatim, as being the most important at the first.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has ruled on the Hon. Member's point. The Chair has no alternative but to call to the attention of the House the motions currently under debate, Nos. 47, 48 and 49, and to request Hon. Members to confine their remarks accordingly. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom).

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, Clause 22 of the Bill deals with the House of Commons and the Senate and provides that it will need the signatures of 15 Senators to request a special debate but that it will need the signatures of 30 MPs for a special debate. We have moved an amendment to reduce the number of MPs to 15. Perhaps one of our reasons for doing that is that we are concerned about the future of the Liberal Party. The way the polls are going, there may not be 30 Liberal Members here after the next election. I am sure they will want to have the ability to file for a special debate on some of the regulations made under the Crow legislation. I know that matter is of great concern to the Hon. Member for Kenora-Rainy River, Mr. Speaker, as he has already come over here to join me. Perhaps that indicates how he will vote in a few days time.

We have had an articulate speech on Motion No. 48 from "Red Ray", the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr.

Hnatyshyn). Motion No. 48 would amend Clause 25 which in subclause (1) provides:

A motion filed under section 24 shall be taken up and considered by the Senate or House of Commons, as the case may be, within five sitting days—

Then it goes on to provide that in the generosity of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) we will be allowed a one-hour debate. Imagine, a one-hour debate on something that might be vitally important to western Canada! That is disgraceful. A one-hour debate with ten-minute speeches means that six Members can speak and that is it. The regulations may be vitally important to western Canada. For reasons that are obvious, therefore, I want to support Motion No. 48 moved by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) who proposes a three-day debate.

That is my second choice. My first choice is Motion No. 49 in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) which would not limit the debate at all. As mature Parliamentarians we would be trusted to decide whether there should be a one-day, a three-day, or a ten-day debate. It would be open-ended. I think we have the sensitivity and responsibility to know when enough is enough. I think Parliamentarians must be trusted. This institution should be supreme and we should make the decision.

If Motion No. 49 is not accepted, then obviously as my second choice I prefer Motion No. 48 which would allow at least a three-day debate. I say that because of the importance of the Crow issue and of the transportation of grain in western Canada.

I find it absolutely despicable that we would only be allowed a one-hour debate on regulations that could be so vital to rail lines all across the country and to the movement of grain across the country in what is really the most important industry in Canada. If we do not have a healthy grain farming economy, that will affect jobs in Ottawa West, Montreal, in Toronto and all across the country. We should have a bit more democracy in this place and a bit more leniency so that we can speak on behalf of our constituents.

I want to make the argument for my urban friends across the way once again, Mr. Speaker. It is not right, nor is it fair, that we have this severe limitation on debate where it would take 30 Members of Parliament to petition that a certain regulation be referred to a committee of the House or 15 Senators to petition that a certain regulation be sent to a special Senate committee. That is not fair because of the discretionary power given to the Minister of Transport.

Even if the present Minister of Transport were to be fully trusted, if he were fully sensitive to the needs of western Canada—the Minister is not but even if he were—who will be the next Minister of Transport?

Mr. Blenkarn: Certainly not that one.

Mr. Nystrom: It could be the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn), for example, though God help us. It might be someone who would do things totally against the interests of western Canada. He could be from any Party, Mr. Speaker. In almost any Government there could be someone who blows the job, who is a dud. And what recourse do we have? We have a one-hour debate.

● (1150)

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, as the fairminded arbitrator you are in this House, that if you were not in the Chair you would be standing on the other side of the House screaming about the unfairness, unjustice and lack of democracy which we have in Clauses Nos. 22 and 25 of the legislation which is before this House. I know that many Liberal Party Members, if they were not afraid of the immense power of the Office of the Prime Minister, would be standing as well and expressing their grave concern about this severe limitation which we have had imposed—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak this morning to Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49. You will be very pleased to know that I intend to keep strictly germane to the topic and not wander about. By speaking to this group of motions, Mr. Speaker, I would also like once again to register my opposition to Bill C-155, the Government's plan to kill the Crow rate. The amendments before us this morning, like all of the other amendments before this House, are very important. As I see it, the intention behind each of these amendments—two of them moved by this Party and one by the Conservative Party—is to protect the authority of Parliament in the face of a growing trend to govern by Order in Council.

It is a laudable provision contained within this Bill to give Members of Parliament, and even Senators, the ability to examine the regulations put forward by the Grain Transportation Administrator and to revoke those regulations if they are not appropriate. Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 only serve to make those provisions much more workable and, I believe, much more fair than what is now proposed.

Motion No. 47 seeks to limit to only 15 the number of Members of Parliament who must give written notice for a regulation to be referred to committee. The same number is required for Senators. As it now stands, 15 Senators or 30 Members of Parliament can give written notice to have a regulation initiated by the Administrator of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee examined by a committee. Why is that? I can understand why we should not try to double the number of Senators required to give notice to 30, the number now required for Hon. Members of this House. If it were not a Wednesday when the pay cheques are handed out, it might be very difficult to find even 15 Senators, let alone 30, who know anything about grain transportation, or who even care. However, setting that logistical problem aside for the moment, I must say that I cannot understand why this Bill would give to a Chamber filled, as my friend, the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), pointed out, with political appointees, what amounts to twice the opportunity to have

regulations examined as Hon. Members of this House who are elected and responsible to their constituents would enjoy.

Motion No. 47 does not remove altogether the ability of Senators to have regulations examined in committee. That kind of slight towards the Senate would, of course, be too much to bear for the Government or my friends in the Tory caucus. The Senate, after all, is the place to which they retire both Tory and Liberal hacks. No, this motion does not slight the Senate in that way. What it does do, though, is recognize the plain and simple fact that Hon. Members and Senators must have at least an equal opportunity to examine, and in some cases reject, regulations proposed for grain transportation. It seems only fitting to me, Mr. Speaker, that elected Members of Parliament should not have more restrictions placed on them in this regard than appointed Senators.

Motions Nos. 48 and 49 deal with the length of time allocated for this House to debate a motion that the proposed regulation be confirmed and brought into effect. As it now stands, a regulation dealing with performance guarantees or awards and sanctions for those involved in the grain transportation system must be laid before each House of Parliament within 15 days. Then a motion must be put that the regulation be confirmed and signed by a Minister of the Crown. That motion is then dealt with by the Senate or the House of Commons, as the case may be.

That is fine as far as it goes. However, what the Government intends with this Bill is to impose a prearranged closure on the debate. The Government has proposed to limit debate to only one hour. If that is all the time the Government feels should be allowed for Members of this House to deal with the motions confirming these regulations, then I must ask, why bother at all? Allowing one hour is the worst kind of tokenism, Mr. Speaker. How much of that hour will Opposition Members receive in order to debate the regulation? Forty minutes? Half an hour? Even a full hour, for that matter, is not very much time for this Government, which has only one Cabinet Member from the West, to allow Opposition Members to deal with regulations which may have long-lasting effects on western grain farmers. It is not very much House time which this Government, which hails largely from central Canada, is allowing western Opposition Members to tell it what is wrong with its proposed regulations for grain transportation.

The motion presented by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) would extend that limit to three days. That makes much more sense, as my friend, the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), suggested. That is our second choice. However, I do not think that is enough. As Hon. Members now know, some of these regulations can be very complicated. And as we are seeing in this debate, it takes more than three days to enlighten the Government on the faults of complicated proposals.

Of course, some of the regulations proposed by the Administrator will be very straightforward and there should be no reason to keep them from being dealt with very quickly. However, I am uncomfortable limiting the debate on these regulations to three days for the simple reason that it may take more time than that to make all the points which need to be made. If a regulation is bad and is complicated at the same time, it could easily take Hon. Members of this House more than three days to convince the Government that the best route is simply to revoke the motion of confirmation in the regulation.

I am surprised also, Mr. Speaker, that the Tories would want to write in the limit of three days in this particular motion. Over the last few days we have heard that Party, and rightly so, complaining about the three-day closure which we are now suffering. I can only think that perhaps what the Hon. Member had in mind when he drafted this amendment was that since one day his Party may well be in power, he wanted to make sure that some form of closure or time allocation was in place for that eventuality.

For my money, Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 49 makes much more sense. It permits debate on the motions confirming regulations to continue until it is finished. Under this proposal, if it takes four days or even five days to deal with one particular regulation, then Hon. Members know they will have those four or five days to deal with it. They will not be faced with automatic time allocation and prevented from making the points which must be made.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that with these motions we are recognizing that some checks must be in place on the Government's ability to govern by Order in Council. I am happy that the Government seems to recognize that Hon. Members of this House must have the ability to examine, and if need be reject, proposed regulations which will come from the Grain Transportation Administrator. I believe, however, when we are recognizing that need, that we must ensure we are not limiting the ability of Hon. Members of this House in that regard more than we are limiting the ability of Senators. As this Bill now reads, that is exactly what we would be doing. We must ensure that once regulations have been examined in committee, Hon. Members have adequate time, if they need it, to debate those regulations in the House. One hour allowed for each motion confirming a regulation is not enough time. For that matter, neither may three days be enough time. Members should be allowed as much time as they need to debate contentious regulations.

● (1200)

As I have said before, in many cases no written notice will be given to have the regulations examined in committee and no debate will occur on motions to confirm regulations; but there will be times when the regulations must be examined and debated. There will even be times when the motions to confirm the regulations must be—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I value this opportunity to contribute to the debate on the motions which are before the House at this time. As a Member, I have often noticed that when debates take place and there is enough time allowed for Hon. Members to express their views, the Ministers responsible for the piece of legislation or regulations that are to be put into place will be present taking notes. Because of that, we do find some changes taking place.

The present Government wants to allow only one hour to debate regulations that could have a profound effect on an industry that is vital to all of Canada but particularly to western Canada. I am talking about the farming industry. Government Members who introduce regulations by Order in Council that could and would have a very profound effect upon western Canada often do not understand how the regulations proposed will affect the western agricultural industry. This is to be understood when we have a Government with no representatives from west of Winnipeg and when we have a Government that depends upon political hacks in western Canada to tell the Government what it should be doing or how a regulation will affect western Canada. I am referring to some of these aged members of the other place who are running around representing British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan. These men have not only grown old and in some cases quite senile but have absolutely no concept of what is happening in their own back yard. They are tired, old and have indeed been rewarded with a permanent pension by being appointed to the other place.

The motion put by an Hon. Member of the New Democratic Party calls for unlimited debate. I think that that is unreasonable. If in three days we cannot use our intelligence to indicate the opposition to a regulation that is being proposed by the Government through Order in Council, we should not be here. Of course, the New Democratic Party constantly reaches for the maximum. Its Members do not think about the legislation that must be put through the House.

The Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant) said that three days of debate on one regulation or on a number of regulations would not be sufficient and that we were probably trying to limit debate to three days because we will soon be the Government and would want this automatic closure in place so that we would not have to worry. I am particularly pleased that he recognizes that the Conservative Party is going to form the next Government. We will form the next Government but not with the help of Members of the New Democratic Party because they are the ones who put in that gang across the street. They should always remember that.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member has clearly misquoted me. I said that some day the Conservatives may form a Government. I did not recognize that they were going to.

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, again we have heard a very frivolous comment from a Member of the New Democratic Party. The comment made by the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake was that we may form the next Government and we would want closure in place. That is totally irrelevant because the Bill that is presently before the House of which we are only dealing with one clause is a Bill that will have a profound effect and is composed of many pages and many amendments. That is why we are against the closure that exists today, closure that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) brought in. However, to suggest that we cannot discuss regulations that will affect western Canada in three days is ridiculous.

All that the Government is doing by limiting debate on regulations to one hour is perpetuating a system that has taken over the Government. I am talking about the system of having the bureaucracy draft regulations that become laws which can often severely penalize those who will be affected by those regulations to the point of fines, court appearances and incarceration.

There is something wrong when we in Canada allow the responsibility of governing and law making to fall out of the hands of the House of Commons and into the hands of the bureaucracy. That is what has happened time and time again. There is indeed something wrong. That is not why the people from our constituencies have elected us and sent us to Ottawa. We are here to be the law makers. We are here to account for those laws that are put into effect in the House of Commons. On the other hand, members of the bureaucracy are hired to carry out the policies and the laws that are passed in the House. More and more we see the bureaucracy setting down guidelines, rules and regulations that have profound effect. By limiting the debate to one hour with ten-minute speeches, the government ensures and absolutely underlines the fact that the bureaucracy will do the governing in the country.

One hour of debate on regulations after a motion has been initiated by a number of parliamentarians or Senators means 60 minutes of ten-minute speeches. The Government will use up three of those speeches and will then allow us only three ten-minute speeches to point out to the Government in a public forum the effect those regulations will have on the agricultural community.

We in the House all know that sometimes debate goes on for two or three days and it is not until the second or third day that members of the Press Gallery even realize or understand what we are talking about. It is only through this House that we signal to the press and through them to the Canadian people the detrimental effects that certain regulations will have. That is why I support my friend and colleague, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), on his motion to allow three days of debate. Three days would be ample time and is at least a compromise position. One hour is totally inadequate. Again, I would not want to see unlimited debate on any one or two regulations that would be brought in.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close by saying that I hope the Government will recognize that we on this side are being sincere in requesting that this amendment for a three-day debate be passed.

• (1210)

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the amendments which are before the House at this time. My concern about the Government's proposition to have a one-hour debate in the House of Commons on a regulation is that it does away with parliamentary control. Those of us who have been involved with legislation realize that regulations can be just as important as the Bill itself. They can be of any length, such as the regulation in the Department of National Defence concerning the rules of appeal for practices and procedures in courts martial which is over 14 pages long. Many words can be printed in 14 pages of *The Canada Gazette*.

I do not believe that Members of Parliament could ever agree to a clause which dictates that we must pass a regulation in one hour when it may take us five hours to read the regulation itself. If we really want to be the voice of the people and supervise the affairs of the Government, and if we really want to take the control of legislation and regulations away from the bureaucrats and restore it with the people's representatives, we certainly should have more than one hour of debate in the House of Commons.

Another provision I find offensive is that which suggests it takes 30 Members of the House of Commons to initiate this one-hour debate while it takes only 15 Senators to do the same thing. The situation may well arise when Members from one Province may wish to argue about a section in the regulations. I believe Members should have the automatic right to speak about a certain regulation, whether it is 10 Members or 15 Members. I find it hard to believe that anyone could suggest that two Members equal one Senator.

My main concern is that the Government, through this provision, is trying to limit the future role and authority of the House of Commons itself. The regulations on the awards and sanctions clause of the Bill will be very important to the agriculture and transportation industry in Canada. The provision in this legislation to provide only one hour in the House of Commons to debate regulations which could affect farmers, the transportation industry and the very way of life in western Canada is ridiculous. As one of my colleagues pointed out, even a time allocation motion requires two hours of debate in the House of Commons. The time allocation procedure under which we are presently debating this Bill allows us three days to debate the last two stages of the Crow legislation. Therefore I must ask how we could ever agree to a one-hour limitation provision which is more strict than any other rule in the House. It would give us less time for debate than we have for a Private Member's Bill and it is less time than we have for an Opposition day or for any Bill that comes before the House of Commons.

I must question why the Government wants to restrict us to a one-hour debate through this legislation when the regulations to be debated may be very important and of concern in the House two or three years from now and which may require a longer debate. If we agree to this one-hour debate, we will prevent future Parliaments from exercising their responsibility.

As a Member who represents the constituency of Churchill, which includes the Port of Churchill, I recognize the danger that this Bill to kill the Crow creates for a place such as the Port of Churchill. From the time this Bill was introduced we recognized that if variable rates were implemented and CN did not provide adequate repairs to its line, the Port of Churchill could be destroyed. For that reason the people in my riding are extremely concerned about this legislation and certainly would not want me to vote for it or any clause within it which would limit the power of the House of Commons to debate and supervise the affairs of the Government.

I certainly support the amendments put forward by my colleague for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). We should not limit ourselves in the future or today to a one-hour debate or even a three-day debate. We are all aware of the lengthy wording that bureaucrats put into regulations. If Members of Parliament are faced with 15-page regulations, how can we only allow them one hour or three days to debate? We should not set a limit on the length of debate when we do not know what the regulations will be. For us to limit our own ability to speak or investigate legislation which could affect all of western Canada and parts of eastern Canada would be complete folly and would run against the very nature of the House of Commons.

Each of us was elected to this place for the primary purpose of representing our constituents. The very history of Parliament has been for the people's representatives to review legislation. The very purpose of Parliament is to supervise the activities of the Cabinet and the bureaucracy. This limitation of debate to one hour as proposed by the Government detracts from the fundamental purpose and rights of Members of Parliament. I certainly will not support the Government's position and I suspect that Government Members, after reconsideration, would recognize that they are cutting their own throats if they pass legislation of this nature.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few moments on the proposal put forward by my colleague from Vegreville that would deal with the regulatory process of this Bill. I suggest that all of us are looking for a reasonable position regarding the ability of the Government to design and implement regulations. The difficulty is that all of us have different ideas of what is reasonable.

The Government takes the position that once the legislation is passed it should have the right to design regulations that flow from that Act, regulations that would be pursuant to the Act. We feel that is true, but even those regulations deserve a certain amount of debate because it is not necessarily true that the Government will always present regulations that are pursuant to the Act or for the good of the people involved. I believe even Members of the Government would recognize that those who design the regulations and who have spent their years in Ottawa, rather than out in the fields where the producers are, do not necessarily remain in touch with the situation in the rest of the country. Since that isolation exists, the regulations flowing from the Bill that the Government designs may not

necessarily be for the good of the producer. Certainly we have seen that in the legislation before us.

The motion put forward by the NDP goes to the other extreme. Their definition of reasonable is that we should be able to debate regulations ad infinitum. I do not know that that is necessary either. While all of us have our own definition of what is reasonable, it is not reasonable to have a one-hour debate on regulations that determine the future of an entire industry in Canada. I do not believe it is reasonable by anyone's definition when the Government can in one motion, by Order in Council, dramatically alter the rules by which the producers operate.

● (1220)

I think it would not take much effort to register how the tables would be turned. I would wonder how Government Members from the Maritimes would react if we brought forward a Bill dealing with the Maritimes fishing industry, that would alter the terms of reference for the entire industry and there was a provision in that Bill whereby you could debate all the regulations pertaining to that industry in one our. I would imagine there are a fair number of Members, including the Minister of Public Works (Mr. LeBlanc), who is here, who would have some concern that the Members from New Brunswick would be able to ventilate their views in one hour. I think the Minister of Public Works would like to see them given the opportunity to debate for more than one hour, unless he really wants to throttle his own colleagues from New Brunswick, though I do not think he is that kind of a fellow.

Mr. LeBlanc: We have heard a lot of ventilation in the last few weeks.

Mr. Friesen: When I ventilate, it is fresh air. What about Members from Nova Scotia or the two Members from Prince Edward Island? If we had a Bill dealing with the fishing industry that determines the future of the maritime Provinces, I think Members of the Liberal Government would be very exercised about the need to be able to discuss regulations that would affect the fishermen constituents whose future they are determining.

There you see the definition or reasonableness changes, Mr. Speaker. What now seems eminently reasonable, a one-hour debate affecting the future of western farmers, which is what seems to be reasonable to the Government, would change dramatically if the venue were changed, if it were to determine the fishing industry of the Maritimes.

We need to look very carefully at the proposal put forward by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). By imposing a three-day limit to debate those regulations, he is being reasonable. Nobody is saying we have to debate the motion for three days. If we examine the regulations put forward by the Government and they seem to be meeting the needs of the producers, helping the producers operate comfortably within their arena and if those producers can function properly and the regulations are meeting those needs, why debate the issue for three days?

I suppose we can say that one of the most overworked committees in this House, one which does not get much attention but nevertheless is overworked, is the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments. That particular committee has the burden of examining all of the regulations the bureaucrats design. Every once in a while we get notice that the bureaucracy has designed regulations that really are ultra vires or have gone too far and are really not operating within the constraints that ought to be theirs. In that case the Standing Committee on Regulations and Statutory Instruments has a very important function to fulfil. If we have only a one-day debate on a motion on regulations flowing from this Bill, rest assured that that committee will get an awful lot of extra work.

As the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) pointed out and we are talking about a one-hour debate on this motion the Government wants us to deal with it, by having ten-minute speeches. This means six speakers. Of those six speakers the Government will make very certain it will have three of them. The Opposition, at the maximum, will get 30 minutes of debating time to deal with very complex regulations. That is not within the bounds of reasonableness, Mr. Speaker, unless everyone unanimously wants to support the regulations. If our experience shows us anything or teaches us anything regarding this legislation, it is that we ought not to take for granted the reasonableness of the regulations that flow from this Bill.

I suppose at the bottom of all this is the whole concept of honour. Because of the experience we have had on this side of the House for the past three years, there is very little confidence left in the Government's sense of honour. Think back to the omnibus Bill presented to us a year and a half ago which brought on the ringing of the bells, Mr. Speaker. The Government tried to invoke about three principles in one Bill and made it impossible for us to debate it. In fact, in the Bill before us there are several concepts that we have allowed to pass within the Bill that are really in violation of the concept of good regulation.

The fact that the B.C. coal lands are incorporated in a Bill dealing with western grain transportation seems to me a contradiction of the whole concept of debate.

Mr. Mazankowski: How much are they worth?

Mr. Friesen: The coal lands are worth billions of dollars.

Mr. Mazankowski: Is it $450 billion?

Mr. Friesen: Let us try $450 billion within the life of those coal lands. We, representing British Columbia, might get ten minutes' debate on regulations determining the future of those coal lands under the Government's terms, assuming we get one of those three speaking slots.

Mr. Forrestall: Are those dollars 1963 dollars?

Mr. Friesen: That $450 billion is in 1972 dollars.

We are talking about an escalating figure as those coal lands are developed. By the time that land is developed it will

be worth a lot more than the $400 billion we were talking about. But the Government wants to debate those regulations affecting the coal lands in ten-minute debating slots if we are lucky. The other Opposition Party might get one of those slots and certainly representatives of the prairie grain farming area will get some of those speaking slots. We from British Columbia might get no time at all to debate the regulations affecting the development of those B.C. coal lands.

I am saying that when it comes to a sense of honour we have had enough lessons in the past three and a half years to teach us not to take a position of trusting honour in the development of the regulations. We have to be sure. Therefore, we need a minimum of three days' debating time. If the regulations are good and we agree with them, we do not have to debate them for three days. But certainly it is reasonable to expect at least a three-day opportunity to debate those regulations if we sense that we need that time.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I have an observation arising from a concern about a section in the Act. Although in this day and age legislation is becoming very complex. Thus it is incumbent upon us not to forget from time to time that we have a responsibility as Parliamentarians to ensure that people being affected by legislation and regulations made pursuant to a measure are understood. We have a responsibility to ensure that in this case producers understand clearly what Parliament intends when it introduces regulations.

If that concern is a valid one, it seems rather easy to me, indeed a very proper position for this House to take, to amend the present wording in the Act. As Your Honour knows, it sets forth with respect to debate on regulations a period of one hour. I have some uncertainty as to whether or not it is one hour for each regulation, one hour for all the regulations, or one hour for an amendment to the Act with respect to regulations which might be introduced at some point in the future. I am still unclear. If this piece of legislation produces a thousand separate regulations, it may well be that the House could be preoccupied for a thousand hours of debate. Of course, that is an extreme interpretation.

● (1230)

The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), together with those Members who laboured long and hard all summer with respect to the legislation, has adopted a much more reasonable position. The Hon. Member for Vegreville suggested that we should have three days of debate on regulations. That is reasonable. In three days it is possible for us to indicate clearly to those persons most directly affected by the regulations what we intended or what we meant, whether we understand clearly the position of the producers, but in theory the position of anyone directly affected by the regulations. Do we understand their position? The only way those directly affected will know is if they have access to a historical document, in this case the *Debates* of the Chamber. If they have access to the *Debates*, only in that way will they understand whether or not we in fact understood their needs or, to put it another way, whether or not the regulations do what they were intended to do, that is, to make the legislation itself operative, flow smoothly and serve the needs for which it was intended.

In seeking to amend the particular clause by striking out the one hour and replacing it with three days, Hon. Members of the House and indeed the Senate would be given an opportunity to put on the record their interpretation of what they believe people in fact want. Unless I am seriously mistaken, it seems that the function and role of government is to serve the people. It is not complex or complicated. We do that by proposing and debating laws which are good laws. Good laws are simply ones which people will instinctively want to follow and adhere to. Bad laws are just the opposite. In my judgment it is not good law to deny people access to an understanding of our intentions. The three days would allow that access; if it is a simple matter, it could be simply stated and perhaps clearly understood.

As other speakers have said, there is no suggestion that every regulation be debated for three days. On the other hand, if it takes more than an hour or one speech to indicate that clearly to those most directly affected by regulations, then that is our responsibility. I think it is a very clear one.

I do not see it as anything other than a reasonable proposition, and I do not understand the Government's objection. I did not understand when it objected to it during the committee debate. It seemed like a reasonable position. My friends in the New Democratic Party suggested some other changes which are quite recognizable from their point of view. Today they might qualify; after the next election they might not. They see themselves as holier than thou, the only spokesmen for western producers or as very specific representatives of particular interest groups. I understand their seeking to reduce the numbers required to communicate to the Chair their desire to debate a particular recommendation. I have no quarrel with that in any particular sense, so I will not in any way try to deal with it.

I would like to deal more particularly with the amendments of the Hon. Member for Vegreville and his colleagues who worked diligently on this, in order to facilitate the prosecution of a responsibility, that is, to ensure that anyone who is interested and follows the debate clearly understands what we intend. It might be that with the complexity of legislation today a speaker may not in ten minutes be able to deal completely with the implications of a regulation. It is incumbent upon us in the Chamber not to impose restrictions on people who participate in debates in such a way as to render it very difficult, if not impossible, to communicate their views to Hon. Members, or, much more important, to those people directly affected, and to have them on the historical record. To this end the ten-minute limitation seems unreasonable. Whether it is more unreasonable to remove that and have no time limit on the debate than the ten-minute restriction, I am not absolutely certain, but I am certain that whatever we in this Chamber do with respect to these guidelines it should be done in such a way as to allow individual Members and Members

collectively ample time in the course of their interventions to make clearly known—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of Motions Nos. 47 and 49, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), and Motion No. 48, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski).

There are a number of issues before us in dealing with these three amendments. The first and perhaps the most offensive, not only to Members of Parliament but I suspect to the people of Canada, is clause 22 of Bill C-155. It states that it takes two Members of Parliament for every one Senator to request a debate on any of the regulations. When it comes to regulations regarding awards and sanctions, regulations regarding the allocation of railway cars, regulations that could affect the quota system or the block system or regulations that could discriminate against a system participant unfairly or discriminate in favour of a system participant unfairly, it surely requires some detailed attention by the House of Commons.

• (1240)

Surely those kinds of regulations deserve more attention, if they are deemed to be of sufficient importance by 15 Senators or 30 Members of the House of Commons, than ten minutes of debate for each of six Members of this House. Surely they require more attention than that if the question is of sufficient importance to some 30 Members of the House of Commons. The Government cannot have it both ways. If it is important enough for 15 Senators or 30 Members of the House of Commons to want to use the time of the House to debate those regulations, it is of sufficient importance not to be restricted to a one hour debate. That is a conflict in itself.

Perhaps government Members, regardless of what government it may be, are telling us in advance that little interest will be shown in a debate of the regulations, about as much interest as the Government is showing in the debate on this and other amendments we have been debating over the last couple of weeks.

I wish to quote a poem from the book "The Blasted Pine, An Anthology of Satire, Invective and Disrespectful Verse". If it was a long poem I would not read it, but it is comprised of only two lines. It says something about the silence that has been so evident in the seats across the way. The poem is entitled "Places" and was written by Joseph Howe. I quote:

As Bees, on Flowers alighting, cease their Hum,
So, settling upon Places, Whigs grow dumb.

I wish some Members opposite would show a little more belief in the project they are trying so hard to sell both to the House of Commons and to the people of Canada. They seem to have taken the position that, as far as they are concerned, it is of extreme urgency, so much so that they have refused time and again overtures from this side to split the Bill into its various component parts. By doing so, they could move ahead on the matter of rail modernization, something that was very important at the time of the last election and when they talked about the Western Canada Development Fund in two different years.

At the time that was discussed, there was no mention of the fact that it was going to require a five times increase in payments by western grain producers in order to get that modernization. When the Government talked about double tracking at the time of the last election, it did not mention that it would be only the western farmer who would pay. What happened to that promise? We now have 50 miles—or do I stand in danger of being prosecuted because I did not put that in kilometres? At the time of that promise, there was no mention that it would be only the western grain producer who would pay for the double tracking.

We also had the Western Canada Development Fund. We were assured that a lot of that would go for the modernization and upgrading of the rail system. There was no mention that that would not happen unless western grain producers paid for it. That went by the boards. It was repeated the next year, but there was still no mention of the fact that it would not happen unless western grain producers paid for it.

There is one overriding issue in this debate. The whole matter of the Crow debate can be put very simply: the people of western Canada do not believe the Liberals and they do not trust the CPR. That is the issue.

Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 are trying to address different issues in the Bill. The Government wants to push them through all at one time instead of splitting them up in some reasonable way. The Government will get its way with regard to this legislation by virtue of its majority, which it obtained a number of years ago. Sooner or later it will have its way. It does not want the House to debate any of the regulations which may ensue from this legislation unless 15 Senators or 30 Members of Parliament request such a debate. If such a debate takes place, it will be restricted to six Members speaking for ten minutes each, or the equivalent amount of time.

It may be that the Members of the Liberal Party believe that it takes two Members of Parliament to equal one Senator. As far as I am concerned, and as far as my colleagues in this and the other Opposition Party as well as the voters are concerned, we have a somewhat higher estimation of the people who are elected here than those which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) appoints. I suspect that Canadians trust their judgment to pick representatives who are at least equal to those selected by one man, a man who currently is not having a great love affair with the Canadian public, despite many of his credentials I am astounded at the reasoning and logic which produce that kind of solution.

I wish more Members opposite would rise in their place rather than simply alight on it. I want to know what is the logic for providing for 30 Members of Parliament or 15 Senators. Surely there has to be some and I would appreciate being edified on that point. I ask Members opposite to give us the reasoning behind that one item.

I am glad we have had an opportunity to discuss these amendments—alhtough I sometimes wonder how many are listening—and to point out some of the tortured logic that makes up much of the legislation before us. Nowhere has this been more evident than in the Government's treatment of the clauses which Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 try to amend.

I conclude by again asking that the Government not only have some of its Members rise to defend the legislation, but consider splitting the Bill in order that we can progress with those items which they promised to the people of western Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to inform the Hon. Member that his allotted time has expired.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be able to participate in this debate on Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49. As other speakers have indicated, these motions intend to strengthen Parliament's role and the role of Members of Parliament in debating and deciding upon regulations that the Government may wish to introduce from time to time to change, enhance or subtract from the powers of the Administrator and the Senior Grain Transportation Committee.

● (1250)

We on this side of the House are very concerned with the original legislation in Bill C-155, especially the role of Parliament. Throughout the evolution of Bill C-155 we have been gravely concerned with the method. We are concerned that Paliament has in many ways been by-passed, as the producers had originally been by-passed. It took the pleading of the combined Opposition to have the Government form a committee to listen to the producers.

We feel that Bill C-155 is a product of the back rooms, that it is a product essentially of people in the Department of Transport who feel they know better in terms of western agriculture, the shape which grain production on the Prairies should take and the transportation of those grains. That Department has shown time and time again that it does not know better. It has made horrendous mistakes in the past that have cost the taxpayers of this country some billions of dollars. If Parliament was not here as an institution, I am certain that these people would have spent and wasted even more of the taxpayers' money than they did with Mirabel, Pickering and the passenger transportation system in this country. To allow these people almost a blank cheque is indeed very irresponsible.

What we have here in this legislation is a design to alter radically agriculture and the transportation of grains in western Canada. Earlier in this Bill the Government sets up the position of an Administrator and a Senior Grain Transportation Committee. We have argued in previous amendments that the Senior Grain Transportation Committee did not properly and adequately represent the producers of western Canada, the people who are directly affected by these policies. The Senior Grain Transportation Committee was stacked in favour of the railroads and larger corporations. We stood in the House and fought to enhance representation from the pools on the Senior Grain Transportation Committee. We still have to vote on that, Mr. Speaker, to see how willing the Government really is to make certain that farmer organizations like the pools are adequately represented.

In this Bill we have also seen the Government attempt to enhance the powers of the Administrator. The Administrator is going to have the power of sanctions and awards that it can level against the pools and the Wheat Board. These are tremendous powers in the hands of the Administrator. How those powers will be used we do not know.

The people of Saskatchewan are very paranoid about the intentions of this Government and they have every reason to be. This Government has not been open or sympathetic to the needs of western Canada and particularly to the people of Saskatchewan. Public opinion surveys in Saskatchewan indicate how strongly the people of Saskatchewan are opposed to this Bill. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Saskatchewan are very paranoid of what this Government is intending to do, and they have every reason to be.

In addition, we now find that the role of Parliament, the role of the representatives of the people, is to be even further curbed. The Government has written into this legislation closure in advance. The people of Saskatchewan are outraged by what the Government is doing. They are outraged by Bill C-155. They are outraged by section after section of this Bill. What we are debating today is just one more item of outrage. It is no wonder that farmers in Saskatchewan occupied Government offices during the last few days. Surely the Government can take this as a signal of the degree of anger that exists in that Province. But no, the Government just buries its head in the sand and ploughs ahead.

Why is this Bill so important to the people of Saskatchewan? This Bill affects Saskatchewan more than any other Province. Saskatchewan is the big loser in this Bill. Hundreds of millions of dollars will be leaving that Province every year because of this Bill. Production of grain in Saskatchewan is our major industry. Towns, villages—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Flis) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is never in the House, or comes in late and does not know where we are. For the Hon. Member's attention, we are not at third reading. We are at report stage discussing Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 which pertain to Clause 22. I wish he would address himself to what is before this House.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I hope that that illogical and out of order interruption will not be taken as part of my time. What I am trying to say to the Hon. Member, if he would only listen and if it would only begin to sink in, is this: If he would only for a moment take that bloody smile off his face and begin to realize the seriousness of this legislation, the Hon. Member would begin to understand that what the Government

is doing in this section is introducing closure in advance. I am trying to get it into your thick skull that this piece of legislation is drastically changing the whole way of life in Saskatchewan, not just its economy but society and culture as well. That is something that you darn Liberals, who are so smug and have enjoyed power so much that you become fooled by your own bureaucrats—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, remarks should be addressed to the Chair; and I am sure the Hon. Member realizes he is straying just a little bit.

Mr. de Jong: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not direct my remarks through you. The feelings that I have are just further provoked by the types of interruptions and interventions that the Hon. Member just exhibited.

As I was trying to point out to the Hon. Member, all of us from Saskatchewan, whether we are in the Conservative Party or the New Democratic Party, have been trying to point out to the Government that what they are doing has serious ramifications not just for the economy of Saskatchewan, but for the culture, the villages, the towns and communities that have developed because of our major industry, the growing of grains. Regulations and laws have a tremendous effect upon the workings of our Province. It is not just something that should be decided by a group of bureaucrats sitting in the back rooms in Ottawa. It should not just fit into the needs of some railway company. There is a whole way of life involved here. To limit Parliament to only one hour of debate is an insult to the people of Saskatchewan and their representatives.

I see by your motion that my ten minutes is up, Mr. Speaker. If it is only one o'clock, I will continue my remarks after the adjournment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock later this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

HIGH LEVEL OF YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, compared with the average 2.4 per cent annual growth in employment between 1971 and 1982, this year's projections of 0.5 per cent are dismal. Economists say it is a respectable performance because a sizable increase in new jobs cannot come before business investment picks up, probably in mid-1984. In the meantime, youth unemployment is extremely high.

In contrast to the over-all trend, the unemployment rate for women aged between 15 and 24 rose in September to 16.7 per cent. The rate for men in the same age group was 20.9 per cent. These rates are far above the over-all 11.3 per cent unemployment rate.

The Economic Council of Canada in its annual review sums it up well. When all the sums have been tallied, putting people back to work or usefully upgrading their skills will be less costly than continuing to support idle resources. A large number of our youth continue to be idle.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LOUIS RIEL

HISTORIC DEBT OF PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Mr. Henri Tousignant (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, in a speech he held in Quebec this weekend, the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party—I noted to my astonishment and concern—showed very poor judgment in saying that by supporting the unanimous resolution adopted by Parliament in favour of bilingualism in Manitoba, this Party was settling a historic debt resulting from the hanging of Louis Riel by a Progressive Conservative Government. Since the past prepares the future, the Progressive Conservative leader can not hope to wipe out his party's debt so easily or so cheaply. It is also incredible to see how he tries to fool people. He tells his constituents in Central Nova that he has not had time to think about whether he would be living in Quebec for the next election, while he is giving every single organizer in each Quebec riding he visits the impression that he intends to run in that riding. At that rate, he will have to run in 76 ridings, that is, the riding of Central Nova and 75 more in his native province.

* * *

[*English*]

SHIPBUILDING

CONDEMNATION OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the thousands of Canadian shipbuilders who have been unemployed for one, two, or three years, I would like to congratulate the Liberal Government for doing an outstanding job to encourage and promote employment in foreign shipyards.

The 1980 policy to slash the Shipbuilding Industry Assistance Program from 20 per cent to 9 per cent, and the failure to implement the promised tax changes to discourage the pro-

curement of foreign equipment, have resulted in an influx of foreign-built ships twice as numerous as those built in Canadian yards.

The Government's plan to ensure work for shipyards abroad at the expense of Canadian yards has worked; employment in the shipbuilding industry has sunk from 14,000 to less than 6,000 nationally. Very real concern has been expressed by the Canadian Shipbuilding and Ship Repair Association.

Excessive unemployment, and billions of dollars in torpedoed business, can be directly linked to government actions that failed to protect Canadian industry and encouraged the importation of foreign-built equipment. Canadian shipbuilders cannot afford the financial and personal losses that come from the Government's protection of jobs in foreign shipyards. We on this side, as usual, are in conflict with the policies of the Government and will return this industry to a productive, vital Canadian sector by implementing legislation that will do just that.

* * *

DISASTERS

STORM DAMAGE AT GABARUS, N.S.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, last week a raging storm went through my constituency of Cape Breton-East Richmond, destroying a number of private wharves in the community known as Gabarus. In addition to destroying those wharves, the major breakwater which had been in place for about 25 years was also destroyed.

I wish to put on the record formally that I will be approaching the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané), the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), as well as the Minister responsible for Canada Works, to seek additional funding. It should be noted that I will also be seeking the co-operation of the provincial Government in Nova Scotia which viewed the disaster at Gabarus, to assure that it will also be providing moneys so that the facilities at Gabarus can be upgraded, renovated, and put back to normal in order that the fishing industry and the economic benefits of that area can be restored.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

FEES CHARGED PROSPECTIVE HONG KONG IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, on Friday in the House of Commons I brought up the matter of the immigration scam in Hong Kong. I mentioned the lawyers and so-called immigration consultants who are going over there and charging exorbitant fees for giving advice that could essentially be had free from the Canadian High Commission. The Minister should take this matter up with the president of the Canadian Bar Association to find out who these people are, what this is really about, and what he can do about it.

We need to upgrade the Hong Kong office. There are good people there, but there are line-ups, and files all over the floor because there is not enough storage.

There are even ads in the *Vancouver Sun* about this. On Tuesday, October 25, an ad appeared in the *Vancouver Sun* saying:

> Eligible for immigration. Make a solid investment in a precious metals refinery in Vancouver and become a Canadian citizen. $300,000.

It gives a telephone number.

There is nothing wrong with having business entrepreneurs as immigrants, but we should make sure that we do not give the impression that you can buy our way into Canada at the expense of the family class. Many of my constituents who have brothers and sisters in Hong Kong cannot afford $300,000, but they also want to get their relatives over here.

This is a real scam that is going on in Hong Kong and it is now going on in the Vancouver papers. The Minister should look into this. We should examine our immigration policy, which is inherently inequitable when you think—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

NEW EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

APPLICATION IN PETERBOROUGH AREA OF ONTARIO

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, for those who had exhausted UIC benefits in the Peterborough area, the NEED Program would allow them to renew claims after a ten week work period. However, I have now been informed that this work period has been increased to 16 weeks because of a supposed improvement in the unemployed rate for Peterborough. This is simply not the case. It is only applicable if Peterborough is averaged into the high employment area of Oshawa which is currently benefiting from an increase in production and sales in the automotive industry.

It is indeed unjust and demoralizing to design a project, the purpose of which is to instil renewed confidence in the unemployed, and then, simultaneously, extinguish their hopes by extending the work period from ten to 16 weeks in the middle of the program. This represents callous indifference to the plight of those so adversely affected by unemployment, and therefore demands immediate attention from the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts).

The unemployment percentage rate for Peterborough must be determined separately from District 52 since District 52

included job growth in the auto industry to our south. I will be requesting Statistics Canada to supply this breakdown of the job losses in Peterborough separate from District 52 at the earliest opportunity, in the hope that a ten-week UIC qualification period might be returned to the Peterborough federal riding.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT

ANALYSIS OF AMENDMENTS TO CROWSNEST PASS RATE ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be useful to let Canadians know to what extent the present Liberal Government has been analyzing proposed changes to the Crow Rate. Before Bill C-155 was tabled in the House last May, a number of consultations and meetings with the people concerned had already been held. At the second reading stage, 97 Members were given nine days to consider legislation, and they did so for 44 hours. In committee, the Bill required 31 days of work, 11 being used to travel across Canada in order to meet concerned citizens. The Committee heard 240 witnesses and 89 amendments were adopted in committee. Until last week's sitting, and we should include today's as well, about 200 speeches had been made at the report stage in the House. Opposition Members are being excessively touchy about their democratic rights when they claim that the Government is not giving them an opportunity to be heard. Canadians are prepared to have these changes adopted immediately, and I hope this will be done as soon as possible.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

JUSTIFICATION FOR UNITED STATES INVASION OF GRENADA

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, the New Democratic Party and some of the Liberal "American haters" in this House are excellent examples of the verse, "All is yellow to the jaundiced eye." Everything which is anti-American is gospel to them. For example, the Communists say, and these Members of Parliament parrot, that the Cubans and Soviets were building an airport in Grenada for tourists, that the Cubans and Soviets on the island were labourers, and that the U.S.A. initiated the invasion.

What are the facts? Well, this airport has gun racks throughout the building, even in the toilets. Some tourist attraction! And how come these Russian and Cuban labourers suddenly have rifles and anti-aircraft guns with plenty of ammunition, all Soviet made? What about the warehouse north of St. George's which was packed with Soviet made AK 47 assault rifles, hand-held RPG7 anti-aircraft weapons, and 120 mm mortars in sufficient quantity to supply a battalion for a month?

Furthermore, at least six of the Caribbean nations testified that they asked the U.S.A. to participate. Prime Minister Seaga of Jamaica has stated publicly that the invasion was just in time to stop the Soviets from carrying out early plans, and I quote, "... to turn the island into a Soviet Cuban fortress". How is it that some Hon. Members of this House cannot see that the Soviet Communists are slowly trying to get bases all over the world for the great world takeover?

Americans are fighting, and some are dying, for all freedom loving peoples. God grant that the socialists in this House will open their eyes before Canada becomes the next victim.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member but his time has expired.

* * *

DISARMAMENT

CALL FOR SUPPORT OF PRIME MINISTER'S INITIATIVE

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there can be no greater need for action in this time of international instability than the need for action to bring about a lasting and secure peace. In this Disarmament Week, Mr. Speaker, I call upon Hon. Members, and indeed upon all Canadians, to support the efforts of the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to rally world leaders around new and creative initiatives—

Mr. Nielsen: Where is the apple?

Mr. Evans: —toward effective arms reductions. The initiative of the Prime Minister is an act of personal courage and a continuation of—

An Hon. Member: No more Cabinet shuffles this year.

Mr. Evans: —Liberal Government diplomatic initiatives in the decades since the Second World War when Lester B. Pearson announced Canada's approach to nuclear war. He stated that there is no national solution, only an international solution. The Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, is continuing the quest for a lasting international solution.

This effort is not, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) would have us believe, simply "philosophical musing".

An Hon. Member: I believe that.

Mr. Evans: Rather than attempting to gain partisan political advantage by undermining the effectiveness of the Prime Minister's bold initiative, the Official Opposition should put aside their partisan rhetoric in an effort to further the cause of peace. There are no second chances, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Oh, John!

Mr. Evans: In the cause of world peace, as the old saying goes, if you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

POLITICAL PARTIES

INVASION OF GRENADA—POSITION OF PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the same topic as the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor), because during the last week the Conservative Party has refused to take a stand against the Reagan administration's invasion of Grenada. Meanwhile, in Britain, that Party's soul sister, Margaret Thatcher, has condemned the invasion as wrong. In fact, many of the Conservative speakers during the special parliamentary debate on Grenada last Thursday were dangerously reminiscent of the 1950 McCarthy regime in the United States.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, where is the Party of John Diefenbaker, who as Prime Minister was not afraid to stand up to an American president? Where is the Party of Robert Stanfield, a statesman, and a man who was respected on all sides of the House for his balanced and moderate views of the world? Where is the new Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Mulroney) when it comes to standing up for Canada? The Conservative Party has been reduced to a branch plant of Mr. Reagan's Republicans. The Americanization of the Conservative Party is complete.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION—CRITICISM OF NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD REPORT

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane-Superior): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last the National Energy Board released its report on the federally owned Northern Canada Power Commission. Not wanting to be unduly harsh in my judgment of this report, I must, however, describe its recommendations as inept, inadequate and, above all, an insult to the two territorial governments and to the people who live north of 60 degrees. Rather than agreeing to the recommendations of a subcommittee of this House calling for the break up of NCPC into two territorially owned power commissions, with a debt free transfer of the assets, the National Energy Board argues for essentially maintaining the status quo.

It wants yet another federal regulatory agency to set rates and to be given complete and final authority in establishing NCPC's annual revenue requirements. The debt burden, it suggests, should remain, except for a very small portion.

What northerners want is to have their own public utility boards assume full responsibility for the setting of rates, and to have those rates roughly comparable to those in effect elsewhere in Canada. This is impossible under the present legislation which governs the Northern Canada Power Commission. Comparability in rate structures can easily be achieved by adding an energy agreement for cost recoveries in the North as is now done for health, social services, education, economic development, justice and public services, public works, and so on.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

GOVERNMENT'S INDUSTRIAL POLICY

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Statistics Canada in its economic figures the other day showed that the economy has dropped because of the poor performance in housing, wholesale trade, and manufacturing. This confirms the fears of a number of economists who have been pointing out that we are in a very slow recovery and, in particular, the Canadian recovery is looking much weaker than that of the United States.

Since the key difference between the industrial policies of the U.S. and Canadian Governments is that the Government of Canada has exercised a much greater degree of direct intervention in the economy, is the Prime Minister proposing that the industrial policy of his Government shift to a less interventionist policy?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Madam Speaker, the Government's policy on the subject was published in the last budget, and also in a number of documents that were published subsequently to stress the importance of the private sector and the role it must play in Canada's economic recovery.

I may remind the hon. gentleman that during the first two quarters of 1983, Canada's economy was growing at a faster rate than the U.S. economy. In fact, our economic growth rate over this period was the highest of all major industrialized countries. We are waiting for the figures for the third quarter. As the honourable gentleman is aware, there was a slack period in July and August especially in August in residential construction as a result of termination of our housing construction stimulation programs. Since that time, however, there has been some recovery, and we believe we shall again have the same high growth rate we had during the first part of 1983.

[*English*]

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, the Minister gave us a long speech on economic policy, but did not address in any way at all the question which is put to him.

REQUEST FOR NON-INTERVENTIONIST POLICY

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, let me go directly back to the main element of my question. A recent survey by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce shows a clear desire on the part of business for a non-interventionist industrial policy by Government, for example, no bail-outs of sick companies, the use of broad base tax incentives rather than arbitrary, narrowly focused and, as the Minister knows, sometimes politically motivated grants to industry, and opposition to a major federal Crown corporation designed to invest in particular industries. Is the Government in agreement with this desire for a pull-back in its policies, which policies have intervened in the economy, presumably to benefit industry which clearly opposes these policies?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, once again, I remind the hon. gentleman that the last budget contained many initiatives that were specifically aimed at stimulating the private sector. In fact, these measures involved funding of about $2.4 billion.

As for the survey the hon. gentleman referred to, you will recall that it was conducted in 1982, and that its findings reflect the views we have often heard in business circles, namely, a desire for less regulation and less government intervention. I believe the measures we have taken during the past year are a step in that direction, but I may remind the hon. gentleman that far from rejecting Government support, businesses are very much interested in obtaining such support.

This morning, the Minister announced, in my presence, a contribution to research and development at Pratt & Whitney, involving about $468 million over the next 10 years, to be matched by a $1.2 billion contribution by Pratt & Whitney, which will create 6,000 additional jobs and generate an additional $19 billion in sales over the next 10 years. That is a significant contribution and an important example of co-operation between the private sector and Government in creating jobs in this country and putting Canada in the forefront of advanced technology.

● (1420)

[*English*]

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, that is very, very expensive job-creation money.

MINISTERS' VIEWS ON POLICY

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one more question and I would like to address it to the Prime Minister. The Minister of State for Economic Development is clearly non-interventionist in his approach. He said that the Government should create a better business climate and not intervene directly. The Minister of State for Social Development in the other place takes a contrary view and wants the Government, through the Canada Development Investment Corporation, to invest directly in certain industries. The industrial community has clearly rejected this approach. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what is the policy of the Government. Should the Government invest directly in industrial corporations, or should it not?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member followed the reply of the Minister of Finance he would know that current examples were given of co-operation between the federal Government and the private sector, but co-operation where the private sector was holding the equity and we were encouraging development, either through grants for technical development or through tax incentives, some $2.4 billion of which were announced in the last budget.

The answer is quite clear. The Hon. Member refers to the CDIC and to the Minister in charge. The Hon. Member knows what the portfolio of the CDIC is. It is not for the CDIC to invest in the private sector. It is for the CDIC to attempt to provide better management for those shares that the Canadian Government—

An Hon. Member: Like Canadair?

Mr. Trudeau: —that the Canadian Government already owns as a result of us preventing the private sector from allowing the destruction of this aeronautics industry, both in the case of Canadair and de Havilland. All CDIC is doing is managing assets that the private sector proved incapable of managing and that we are now attempting to manage to keep this technology here.

* * *

SHIPBUILDING

CRITERIA GOVERNING CONTRACTS—UNEMPLOYMENT AT PORT WELLER

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce I direct my question to the President of the Treasury Board who has a certain responsibility for the Niagara Peninsula as well as for southwestern Ontario. Last Thursday in St. Catharines, where the unemployment rate is already at 16.1 per cent, the highest of those metropolitan communities that reported, over 700 employees of the Port Weller drydocks who are unemployed were complaining and protesting about the fact that $4 billion worth of shipbuilding contracts had been let since June, 1983, and none had gone to Port Weller. Since Members of the Government have said that Port Weller drydocks will not share in the allocation of this money because it was not the low

bidder, is the lowest bid now the criteria upon which these contracts are let?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, according to Government policy, when there is a public call for tenders, the Government always applies the criterion of the lowest bidder. This was done in the case of the six class 1100 ice-breakers. I would qualify my answer only to say that two of the six ice-breakers were to go to shipyards on Canada's West Coast and four to the shipyards in the East. The Port Weller dry-docks bid on the four ice-breakers designated for the East coast, and unfortunately, the bid made by the Port-Weller dry-docks was higher than the bids of the other shipyards who were awarded the contracts for the four ships.

[*English*]

SUBSIDY TO MARINE INDUSTRIES IN SOREL, P.Q.

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister, and I trust that he will respond this time. If the lowest bid is the criterion upon which these contracts will be let, does the Minister take into consideration what was announced last week in the awarding of those contracts? By that I mean the grants to the yards themselves, like the federal grant of $2,189,000 that went to Marine Industries which received a contract for two icebreakers. When letting contracts, does the Minister take that $2 million into consideration?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member mentioned $2 million for Marine Industries Limited in Sorel and there was also an announcement that $1.2 million would go to Davie Shipbuilding Limited and more than one million dollars to Saint John Shipbuilding Dry Dock Co., Ltd., in New Brunswick. These subsidies were granted under the Shipbuilding Industry Assistance Program and represent 3 per cent of the cost of work and renovation already carried out. This amount was not considered when awarding the contracts for the six 1100 icebreakers. The amounts were a 3 per cent subsidies for previous work on ships or for shipyard renovation.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—SUGGESTED PARLIAMENTARY FACT FINDING MISSION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and concerns last week's invasion of Grenada. Last week the President of the United States, in attempting to justify the invasion, said that the decision had been made on Sunday, after being requested to invade by a group of east Caribbean states.

It appears from information that was provided over the weekend in Washington that in fact the decision to invade was made by the President of the United States and Mr. Shultz on Saturday and that, after that decision was reached, the United States drafted the wording of a request for invasion which was sent to the Commonwealth countries, and an appeal was made to the Commonwealth countries to use that wording when demanding U.S. intervention.

Considering that the Government of Canada and the Prime Minister were saying last week that we do not have enough information on this deplorable series of events in Grenada, will the Government now agree to send a fact finding group of Members of Parliament, composed of representatives from each Party, to the area in order to report back? Unlike the Conservative Party, we take a position on this important issue.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything to what I said at the end of last week when last commenting upon this matter, which was that we are attempting to determine the sequence of events and the facts. At this stage I do not see the advantage of naming a fact finding committee of this Parliament to make that investigation. We will try to find the answers in order to satisfy ourselves.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister knows that the events are not only profoundly important in terms of the impact in this region of the world but have very serious implications well beyond this hemisphere.

SUGGESTED COMPOSITION OF MISSION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister why, in the light of statements that he made last week, and in light of the statements made by the Acting Secretary of State for External Affairs, he would not agree to send a small delegation, composed of one Member of Parliament from each Party, and their staff, to visit the region and report back to the House and the people of Canada.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer is that the Government is trying to ascertain the facts for itself. When we know the facts we will be able to clarify some of these matters in response to questions from the Opposition. There is no interdiction on any Member of the House to go there and attempt to find the facts as well. However, for the Government to authorize Members of the three Parties to go there and find facts does not seem to me to be the right thing to do.

● (1430)

We are in possession of telexes. We know what our ambassadors think. We are trying to reconcile dates and conflicting views.

I answered the House the other day that we thought the decision was taken some time between Sunday night and Monday night. Apparently *The New York Times* has a contrary opinion on which the Hon. Member seems to be basing his question. We will try to find out, but I would think that it would not make the search any easier particularly to have the NDP and the Tories in the task force because, as the Leader of the NDP rightly points out, he has views and the Tories do not.

Mr. Broadbent: One must not totally despair over the Tories finally making a decision at some point about something.

TIMING OF INVASION DECISION—NATURE OF AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister wants to rely simply on government sources, whether they are ambassadorial or others, could he now give the Government of Canada's view on when the decision was reached and who drafted the communique requesting American intervention? Finally, does he agree with the British firm that was hired to build the so-called military airport in Grenada that, far from being a military airport, it was constructed for civilian purposes and has been financed not only by the Cubans but by other western European States that are part of NATO? Does the Prime Minister agree with all of that?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I have not seen the statement by a British firm. I will look into it.

I do know that there has been an aid program of Canada to Grenada and, contrary to what the official critic of the Tory Party has said, that it was the highest—

Mr. Stevens: I did not say the highest; I said one of the highest.

Mr. Trudeau: One of the highest. I think it was six out of ten two years ago, and it was third out of ten last year. So one can say one of the highest, I suppose, because ten is not a very large number. However, it does seem to me that we have not denied that we have assisted, in some ways, the Government of Grenada. The House knows that we were hoping to prevent it from being pushed all the way into the hands of Castro and the Soviet Union, and that has been our policy.

On the specific facts of the airport which the Hon. Member asks about, it is not something of which I have knowledge, but I am sure we could find out.

REQUEST FOR REFERRAL TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): My question is directed to the Prime Minister—

Mr. Broadbent: Here comes a position.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stevens: My question centres on our request last week for a reference to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence so that we could look into the Grenadian situation with particular reference to what went wrong with the Canadian airlift, why Canada was shut out from any meaningful knowledge of what was transpiring, and what indeed was the role of the Canadian ambassador in Washington with respect to this affair.

Since the Chairman of the Standing Committee seemed to be well disposed to such a reference, would the Prime Minister assure the House that the Government will co-operate in every way so that the committee can not only have the reference but a meaningful hearing?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think the question is hypothetical. As I understand it, the Committee has not been set up yet.

Mr. Stevens: It is a Standing Committee.

Mr. Trudeau: It is a Standing Committee. I am sure that, as concerns the terms of reference of a question to it, our House Leader will gladly discuss the question with the House leaders of the other Parties.

POSSIBLE CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN PEACE-KEEPING OPERATION

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister will recall that I asked him a question with respect to Canada's possible participation in an observation group or peace-keeping group, with respect to Grenada. Will he bring the House up to date on what steps have been taken by Canada with respect to participating in such a group? Would it be a Commonwealth type of group? Most important, will he assure the House that the provisional Government in Grenada will be consulted and that they will not exclude such countries as Barbados and Jamaica from whatever force is put together?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I advise the Hon. Member that we have been in close touch with Mr. Ramphal, through our High Commissioner in London, on this subject over the weekend. I think the Hon. Member would be aware that it is not intended at the present time to constitute a peace-keeping force in the sense that a new force would attempt to interpose itself between the troops presently on the island. What is intended is an effort to help restore constitutional authority on the island after forces might withdraw. I believe that the form that a Commonwealth presence might take is still somewhat unclear, except that it could support an interim government and could assist in the holding of elections at an appropriate time.

INDUSTRY

PROSPECTS FOR FORT ERIE HELICOPTER PROJECT

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce who is involved in a Cabinet meeting behind the curtain. I understand that the Minister will soon be announcing a deal involving the federal and provincial Governments, Fleet Industries of Fort Erie, and a German helicopter firm.

As the Minister knows, this year the Niagara region has been twice cited as the unemployment capital of the country. First, is it true that Fleet will get the helicopter deal and, second, if it is true, when will the Minister make the announcement?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, my experience in public office, both at the local level and at the federal level, is such that I believe premature discussions and announcements usually lead to very disappointing results. I would request that the Hon. Member refrain from discussing this issue until such time that we finalize negotiations with the company.

Mr. Fretz: I am not sure I appreciate the Minister's answer.

REQUEST FOR MINISTERIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, since hundreds of jobs are at stake in my riding, would the Minister do everything in his power to assist Fleet in getting this deal?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member is serious about these jobs, I think, as I have suggested to him privately and now publicly, that the least said publicly during negotiations usually leads to more productive results.

* * *

STATUS OF WOMEN

REQUEST FOR EXPANDED JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS TO INCLUDE FEMALES

Mrs. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, last night the Prime Minister was the absent host for a lounge suit reception for women attending the federal consultations. Obviously, boogeying with Barbra in New York took precedence over the serious economic concerns of Canadian women.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Mrs. Mitchell: My question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Status of Women. Since the Government's job creation record for women has been very dismal, when only 20 per cent of NEED jobs went to women, what action will the Minister take, in co-operation with the Minister of Employment and Immigration, to expand job-creation programs to guarantee this year that women will have jobs at least equal to their participation in the labour force?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of Members of the House that last night's reception was co-hosted by three of us, including the Minister responsible for the Status of Women and the Secretary of State. We had a very successful event. I must also say that the Prime Minister's Office was very well represented at last evening's function and that this Government is hosting three days of consultations with the women of Canada, which began very effectively this morning.

I might add that we made absolutely sure that the Members opposite were also invited to the reception and very few bothered to turn out.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (1440)

Mrs. Erola: I might also add that the employment figures which the Hon. Member has suggested are not the actual figures, and that the number of women employed in the NEED program are much higher than the statistics to which she has referred. Yes, the Minister of Employment and Immigration and I are working very seriously toward very specific programs aimed at the retraining of women.

SERVICES FOR FEMALE VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

Mrs. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister responsible for the status of women. Battered women need protection now, as was promised in the House of Commons Standing Committee. They do not need just a federal-provincial report card, due in June, 1984, which is one of the things that came out of the meeting the Minister held last spring. What is the federal Government prepared to do right now to prevent further cuts in transition house services in British Columbia and other Provinces, and also to provide the kind of shelter that is urgently needed by women in the Annapolis Valley of Nova Scotia?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Madam Speaker, I am shocked—

Mr. McDermid: You are always shocked.

Mrs. Erola: —that the Hon. Member is not aware of all this Government has done in that area. As a matter of fact, last year as soon as the report was released this Government moved to finance more transition homes. We released 150 units immediately. We have exceeded that by at least 20 units in the past year. We have funded more transition homes in the past three years. I would suggest to the Hon. Member that she have

a look at the actual figures and the thrust of the work that has gone on in the past year concerning battered women.

As to the project in the Annapolis Valley, I would suggest to the Hon. Member she bring it to my attention so that we can work on it very quickly to see that it happens.

* * *

FISHERIES

GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OF BRITISH COLUMBIA PACKERS' FACILITIES

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, if he can tear himself away from his briefing with his predecessor.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Siddon: The question relates to a very serious matter which is developing in British Columbia. Today the Government of Canada will close a deal with British Columbia Packers and hand it $9.8 million so that Small Craft Harbours Branch can take over the operation of the small craft facilities that were formerly provided for fishermen by B.C. Packers. Coincident with that takeover, the fishermen are to be charged, up front, exorbitant increases in moorage and storage costs. Contrary to the undertaking of the Minister in a letter to me, there apparently was no advance consultation with respect to these increases.

Will the Minister please explain for the fishermen, of whom over 1,000 are meeting this afternoon in Richmond, B.C., why he is nicking them at least $1,000 each in the aftermath of a very poor fishing season?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, this is a classical case where the Minister is damned whatever he does. Here is a company, B.C. Packers, which has decided to use its land for a housing development project. As you know, it has berthing facilities for over 1,000 boats there. I came to the conclusion that it was my duty to convince Cabinet to give me the money to buy that facility so those who have their boats there will not have to move either to Port Alberni or to other sites in British Columbia. This is what I have done.

As for the amounts to be paid by our fishermen, this, of course, is open for debate. I understand that in order to score some political points the Hon. Member is against the Department charging a reasonable fee. But I just ask the Hon. Member to look at what the private sector charges, particularly to those involved in sports fishing in B.C., and he will see the Department's fee is very reasonable.

Mr. Siddon: None of these fishermen are sports or recreational fishermen. Some of them operate small vessels. Some of them, particularly a large contingent of Japanese fishermen, were mistreated once before by this Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the hon. Member please ask his question?

DOCKING FEES TO BE CHARGED TO FISHERMEN

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister please explain why the fishermen are now going to be paying up to $1,000 a year, whereas formerly they were paying virtually nothing for these moorage facilities? Is that a sign of progress? Is that a consequence of the Government's nationalization of our waterfront in British Columbia?

Mr. McKnight: It's user-pay.

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is again trying to score political points and really is reaching the bottom. What we are talking about here is that the Government of Canada moved precisely to remove any hardship. But if the Hon. Member is now suggesting that my Department should not try to levy a small fee to have the participants of the fishery pay a small part of the cost of those berthing facilities, which will increase our expenditure on the small craft harbours in B.C. substantially, because of that major acquisition, frankly, I expected some more responsible comments from the former Parliamentary Secretary of the Department.

* * *

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SIZE OF CANADIAN CONTINGENT STATIONED IN EUROPE

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. When the Prime Minister visits our NATO allies in Europe this week, does he plan to tell them that this country, as a contribution to maintaining world peace, intends to restore the original size of our NATO commitment to 10,000 fully equipped men, which we pledged originally when NATO was formed, and which we maintained in Europe until 1968 when the Prime Minister took office and unilaterally cut that force in half?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member raises a very complex question. If I could refer him to my speech in Guelph on Thursday night, he would, I think, see the answers to that. There are two ways in which we can raise the nuclear threshold, one, by making the conventional force in Europe equal, by raising our expenditures in NATO on conventional arms, including the route which the Hon. Member indicates, that is, to increase the number of men and material over there. The other would be to have a successful follow through with the mutual and balanced force reduction talks in Vienna.

I would think it would be unwise to prejudge which of the two is better. But, as I said in my speech, surely the purpose of nuclear disarmament is not to make the world safe for more conventional arms. Therefore, the answer to the Hon. Member's question is not certainly that I would propose that we

increase conventional arms in Europe. There may be another and a better route which would leave more money free for helping the developing world rather than to spend more money for defence, as the Hon. Member suggests.

REQUEST FOR RESTORATION OF CANADIAN COMMITMENT

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister not agree that NATO is the only effective peace movement this world has known during the past 30 years? Does it not make sense to restore the commitment which a former Liberal Government made under Mr. St. Laurent, when NATO was first formed, of 10,000 fully equipped men, an excellent force, and that that force be restored to its full size so we can play our full part and pay our full share of maintaining this most important peace movement that has taken place during the past 30 years?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member would do me the courtesy of reading the "blues" and seeing what I said in answer to his first question, and then reflecting on it a little bit. All the Hon. Member is proposing in his second question, as in the first, is returning to what was. Would the Hon. Member also argue that we should rearm our 105s with nuclear warheads? This Government, when it made the decision to reduce the number of men in the European theatre, also decided to denuclearize our force in Europe. I see the Hon. Member nods his assent. This, presumably, has his support and I am very grateful for that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I simply asked did the Prime Minister live up to the commitment which a former Liberal Government made to help preserve the peace in this world.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION INQUIRY

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. He undoubtedly knows that in the Throne Speech of April, 1980, the Government said:

> As a major employer in Canada, my Government will play a leadership role by implementing affirmative action measures in the Public Service.

That was three and a half years ago. We have no programs before us. We have no legislation before us. All the Government has is an announcement that it will be doubling the number of women in the management category in a year and a half if the implementation programs are accepted and implemented. When will we have real action by the Government to bring affirmative action into the Public Service?

● (1450)

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend must have been on another planet for the past six months. Last June, jointly with the Minister responsible for the status of women, and other Ministers, I announced the extension of an affirmative action program across the entire Public Service, covering women as well as indigenous people and the handicapped. We did not simply announce a doubling of women in the management category. We announced the beginning of a program which would have a number of milestones, with action taken both in the short term and over the next two years. The announcement about doubling the number of women in the management category which, if my hon. friend were sincere, he would applaud, is only one of the initial steps we are taking as part of the extension of that affirmative action program across the entire Public Service. I would ask my hon. friend to come down to earth, and then he would know what is going on.

* * *

CANADA LABOUR CODE

INTRODUCTION OF AMENDING LEGISLATION

Hon. Bill Jarvis (Perth): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour whose Department, I presume, is constantly examining the Canada Labour Code with a view to making amendments and updating that very important piece of legislation. Is the Minister considering introducing legislation in the forseeable future to amend the Canada Labour Code? If so, will he indicate to the House the nature of those amendments? Would they be either extensive in terms of their number, or very meaningful in terms of the potential change to the Canada Labour Code now contemplated?

[*Translation*]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Hon. Member for his question. I believe he is as anxious as I am to see the present session come to an end, and I can assure him that among the major projects the new session will include, there will be a Bill proposing a series of amendments to the Canada Labour Code.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM

IMPACT ON INVESTMENT BY OIL COMPANIES

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources I will direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Arden Haynes, President of Imperial Oil, stated that Imperial Oil reduced its investment in Canada by $6 billion because of the National Energy Program. What is the Minister's estimate of the total lost investment to Canada because of the NEP, and how many jobs will be lost because of this lost investment?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would certainly beg to disagree very strongly with the statement of Mr. Haynes. In effect, the abandonment of the project at Cold Lake, for instance, was like the abandonment of other projects in the tar sands, resulting from the absence of growth in oil prices. This situation has occurred not only in Canada but in the United States and all over the world.

I remind my hon. friend that the same company, I believe, abandoned a project in the United States in which it had invested many hundreds of millions of dollars, around the same time. As a matter of fact I think it was a project which was ready to go into production and was to the tune of a couple of billion dollars. I cannot remember the exact figure, but it was a very large project. We have a situation where, all over the world, investment in the oil and gas industry has had to slow down quite significantly as a result of an absence of growth in oil prices.

* * *

EDUCATION

WOMEN'S ELIGIBILITY FOR STUDENT LOANS

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. It also concerns the problems of Canadian women, many of whom cannot complete university and college programs because some provincial Governments, notably the Government of British Columbia, have tightened restrictions on eligibility for full-time student loans. This has had a particularly adverse effect on women. What action will the Minister take to improve federal loan assistance in such a way that it will not be vitiated by provincial action?

Hon. Serge Joyal (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have already written to all provincial Ministers of Education, in particular to the Minister of Education of the Province of British Columbia, underlining the understanding of what happened in the House of Commons last June when Bill C-161 was voted on, that the additional amount of money, the $60 million, would be passed on to students, especially students who needed it most, in particular, women. I have not yet received a detailed answer from the British Columbia Minister of Education. I have raised the issue with the chairperson of the Council of Ministers of Education, who is the Minister of Education of Nova Scotia. I propose to meet with him in the forthcoming weeks to make sure that we review the various initiatives which could be taken at the level of the Council of Ministers of Education to ensure that the understanding will be respected.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN TRAINING EXERCISES

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Prime Minister is supplementary to an earlier one asked by the Hon. Member for Northumberland. The Secretary of State for External Affairs ten days ago in Halifax reaffirmed Canada's commitment to NATO, yet today the Prime Minister indicated that he is not certain whether our full commitment of material and manpower to NATO should be made. In particular, according to *The Financial Post*, Canadians were not even able to participate in the full range of autumn exercises of NATO because of budgetary constraints. If we are fully committed to NATO, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs indicates, will he not supply sufficient funds so that our troops in Europe can at least exercise with our allies to provide some deterrent? Otherwise, they are worse than useless and might as well be brought home.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, obviously the Hon. Member was not listening to the question of his seatmate. The question was whether we would return to the 1970 or thereabouts situation. Therefore, the Hon. Member is perfectly unjustified in saying that I said that I was not certain whether our commitments should be fulfilled. Of course our commitments should be fulfilled. They are being fulfilled on the two-track. They are being fulfilled on our 3 per cent per year real increase.

An Hon. Member: They are not.

Mr. Trudeau: They are being fulfilled. The question was about something that happened 15 years ago. The Hon. Member is quite unjustified in saying that I said in my answer that our commitments should not be fulfilled. He is quite wrong, and I wish he would withdraw it.

Mr. Andre: A supplementary question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown.

Mr. Andre: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

ISSUANCE OF UNILINGUAL FRENCH PARKING TICKET IN NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. It has been reported in the press that the Secretary of State is prepared, morally and financially, to support an individual in Whitehorse to fight a unilingual English parking ticket, up to the tune of about $25,000. Would the Minister be prepared to give me the same support after obtaining a unilingual French ticket in the National Capital Region last week?

Hon. Serge Joyal (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the program that the Secretary of State administers in relation to the official languages of Canada is essentially based on Sections of either the British North America Act, that is, the Constitution Act, 1982, or on some relevant Sections of the provincial Act of the Province concerned. In the case of the Province of Ontario, there is neither a similar proposal in the Ontario Act nor in the Constitution Act of Canada which could give rise to legal proceedings. It is a different situation in Quebec, for instance, where there is already a case in the Supreme Court of Canada which has been supported by the Secretary of State, and in the Province of Manitoba where there has already been some money provided to a litigant.

After consultation with the Department of Justice, the amount of $25,000 was a fair assessment of the average cost of an action launched at the Supreme Court or Superior Court level, depending on the Province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Waterloo.

Mr. McDermid: Oh, come on.

Mr. Lalonde: Don't be such a bigot and listen to the facts.

Some Hon. Members: What's going on?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hon. Members will bear in mind that the Chair is trying to accommodate as many Members as possible.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A supplementary, the Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McDermid: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The answer to the question is no, he will not support me on that particular thing.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, does the Minister not understand that his strident and unfair, one-sided support of bilingualism is not promoting bilingualism in Canada but is setting it back 20 years?

Hon. Serge Joyal (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, with all respect to the Hon. Member, when a citizen wants to go to court and launch an action against the federal or a provincial Government, claiming that he or she has the right, either under the Constitution of Canada or under the constitution of his or her Province, there is a legal question which has to be established. If there is a legal motive or a legal basis on which to launch the action, there is a program to support the initiative. If there is no legal motive, there is no program and no money to support such an initiative. That is the only answer I could give to the Hon. Member.

Point of Order—Mr. Lumley

● (1500)

In Quebec, there is a legal basis of action, Section 133. There is no such Section in Ontario. There is a similar proposal in the Manitoba Act. That is why this House has voted on this. That is essentially—

Mr. McDermid: It was given to me in Quebec, in the National Capital Region.

Mr. Joyal: The Hon. Member mentioned the Capital Region. If it is in the Hull section of the National Capital, then he has a legal ground of action. There has already been a case in the Supreme Court of Canada, the McDonald case, which will be heard in the next session of the Court. There is no doubt that, if there is a legal ground for action, the Hon. Member will have access to the financial support of the Secretary of State.

* * *

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petitions, with the exception of seven, presented by Hon. Members on Friday, October 28, 1983, meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form. Three of the petitions presented by the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) and four presented by the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) do not meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

Three Hon. Members have given me notice of points of order. All Hon. Members will be recognized. The Chair recognizes the Minister of State for Economic Development.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. LUMLEY—APOLOGY FOR REPLY GIVEN DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, during Question Period the Hon. Member for Erie (Mr. Fretz) asked me a very legitimate question. I want to apologize to him for my attitude. The negotiations are at a very critical stage. He asked a legitimate question. I did not answer it in a manner that is appropriate in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis) has given notice of a point of order and the Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid) will be recognized on a question of privilege.

MR. LEWIS—REPLY OF MRS. EROLA DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order with reference to the remarks of the Minister responsible for the Status of Women during her reply to a question from the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell). The Minister suggested in her remarks that we were all apprised of and invited to the reception on Sunday evening. The best we can find out is that there were some telephone calls on Friday afternoon to some Members' offices inviting some of us to that reception. I suggest, as a point of order, that the Minister has come as close to lying as one possibly can in this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has made his observation.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. McDERMID—REQUEST FOR WITHDRAWAL OF UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, I was called some names across the floor of the House which are very unfair. I am going to ask that they be withdrawn. That is my point of privilege. It was said by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) that I was a bigot. To quote exactly, he said "Don't be such a bigot".

Mr. Lalonde: And listen to the facts.

Mr. McDermid: I want to make it very very clear to this House and to the Minister of Finance that there is nobody who has supported bilingualism in Canada more than I have.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Will the Hon. Member please resume his seat. A reference to another Hon. Member in this context as a bigot is, in the opinion of the Chair, unparliamentary. If the expression was used, I invite the Minister, who is a distinguished Parliamentarian, to withdraw it.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I certainly will withdraw it since it has been uttered by me as has been said. I did indeed say "Don't be such a bigot and listen to the facts", since the point raised by the Hon. Member was answered by the Secretary of State (Mr. Joyal) saying quite clearly that it was his privilege—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Will the Hon. Minister please resume his seat. The Minister of Finance has withdrawn the particular word which is unparliamentary in the judgment of the Chair. That is the end of this matter.

[*Translation*]

Tabling of Bills. The Hon. Pierre De Bané, Minister of Fisheries and Oceans: Stand.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, we intend to table this Bill.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

ATLANTIC FISHERIES RESTRUCTURING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

Hon. Yvon Pinard (on behalf of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishery enterprises.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

[*English*]

* * * * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There are a number of items under the heading "Motions". Shall I dispense?

Mr. Nielsen: As in the past, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion we will not insist upon the motions being read seriatim, but we would agree to your putting the question to the House generally as to whether Members having motions standing in their names wish to call them this day. I do not think you will find any on this side.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I am becoming somewhat concerned about a practice that is developing in the House which has the motions carried en masse rather than carried individually. Over the course of the last few days, albeit there were a large number of motions, on each occasion when we reached motions we have for one reason or another allowed that they be carried without each being read. I would like to indicate that we are not likely to give our consent on any future day after today to this practice being pursued.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a misapprehension in the mind of the Hon. Member that the motions are being carried. That is not the case. They are simply being called by the Chair. We are agreeing to an exception here because we want to debate the Crow rather than taking up time by putting all of these motions. Apparently the New Democratic Party does not want to do that. We will agree on this day and on tomorrow and on any other day where the Crow is involved to treat the procedure individually on that particular day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I think there is some misapprehension on the part of my hon. colleague from Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). The motions are not carried, they are only carried over. Furthermore, we are saving considerable time in this way, thus giving us a chance to consider a Bill that has attracted considerable interest on this side of the House and, I hope, on the other side as well.

● (1510)

[*English*]

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, there was absolutely no misunderstanding on my part. I know exactly what is happening. It is being carried over to tomorrow, the day after and the day after that. The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that the Conservatives decided to put down so many motions in an effort to block the Crow and then did not use them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that we move to Questions on the Order Paper?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 3,028, 4,655, 4,799, 4,893, 4,940, 4,944, 5,012 and 5,013.

[*Text*]

EMEC TRADING LTD.

Question No. 3,028—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. To the knowledge of the government, what are the names of the officers of EMEC Trading Ltd., 555 West Hastings Street, Vancouver, British Columbia and are these individuals Soviet citizens and/or residents of the U.S.S.R?

2. At any time did the company use Canada Customs invoices that were not filled out and which were signed blank in Moscow in advance and, if so, what are all the details and on what date was the process discontinued?

3. Did the company misdeclare values on certain import entries such as (a) entry No. 286837 through Vancouver, October and November, 1977, resulting in a short payment of $2,300 (b) entry No. 204610 through Vancouver, February and March, 1978, resulting in a short payment of $125 (c) entry No. 022536 through St. John, New Brunswick, April, 1978, resulting in a short payment of $5,400 (d) entry No. 001088 through St. John, New Brunswick, May, 1978, resulting in a short payment of $4,200?

4. Did the Canada Customs Investigation Branch become aware of this matter and, if so (a) on what date (b) what investigations were made (c) was any action taken and, if not, for what reason?

5. Did the Government at any time refund previously-assessed advanced duty to the company with the knowledge that Soviet dumping practices had undermined Canadian industries and, if so, what amount was involved and was it approximately $500,000?

6. Has the RCMP been involved in investigating the matter and, if so, what were the results?

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, National Revenue and the Solicitor General as follows:

1. Departmental records do not contain the names of the officers of EMEC Trading Limited, 555 West Hastings, Vancouver, B.C. The names of the three directors of this Corporation are: Alexander V. Dgebuadze, Geoffrey Innes Edgelow, Leslie R. Peterson. Mr. Dgebuadze is a citizen of the U.S.S.R., residing in Vancouver, B.C., and the remaining two directors are Canadian citizens.

2. Customs is not aware of such practice.

3. (a), (b), (c) and (d) The import entries in question have been subject to review and Customs is satisfied that proper duties have been assessed.

4. (a) Information alleging undervaluation was received by Customs Investigations Division (Vancouver) in June, 1980. (b) and (c) The entries in question were already being reviewed for Customs valuation purposes.

5. Any information relating to entry documents is confidential pursuant to Section 172 of the Customs Act.

6. Yes, the RCMP commenced an investigation in this case, but subsequently learned that Revenue Canada—Customs was already reviewing the entries in question for Customs valuation purposes. Consequently, the RCMP investigation was terminated.

PROCESSING OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE CLAIMS

Question No. 4,655—**Mr. Wenman:**

1. Was a memo issued to all Members of Parliament on November 12, 1982 by the Minister of Employment and Immigration stating that "our agents are working many hours of overtime on evenings and weekends" to alleviate undue delays in processing unemployment insurance claims?

2. Are these agents being paid overtime and, if so (a) at what rate (b) what was the total cost to the taxpayer for the overtime payments?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): 1. A letter dated November 12, 1982 containing the words quoted was released by the former Minister on November 16, 1982.

2. (a) Pursuant to current collective agreements, agents are paid overtime at 1.5 times their hourly rate for hours worked in excess of the normal scheduled work day and for the first 7.5 hours of work on the first day of rest and double time thereafter. Double time is paid on the second or subsequent day of rest (must be unbroken series of consecutive and continuous calendar days of rest).

(b) As such, total agent overtime cost for the period April-December, 1982, amounted to $4,100,702.

JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Question No. 4,799—**Mr. Howie:**

1. How many permanent jobs does the Department of Employment and Immigration estimate that it created for handicapped persons in the fiscal year (a) 1981-82 (b) 1982-83?

2. In which industries and services were these jobs created?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): 1. Employment opportunities created through job creation programs are, for the most part, funded for periods of time ranging from several weeks to three years. Although many of the jobs created are not permanent, programs such as the Local Employment Assistance Program, the Canada Community Services Projects and the Program for the Employ-

ment-Disadvantaged create jobs which are designed to continue when federal funding ceases.

The following numbers represent the estimated jobs created for the handicapped under the job creation programs of the Employment and Immigration Commission for (a) 1981-82 and (b) 1982-83:

	1981-82	1982-83
Program for the Employment-Disadvantaged	2,569	2,985
Canada Community Development Projects	1,747	1,700
Local Employment Assistance Program	779	608
Summer Canada	330	335
Canada Community Services Projects	162	178
Totals	5,587	5,806

2. The number of jobs created by sector for the Program for the Employment-Disadvantaged is the following:

Industrial Sector	1981-82	1982-83
Agriculture	62	80
Forestry	6	7
Fish and Game	3	2
Mines-Oil Quarries	2	8
Manufacturing	885	881
Construction	93	122
Transport	86	80
Trade and Commerce	656	816
Finance-Insurance	63	51
Services	698	912
Administration	0	1
Other Miscellaneous	15	25
	2,569	2,985

For the other job creation programs listed in 1 above, the number of jobs created is not available by sector.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

Question No. 4,893—**Mr. Parker:**

How many persons in the constituency of Kootenay East-Revelstoke exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits in the first quarter of 1983?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Unemployment Insurance statistics on individuals who exhausted their claim for benefits are not available on a constituency basis.

For the first quarter of 1983 then some 22,500 individuals in British Columbia exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits.

USE OF COURIER SERVICES BY EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION COMMISSION

Question No. 4,940—**Mr. Bradley:**

1. Is it a practice by the Department of Employment and Immigration to utilize courier services other than the Canada Post Corporation services to deliver correspondence to Canada Manpower Centres that are occupying space in the same building as Corporation services and, if so, what is the reason for using courier service instead of what would appear to be the more convenient delivery system by the Corporation?

2. What were the total funds spent in the fiscal year 1981-82 on courier services by the Department and what percentage of that cost was to offices occupying the same building as the Corporation?

3. What was the total cost paid by the Department for postal services in the fiscal year 1981-82?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): 1. In some of the regions of the Employment and Immigration Commission it is a practice (i.e. occurs regularly) to use courier services to deliver correspondence to Canada Employment Centres occupying space in the same building as Canada Post services.

The reason for so doing is the faster delivery times provided by courier services (for urgent items) and in certain instances it is less expensive to deliver by courier than Canada Post.

2. The total funds spent in the fiscal year 1981-82 on courier services by Employment and Immigration Canada was $1,072,354. Approximately 11 per cent of this cost was for delivery to offices occupying the same building as the Canada Post Corporation.

3. The total cost paid by Employment and Immigration Canada for postal services in the fiscal year 1981-82 was $11,830,284.

RCMP OFFICER D. R. EWING

Question No. 4,944—**Mr. Bosley:**

Was RCMP Officer D.R. Ewing transferred from Hong Kong to Amsterdam and, if so (a) on what date (b) for what reason (c) who paid for the transfer?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): In so far as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are concerned:

RCMP Officer D. R. Ewing was not transferred from Hong Kong to Amsterdam.

(a) He was transferred from Hong Kong to Bangkok in July, 1978, then from Bangkok to Amsterdam in July, 1980.

(b) In each case the reason for the transfer was to meet career rotational transfer requirements of the RCMP Foreign Services Directorate.

(c) The transfers were paid for by the RCMP.

BUS AND RAIL PASSENGER COSTS

Question No. 5,012—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

Was a study done on behalf of the Department of Transport to examine the relative cost of bus and rail for intercity passenger services and, if so (a) who performed the study and at what cost (b) what was the purpose (c) what were the major conclusions and recommendations (d) what steps has the government taken to implement the recommendations?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): (a to d) A Study is underway to examine the relative costs of bus and rail for intercity passenger services. The study is being carried out by Marshall, Macklin and Monaghan Ltd. of Toronto, on behalf of Transport Canada. The over-all objective of the study is to improve the efficiency of the Canadian transportation system by encouraging the use of the most appropriate

transportation mode for intercity passenger travel and to assist in the work under way in the Department to assess the long-term role of each mode. To achieve this, the study will involve an economic analysis to identify the most appropriate application for rail and bus services within the intercity passenger transportation system including traditional buses, high capacity buses and innovative types of buses.

The cost of the study is estimated to be $49,635. The study was started in May, 1983 and is expected to be completed in February/March, 1984. Upon receipt of the contractor's final report, the Department will be in a position to review the conclusions and recommendations and determine what steps, if any, should be taken for their implementation.

PARTY CELEBRATING PASSAGE OF CANAGREX BILL

Question No. 5,013—**Mr. Neil:**

Was a party held at the Central Experimental Farm to celebrate the passage of the Canagrex Bill and, if so, what was the total cost?

Hon. E. F. Whelan (Minister of Agriculture): Yes. However, there was no cost to the taxpayer as the hospitality was provided through contributions.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if questions Nos. 4,665 and 4,963 could be made orders for returns, these returns would be tabled immediately.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Is it the pleasure of the House that questions Nos. 4,665 and 4,963 be deemed to have been made orders for returns?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

NATIONAL PAROLE BOARD

Question No. 4,665—**Mr. Howie:**

1. What are the names of the chairman and members of the National Parole Board?

2. In the fiscal year 1981-82, what amount was paid to each member of the Board, including the chairman, for (a) fees (b) expenses?

3. What were the dates and locations of all Board meetings for the fiscal year 1982-83 to the date this question is answered?

4. How many times per year is the Board required to meet?

Return tabled.

FM PROGRAMMING REQUIREMENTS

Question No. 4,963—**Mr. Beatty:**

1. Did Mr. J. Sward, Vice-Chairman Radio for the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, state before the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture on April 26, 1983 that "it is common for private FM broadcasters to be required to ensure that more than 60 different mathematical criteria are met for each broadcast day. Very few of these criteria pertain to Canadian content . . . almost all are explicit program content directives from the CRTC" and, if so, is the CRTC aware of the statement?

2. Is it common for private FM broadcasters to be required to ensure that more than 60 different mathematical criteria are met for each broadcast day?

3. Are some of the programming requirements that must be met by most Canadian private FM radio stations that (a) no more than 50 per cent of all musical selections broadcast can have achieved a "hit" status as defined by the CRTC (b) no single musical selection can be repeated more than 18 times in any seven-day period (c) a set minimum (up to 22) of the 15-minute periods each day must be programmed in what the CRTC refers to as "mosaic" format requiring at least 30 seconds spoken word content from "enrichment" categories as designated by the CRTC as categories 2, 3A, 4 or 5 (d) not more than 50 per cent of any broadcast day can have more than three songs in a row without interruption (e) not more than 120 minutes daily of advertising content and not more than 10 minutes in any given hour is allowed and, if so, in addition to these specific directives from the CRTC to private FM broadcasters in Canada, are these broadcasters required by the CRTC to commit to other programming criteria as a condition of licence for up to five years and do these other program criteria include (i) a commitment to approximately the amount of time and minutes which will be broadcast weekly in music from each of their defined music categories or types (ii) a minimum commitment to the amount of news broadcast by the station weekly (iii) a minimum commitment to the amount of public service messages including weather, traffic conditions, etc. to be broadcast weekly (iv) a minimum commitment to the amount of time for sports reporting to be broadcast weekly (v) separate commitments for the amount of spoken word in "enrichment" categories?

4. Did Commissioner John Grace of the CRTC make the statement respecting the Commission's announcement earlier this year of revised programming requirements for FM broadcasters that "The majority statement leaves FM radio encumbered by excessively fine-spun regulations which allow broadcasters insufficient flexibility to respond alertly with their own professional initiatives to the changing tastes of audiences and to a diversity of markets" and, if so, does the CRTC concur with Commissioner Grace's opinion and, if not, for what reason?

5. In the view of the CRTC, what is the role of programming personnel working for the private FM radio stations?

6. Did the CRTC seek information concerning the (a) direct (b) indirect costs to private FM broadcasters of compliance with federal programming regulations and, if not, for what reason?

7. Did the CRTC receive complaints from private FM broadcasters that excessive regulation (a) imposes unjustified costs (b) inhibits creativity and variety and, if so, what was the CRTC's response?

8. Did the CRTC conduct a review of FM programming regulations and, if so (a) what was the cost to the taxpayer in terms of (i) person-years (ii) dollars (b) on what date did the review (i) begin (ii) conclude (c) does the Commission feel (i) radio station audiences (ii) radio station licences received substantial benefits from the review and what were those benefits (d) does the CRTC anticipate a further review of the regulations in the foreseeable future?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Parliamentary Secretary could somehow find time to answer question No. 1,741 placed on the Order Paper on November 20, 1980. That question involves the use or misuse of passes by Air Canada in giving directors of CNR Air Canada passes. I was wondering why that very simple information could not be obtained. It is the kind of thing that I think the public of Canada are entitled to know. Surely the use of free air passes given by an airline to other members of the bureaucracy in other Crown corporations is a matter that affects the profitability of Air Canada. I think we are entitled to have that

information and there is no reason why that answer should not have been given in a three-year period.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, that is the first I have heard of this particular question but I will look into it immediately.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know why questions Nos. 4,367, 4730 and 4,737 have not been answered. The first question I mentioned was placed on the Order Paper June 10, 1982 and all it asks for is a list of the legal firms that have been given Government contracts. The other two simply ask for the guest list for the state dinner hosted by the Prime Minister in honour of Her Majesty the Queen in Vancouver and Victoria in March of this year. I want to find out whether the Government sees Her Majesty as a servant of the liberal Party or all other Canadians too. It would be a very simple question for the Parliamentary Secretary to have answered.

Mr. Evans: Once again, I will look into that but I can assure the Hon. Member that that is not the way to get additions to his fund raising list.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Parker: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary has answered my question No. 4,893 but I would like to ask where the answer to question No. 4,894 is. I asked that question on May 12. It deals with the Crowsnest agreement, which relates to the debate that we are trying to have. The question was:

With reference to the 50,000 acres of Dominion coal blocks in the Constituency of Kootenay East-Revelstoke, have there been any applications from or discussions with mining companies for the development of these properties and, if so, what were the names of the companies interested in obtaining licences on these lands?

It is important to me that these answers be made so that I can debate the Crow legislation in a very constructive way.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I will attend to that right after Question Period.

Mr. Speaker, were the remaining questions allowed to stand?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Mr. Gamble: Question No. 2,374 was asked by myself on April 10, 1981. It was a very simple question which took about two and one-half lines in *Hansard*. It asks:

Was the Prime Minister in New York on government business during the weekend of April 3, 1981 and, if so, what was the cost to the taxpayer?

I think it is rather significant that I should be inquiring about the answer to that question placed on the Order Paper over two years ago since the Prime Minister was again in New York last weekend for presumably the same purpose, and I should be asking another question with respect to that. Surely after two years we should have an answer by now to what is a very simple question.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I will look into that. I have now five or six questions that have been put to me and I will get on to those right away.

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, while the Parliamentary Secretary is looking into five or six other delayed answers, I would like him to check one for me. It dates back to November 18, 1981. The question is: "Did three Liberal Cabinet Ministers take separate JetStars to Winnipeg for the official opening of a firm in Winnipeg and, if so, in each case other than the Minister and the aircraft crew who was on the flight?" I understand these three flights were flying in Liberal campaign workers to work in the last provincial election in Manitoba.

I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary could find out what is causing the delay in answering this question, which is almost two years old.

Also, I have had a question on the Order Paper since June 29, 1982, No. 4,387, with regard to the hiring practices of the RCMP. They are having difficulty in western Canada. Unilingual English Canadians are unable to join the RCMP and I would like to get the answer why they are unable to join the RCMP. This question has been on the Order Paper for well over a year.

Mr. Evans: I will look into those as well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motions Nos. 47 and 49 (Mr. Benjamin) and Motion No. 48 (Mr. Mazankowski).

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to rise in resumption of the debate on report stage of this Bill. I will not take the time of the House to give Hon. Members the benefit of the wisdom I accumulated after listening to several days of petitions, although it will be retained in my memory for years to come. What I prefer to do today is rather to present to the House a series of proposals that I believe would help improve the Bill and which would require unanimous consent.

We have had many days of debate and I think some very useful ideas have been proposed during that period of time. In light of those expressions of recommendation and concern, I

thought we might use this resumption of debate to put on the Table amendments which we consider from each of our own groups to be of importance and of significance in improving the Bill and therefore ensuring that we have the right to debate and ultimately vote upon such proposals.

On behalf of the Government I would like to present a couple of key amendments and I would do so by indicating that if Members of the Opposition also wish to present amendments that they would like to have debated, or would like to have on the Order Paper, then on behalf of the Government I would certainly be prepared to provide to them the same courtesy if they would also provide consent to the amendments that I am prepared to bring forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. For amendments to be considered at this stage, unanimous consent would be required.

Mr. Nielsen: Let us hear the proposals before we seek consent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Minister put forward his suggested revisions one at a time and we could deal with them individually.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to accede to both those requests. I had intended to. The first one is to bring forward for consideration by the House an amended version of what is now called "the safety net proposal". Members will recall that previously we had proposed a safety net to protect or provide assurance for farmers against an increase in their costs in relation to grain prices. That was ruled out of order by the Chair. I would now like to move that:

Bill C-155 be amended by striking out the heading "Part IV," preceding Clause 59 and substituting the following—

Then follows a new Part IV. It is a very lengthy amendment running to some two pages. I have submitted copies to the critics of the Opposition. Rather than reading the entire amendment, if they would allow me, I would précis the contents.

● (1520)

What we are proposing is a safety net brought in over a graduated period, beginning at a 4 per cent level in 1984, 5 per cent in 1985, 8 per cent in 1986, 9 per cent in 1987 and 10 per cent from 1988 onwards. The safety net previously proposed of a flat 10 per cent would start at 4 per cent on the implementation of the legislation on January 1. We believe that would provide immediate protection for farmers against any change in the price-cost ratio. I am prepared to read the whole amendment but Hon. Members have copies.

Contigent upon that is a requirement that a consequential amendment be moved as follows:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 37 by striking out lines 37 to 43 at page 19 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*a*) the estimated government commitment less an amount equal to the CN adjusment in respect of that crop year, plus or minus the total of the interim adjustment for the current crop year and the final adjustment for the preceding crop year, plus the shipper share limitation adjustment for the preceding calendar year, as determined under Part IV, by".—

I will provide copies of that as well. I think Hon. Members will see that it simply follows upon the first amendment that I proposed.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In order that this make sense to anyone who wants to read it some time in the future, I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to put his amended safety net proposal on the record. It is two pages long but I think it is important that we have things in proper order so that they can be seen by anyone who may want to read them. I know that some Hon. Members have had the opportunity to look over the proposals because they were provided to us and we are grateful for that.

In the interests of completing the debate, however, I think it is important that the Minister put his amendment, get unanimous consent, then put his further amendment and get unanimous consent for that. In that way we would be quite clear on the process that was followed.

Mr. Mazankowsi: We would have no objection to that. We are cutting into debating time, however, and we are under strict limitation of debate. The motion the Minister refers to has been submitted to the Table and I assume it will find its way into the official proceedings. This happened on a previous occasion when the Minister rose to submit a similar amendment in a somewhat modified form. It found its way into the official record of proceedings.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has a suggestion to make at this point. Perhaps the Hon. Minister could table copies of the amendments he seeks to introduce and some time later this afternoon they could be moved. It might avoid difficulties if the amendments were tabled and Hon. Members had a chance to look at them.

Mr. Mazankowski: Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker, if we have to await a decision on this, I would rather that the Minister read the motion into the record. Then we could dispose of it as the House Leader for the NDP has suggested.

Mr. Axworthy: Following on that, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if Hon. Members would be prepared to give unanimous consent that I move the consequential amendment I just moved to Clause 37?

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have a narrative on the original amendment which I found very helpful. The consequential amendment is very detailed and I would like to have a narrative on that from the Minister.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, what we are seeking at this point is not consent to debate any amendment but merely consent to allow these amendments to be put on the Order Paper. If we have time we will debate them and vote on them.

What the Minister is seeking is unanimous consent to dispense with giving notice to put the amendments he is

talking about on the Order Paper, even though some of them were declared inadmissible in the past. By unanimous consent we could do that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair was under a misunderstanding of the Minister's intention. Obviously, leave to put them on the Order Paper is very different from leave to introduce the motions. Is there unanimous consent for the Minister to put these motions on the Order Paper?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I think this procedure is becoming unnecessarily muddled. As I understand it, the Minister is asking for leave to have those motions listed for debate and for disposition at the end of the second day's debate. All we are asking is that if the Minister was simply to go back to his original motion and read it, we would then be able to give consent. He could then go to his second motion respecting Clause 37 and read it and we could perhaps give consent, then to his third motion on Clause 2 and read it, and we could give consent, and finally to his Clause 59 amendment and we could deal with that. I think we would then have what we want. He is asking for consent to have those questions recorded and put to the House for disposition along with the other motions that now stand on the notice paper.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the Government House Leader is saying. If we give unanimous consent to the Minister, those motions will be placed on the Order Paper. The only difference in reading them out is that they will appear in two places, once on the Order Paper if consent is given and once in today's *Hansard*. The latter is not necessary if we have them on the Order Paper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the Minister seeking consent to have these motions placed on the Order Paper?

Mr. Axworthy: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the Minister place the amendments he has in mind on the Order Paper?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I seek your advice on the point raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). I provided copies to Opposition critics so that they would have a chance to read them. If they are put on the Order Paper they will then be on the record and would not have to be read. I am trying to expedite this because the motions are lengthy and we are under some time constraint.

Mr. Nielsen: Just give a brief explanation.

Mr. Axworthy: The brief explanation to the amendment to Clause 37 is simply that it relates to the formula by which the allocation of moneys is determined. The shippers' share limitation would have to be built into that if Part IV is accepted. It is simply a way of recalculating the formula.

I should also like to propose that the House give unanimous consent to placing on the Order Paper an amendment dealing with the review inquiry. It will appear in written form and it is very lengthy. Basically what I am proposing is that the review commission that is being established under the Bill and which will be reporting its findings should look at the whole question of the method of payment and the impact on various aspects of agriculture. Under the legislation as it stands, the report of the review commission would simply be tabled.

I should like to introduce an amendment that would provide for a full day of debate in Parliament on the results of the review commission report in order to provide a clear connection between the commission's findings and the consideration by Parliament. This was discussed with a number of farming groups in western Canada and they felt it was important to ensure that Parliament was seized of the findings and that there was a full day's debate on them. This should respond to some of the Opposition's concerns.

I should like to seek unanimous consent to that particular amendment.

Mr. Mazankowski: We would agree to that, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure whether we are going through this step by step but we will agree.

Of course, we agree with the expectation that similar approval will be granted to four motions that we will be presenting. We hope that we can seek similar unanimous consent for presentation of these motions to be included on the Order Paper for debate and final disposition.

● (1530)

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, that certainly is the procedure which I am prepared to follow with other Hon. Members of the House. If Members on the other side wish also to present amendments for Order Paper consideration, our side is in agreement with that.

Finally, I have one final amendment which is again just a reintroduction of the amendment which was ruled out of order by the Chair during an earlier part of our considerations, some time back there in deep history. That has to do with amending Bill C-155, as follows:

> That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 14 to 18 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:
> "'grain' means any grain or crop included in Schedule 1 that is grown in the Western Division or any product thereof included in Schedule 1 that is processed in the Western Division and includes any other grain or crop grown in the Western Division . . . that the Governor in Council, by regulation made under paragraph 62(1)(b), prescribes as being included in Schedule 1;"

That is simply a requirement, Mr. Speaker, which is again contingent, I believe, on other matters which will be coming forward. However, it does give Order in Council approval for the inclusion of other crops under this schedule.

Mr. Deans: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans).

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether or not the Minister was reading from his motion. However, he did not read what I have in front of me. I wonder if it was simply an oversight or whether he was just giving us a sort of outline of what it contains. He made no mention, for example, of the fourth last line, " . . . and any product thereof processed in the Western Division." He spoke only of the grain. I am concerned that perhaps he had overlooked it inadvertently.

Mr. Axworthy: It would only be as a result of my failing eyesight, having examined these amendments many times in the past. It was simply an oversight. Line 6 should read:

—and any product thereof processed in the Western Division—

Therefore, with unanimous consent given to these four sets of amendments, Mr. Speaker, we would be very pleased to have the opportunity to consider them at a future date.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my Party, I will certainly agree, particularly to the last one since I have the expert on the definition of grain sitting at my side, the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans).

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, we also give unanimous consent. While I am on my feet, we also have some amendments for which we would like to seek consent.

Mr. Mazankowski: A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Official Opposition has the right of presenting its proposed motions at this particular time. I was simply granting unanimous concurrence from our point of view.

Mr. Nielsen: That is all the Chair was asking for.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the—

Mr. Mazankowski: That is all the Chair was asking for at that point in time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair tries to proceed with the best judgment in the circumstances. The Chair did recognize the Hon. Member for Vegreville for whatever purpose he desired to be recognized—

Mr. Nielsen: Consent. It was for consent.

Mr. Mazankowski: Further to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did indicate at the very outset that we would be advancing similar motions and expecting the same concurrence. And the Minister stood in his place and agreed with that. I believe there are traditions, conventions and customs in this House. We found that out on a couple of occasions during the course of this debate. I believe, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, that I have the right to present the motions on behalf of my Party at this time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I had the floor, if I recall correctly, and I—

Mr. Nielsen: Only for giving consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is perfectly right. However, both Hon. Members concerned, who are reasonable men, will recognize the position of the Chair. The Chair recognized the Hon. Member for Vegreville and presumably recognized in the same spirit the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is technically right in stating he has the floor. There is no dispute about that. However, I suggest that perhaps the Hon. Member for Vegreville should be recognized to present his motions, then the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, because the expectation, whether rightly or wrongly, was that both sides were indicating their formal concurrence with the position of the Minister, and the Chair did assume that there would be a normal sequential presentation of amendments.

If the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain wishes to press his point, he will recognize the very difficult position in which he places the Chair. The Chair cannot be a Solomon and please everyone. It can only attempt to dispense the best judgment in the circumstances.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: We know what they think of the Chair. The way they treat the Chair, they should not even be recognized.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I ask the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain to defer and let the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) present his amendments. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain was recognized and he is on his feet again.

Mr. Nielsen: Point of order—

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker. I seek the unanimous consent of the House to—

Mr. Nielsen: I have a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I hear the Hon. Member—

Mr. Nielsen: I have a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon no doubt has a point of order. In the circumstances, I would like to hear just what the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is proposing briefly, then I will hear the Hon. Member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: He is proposing a motion. I have a point of order before he proposes it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not know whether he is or not.

Mr. Nielsen: I do. He has said so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain has been recognized and the Chair has to concede that this is the case.

Mr. Nielsen: A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: I believe it would help us all, Mr. Speaker, if we reviewed briefly the sequence of events and the procedures which we are applying here. The Minister rose to put four proposals to the House and to seek seriatim the unanimous consent of the House to put each one of those four proposals. After each of those proposals were put, the Chair asked whether there was unanimous consent to put each of those four proposals. On each of those four occasions, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) rose and gave the consent of his Party, which is Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in this place, and the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) rose and in each four cases gave his consent—

An Hon. Member: Oh, no.

Mr. Nielsen: Well, on two or three of them, perhaps not all. Nonetheless, that is the process in which we were involved. The Chair in that mode was asking for unanimous consent at the request of the Minister for placing his four proposals on the Order Paper. Now you cannot, when you rise to give consent at the request of the Chair to the Minister's proposals, then smuggle in amendments in the course of giving that consent. The job of this Party in the House is Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. Any proposals to follow upon the Minister's, which are given first, naturally, by tradition, will be followed by proposals from Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, not from the little red rump down there.

Mr. Deans: Calm down.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The splinter Party comes third.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In the interest of decorum in the House and the usual good humour which prevails at the beginning of a week, the Chair is respectfully asking the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain if he would perhaps concede that the Chair look to him for consent concerning the proposal of the Minister, and then allow the Hon. Member for Vegreville to move his motion, then recognize the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, who undoubtedly also will have some matters to raise. The Chair appeals to the Hon. Member to accept this—

Mr. Yurko: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair sees everyone, but I am sure the Hon. Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko) will let the Speaker finish his remarks before he interrupts. The Chair appeals to Hon. Members to accept this, bearing in mind that it is not an easy thing to settle. The Chair is just trying to exercise fair judgment. The Hon. Member for Edmonton East.

Mr. Yurko: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to bring to your attention that there is an Hon. Member sitting in this House as an independent whose permission must be obtained when unanimous consent of the House is asked. I notice that you had not made any reference to this Member at all in any of your previous remarks. I wanted to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I am quite pleased to offer my consent to the four proposals put forth by the Minister before this House. I will be considering seriously offering my consent to the proposals put by the Hon. Member representing the Official Opposition, as well as the House Leader of the New Democratic Party, provided that I also have the opportunity to put forth an amendment and receive the unanimous consent of the House for such a motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair wishes to assure the Hon. Member for Edmonton East that his rights as an Hon. Member will be scrupulously respected in every way. The Chair assumes, not having heard to the contrary, that there was consent. The Hon. Member always has the right to rise and express his point of view.

• (1540)

At this stage, the Chair would like to recognize the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) but the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) is on his feet. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain briefly and ask that he defer to the express wish of the Chair under these circumstances.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I had not finished my point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has risen on a point of order with regard to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Nielsen: I have not finished it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think, with all due respect, we may be close to a solution, if the Chair is reading he situation correctly. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain has been recognized only for the purpose of giving his consent with respect to the remarks and the proposals of the Minister.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the dilemma in which you find yourself, Sir, and I can well understand why Members of the Official Opposition want to grab the floor away from me given that they want to move an amendment in which until this point in time they had expressed absolutely no interest, an amendment that we have been trying to move since April last, and I therefore propose to move it now. I would ask that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: No, the Chair is not recognizing the Hon. Member for the purpose of moving a motion at this time. The Hon. Member has, however, made his point. I am sure

that it has been noted by everyone in the country who is watching the television broadcast of our proceedings. The proceedings as reported in *Hansard* will amply show the remarks of the Hon. Member who put his claim forward with regard to the amendment.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You yourself said that you had recognized me and that it was appropriate for me to seek unanimous consent having been recognized. There is absolutely no requirement on the Chair to recognize the Hon. Member for Vegreville ahead of me at any time. The Chair is entitled, under the Standing Orders, to recognize any Member he believes he saw first.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has recognized the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain for purposes of concurrence with the proposals of the Minister, and the Chair is now recognizing the Hon. Member for Vegreville for purposes of moving motions, and will subsequently recognize the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain for purposes of moving motions. The Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Mr. Deans: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank Hon. Members of the House for their indulgence, and I particularly want to thank the Hon. Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko)—

Mr. Deans: Point of order!

Mr. Hovdebo: He has a point of order!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain continues to rise on a point of order although he has had ample opportunity to be heard. It is difficult to imagine that he has a point that he has not yet made, but he has the opportunity of expressing himself.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want you to tell me why it is that, having been recognized since you rose and indicated that I had been recognized and indicated not five minutes ago that I was entitled to move the motion, we are now having the rule changed because of the intervention of the Hon. Member for Yukon.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please resume his seat? I am sure the Hon. Member, being a Member of some years' service and seniority in the House, will recognize that the Chair is in an impossible position—

Mr. Benjamin: Which you got yourself into.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) please retract his remark?

Mr. Benjamin: Retract what, Mr. Speaker? I did not have the floor.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There was an intervention made which was certainly reflecting upon the Chair. If the Hon. Member consistently makes remarks reflecting upon the Chair, he knows the difficult position in which he places the Chair with regard to the Hon. Member and future proceedings of the House. Does the Hon. Member for Regina West care to retract his words?

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, after hearing from my colleague, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, and the Chair, I will be glad to retract the situation that the Chair allowed us to get into.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair appreciates the courtesy of the Hon. Member for Regina West. At this point, the Chair appeals to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain. He has made his point concerning amendments that may or may not be forthcoming. He certainly has his rights as House Leader of a Party in this House, but the Chair at this point would like to recognize the Hon. Member for Vegreville for the purpose of putting motions, followed by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain for the same purpose.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to thank Hon. Members of the House for their indulgence, and particularly the Hon. Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko) who has offered his concurrence for the submission of the motions that both the Minister and I on behalf of my Party will be presenting. Essentially, Mr. Speaker, I seek the same concurrence as was granted to the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), and there are three specific motions which I hope to be able to get unanimous consent to have inserted on the Order Paper. Regarding the fourth motion, I think there is a general disposition among all Members of the House to have it accepted, not only for debate but in principle as an addition to the Bill, which will resolve a problem with respect to the definition of the word "export".

The first motion I would like to present reads as follows:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 43 by adding immediately after line 34 at page 24 the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the rate a railway company may charge a shipper for the movement of grain for the period January 1, 1984 to July 31, 1986 shall not exceed the existing rates in effect on August 1, 1983."

By way of brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, that would have the effect of retaining the existing statutory freight rate as it now exists until July 31, 1986. That would be the period of time in which the review would take place to look at, among other things, the ability of the producers to pay the economic assessment and the impact upon individual producers and upon the agricultural community as a whole.

The second motion for which I would seek unanimous consent—

Mr. Nielsen: Put that one first.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Since the Hon. Member for Vegreville wants to follow the procedures of the House as we have agreed to, he might at least allow us to pass judgment on the motions one at a time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the Hon. Member for Vegreville was prepared to cede the floor to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain for comment at this point, having introduced the first of his motions.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member for Vegreville is now asking the Chair to seek unanimous consent to permit the Hon. Member for Vegreville to put the motion, which he read and explained, on the Order Paper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville is making the same request as did the Hon. Minister of Transport a short while ago. Under the circumstances, the Chair is asking for unanimous consent. Is there consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain wish to be recognized on this matter?

Mr. Deans: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I would also like to thank Hon. Members of the House for granting that consent.

The second motion for which I seek the same unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 58 by immediately adding after line 13 at page 34 the following therefor:

"58. (3) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, based upon the recommendations of the committee established under section 59(2) to examine the method of payment, the Governor in Council may, subject to approval by Parliament, make regulations prescribing the manner in which, and the parties to whom, payment of the government contribution, including the Crow benefit, shall be made."

By way of a brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, that would provide for an enabling mechanism, pending the outcome of the review of the Commission of Inquiry established under Clause 59(2), for a modified method of payment, depending upon the recommendations that flowed from the inquiry, to be incorporated into this piece of legislation subject to the recommendations of the Governor in Council and subject to approval of Parliament. This deals with the distribution of the Crow benefit.

Under the provisions of the Bill, the total Crow benefit is paid directly to the railroads. If the Commission of Inquiry finds that there is a better system or way to distribute that payment, and a recommendation flows therefrom, this would enable that to take place.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if you would seek the unanimous consent of the House to have that motion placed on the Order Paper for debate and further disposition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville seeks the unanimous consent of the House to have the motion which he has just read placed on the Order Paper for further consideration. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

● (1550)

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, the third proposal concerns Clause 62 of Bill C-155. We are proposing:

That Bill C-155 be amended at page 35 by deleting lines 19 to 24 so that the clause would now read:

"62. Notwithstanding the Crow's Nest Pass Act, and any agreement made pursuant thereto, the Government of Canada, in the spirit of the Constitution of Canada which gives to the several provinces the proprietary interest in, and the right to legislate for, lands, minerals and resources within their respective provinces, shall, for greater certainty, confirm the proprietary ownership in all lands and minerals, including coal, within Parcels 73 and 82 of the Dominion Coal Blocks, to Her Majesty in right of British Columbia to hold, dispose of or otherwise deal with, as is deemed fit."

This particular clause in Bill C-155 as it now exists would see these lands revert to the federal Crown. We are suggesting here that these lands revert to the Crown in the name of the Province of British Columbia. Again, I would ask unanimous consent of the House to have this motion put on the Order Paper for debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member asks for unanimous consent of the House. Is there agreement?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, of course we will be happy to give unanimous consent to something we have been proposing since the day the Bill was introduced. It is unfortunate that the Conservatives had not joined with us earlier in the debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member gives unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I have one more motion I wish to present. I hope the Minister and the spokesman for the NDP will follow this very closely because I think that, in addition to granting unanimous consent to have this motion put on the Order Paper, I believe there is general agreement that the motion I will be presenting has support of all Members in the House. It is something that we have wrestled with in the committee and on the floor of the House for quite some time. It deals with the definition of "export".

Essentially, the proposal that I have is:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 7 to 9 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

" "export" is respect of grain means shipment by vessel within the meaning of the Canada Shipping Act to any destination outside Canada and shipment by any other mode of transport to the United States for use of the grain in that country and not for shipment out of that country;"

As I said earlier, this particular definition has caused the committee and the House some difficulty, but I believe, in trying to meet all of the objectives and overcome some of the difficulties we have had with previous definitions, that this will more or less fit the bill. I hope that, in addition to receiving unanimous consent to have this matter brought forth for debate, we might also obtain unanimous consent for its acceptance at the same time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there agreement for the Hon. Member to place the amendment on the Order Paper?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask for unanimous consent of the House to waive notice and allow the following motion to be put on the Order Paper. The motion is:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 62 by striking out lines 19 to 23 at page 35 and substituting the following therefor:

"the Government of Canada shall convey to the Government of the Province of British Columbia immediately upon the passage of this Bill all lands and the coal, mineral or other rights on such lands which it received pursuant to paragraph 1(i) of the Crow's Nest Pass Act."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to present his motion for the purpose of placing it on the Order Paper?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to seek unanimous consent of the House to waive notice and allow the following motion to be put on the Order Paper and dealt with. The motion is:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by adding immediately after line 45 at page 14 the following:

"(3) The Government of Canada shall provide the funds needed to rehabilitate to a level of utility allowing reliable year-round train services in reasonable circumstances those railway branch lines protected by order in council against abandonment to the year 2000, and such rehabilitation shall be completed by July 31, 1987."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to placing the amendment of the Hon. Member on the Order Paper?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the unanimous consent of the House to put forth the following amendment to Bill C-155 so as to relieve my anxieties with respect to this Bill which have, to a large degree, been lessened by what I have heard here today. I would like to ask the House to approve this amendment:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54(1)(b) on page 29 by adding after the words "31.1 million tonnes" on line 15, the words "which shall be increased annually by one per cent".

This is in recognition of the fact that the grain industry in western Canada is a growth industry and will continue to grow from year to year. This amendment recognizes this growth. Its purpose is to provide the farmers of western Canada, particularly the small farmers, the appropriate compensation for growing grain, and not only growing new grains but shipping their grains to market.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have unanimous consent of the House to have his amendment placed on the Order Paper for consideration?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify that we are simply waiving notice and not agreeing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for unanimous consent of the House to waive Notice and allow the following motion to be put on the Order Paper. The motion is:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 33 to 45 on page 30 and substituting the following therefor:

change" means zero.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have the unanimous consent of the House for his motion to be placed on the Order Paper for consideration?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to waive notice and allow the following motion to be put on the Order Paper:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 13 to 16 at page 29 and substituting the following therefor:

"obtained by multiplying the total number of tonnes of grains and grain products moved in that crop year by the aggregate of"

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have unanimous consent of the House for his motion to be placed on the Order Paper for consideration?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to thank the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), the Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), the Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko), and my colleague for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) for the efforts they have put forward with respect to the definition of "export". When it is voted on, we look forward to having it included in the Bill.

● (1600)

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask for the unanimous consent of the House to include another motion on the Order Paper. It has to do with the shippers' share limitation. The motion is quite lengthy. It is very similar, I suppose, to what the Minister moved earlier on. I would file it rather than read through the two pages. The basic difference is that it would put the price ratio limit per calendar year at 3 per cent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member's motion to be put on the Order Paper for consideration?

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, now that we have had agreement to have these motions put on the Order Paper for debate, the question arises when, if ever, will we have a chance to debate these points, which I think are pretty fundamental and go to the core of the Bill? I think the safety net proposal with respect to the freeze and method of payment is certainly a fundamental component in this piece of legislation. If these

motions are simply going to be added to the Order Paper, the chances are they will not be debated.

Would there be a disposition on the part of the Members of the House to have these motions brought forth for immediate debate? If debate on them is concluded, then we could go on to the other motions appearing on the Order Paper. It would seem to me that we on this side particularly would like to debate these issues. I assume that other Members would see fit that that be done as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have an observation at this point which might be helpful. We have before us Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 on which debate has taken place but was not concluded. Would it be possible for the House to conclude its debate on these motions or stand them, if the House wishes? Is it possible for the House Leaders or representatives of the Parties to get together and come to some agreement which could be presented to the House as to how they wish to proceed at this point?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, assuming that is possible—I imagine we can find the Government House Leader—what the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) is essentially asking is for the Chair to see if there is consent to go on with these fundamental items and stand the others so that there will be an opportunity to debate them.

I will certainly take the initiative and seek out the Government House Leader and, along with the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), see what we can do with the rest, but in the meantime perhaps all other motions could be stood and we could proceed with the Minister's safety net proposal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The suggestion of the Hon. Member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is eminently sensible. But there are one or two observations from the Chair. First, it appears that some motions are similar. It appears that they might be grouped for debate and it appears they might even be grouped for votes.

Mr. Nielsen: Only one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, but other motions were presented today. These might well be details that could be ironed out in private discussions among the representatives of the Parties. The Chair suggests that until such time as there is agreement, perhaps we could proceed with Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49, and possibly dispose of them. Or we could interrupt the debate or set them aside until there is an agreement for an alternative way for the House to proceed.

Mr. Nielsen: May I suggest, because of the fundamental nature of the amendments proposed by the Minister, the other two Parties and the independent Member, following the proposal of the Hon. Member for Vegreville, who has asked the Chair to reserve the matter, that we now proceed with the Minister's suggestion on the safety net and stand everything prior to that? There is only one amendment on the safety net. Let us proceed with that now. Let the House Leaders get together immediately to determine how we should proceed with the other amendments introduced today.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Government I am prepared to give consent that we now priorize the amendments that have been presented in order to focus debate on significant items.

I do think the Hon. Member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is slightly mistaken. I do believe the NDP also presented an amendment regarding a safety net. However, I suggest that if you look at the basic thrust of the amendments, aside from the one on export which the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) has presented, at which we are looking favourably, there are two issues being looked at. One is the ability to pay and how we provide some protection on that issue, and the second is the method of payment issue and how the review period can be properly and effectively used and ultimately recognized by Parliament in 1985-1986. Those are two key issues. It would seem to me that if we could group debates around those issues, it would stand the Canadian people in good stead to debate then before we conclude report stage. If that is what they want to hear about and if that is the kind of exchange they want to have, then I would seek a way, either by House Leaders or by myself, of meeting with the Opposition critics to see if we could find a way of debating, certainly over tomorrow, those two key issues centring around the amendments that were presented today. I think we could do a real service to the public by doing that.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, we are not in a position to agree to that at the moment. We remember what happened to us on the day the time allocation motion was moved and how the Conservatives cut us out of the debate.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deans: We would be reluctant to enter into any kind of an arrangement sight unseen.

An Hon. Member: What a phoney!

Mr. Deans: The fact of the matter is that all of the amendments that we have before us are important, all of the amendments, not only the most recent ones, but all of the other amendments which are standing on the Notice Paper and have been waiting there for some time for debate. We are prepared, as we always are, to move through, as expeditiously as possible the amendments as they appear on the Notice Paper. If, as and when we get to the most recent amendments, we will debate them in the most learned and knowledgeable way, as we always do.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, if the New Democratic Party insists on debating frivolous amendments and leaving the issues, such as the very important issue of the producers' ability to pay and the method of payment, very fundamental issues, that go to the very central core of this legislation—

An Hon. Member: You can't be trusted.

Mr. Mazankowski: —it appears the NDP simply wants to filibuster on frivolous motions and fight the Bill, not on the basis of whether it is going to be in the best interests of the agricultural community or the producers of Canada but on whether in fact it is going to be in the NDP's best ideological and philosophical interests.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is in the hands of the House. At this point there does not appear to be unanimous consent with regard to the suggestion of the Hon. Member for the Yukon. In the circumstances, the Chair suggests that we proceed with debate on Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49.

The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) is rising.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am happy to know that the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) called Motion No. 48 frivolous. I am happy to know that he is calling all his own motions frivolous.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not making a point of order. The Hon. Member will be recognized in due course and will have an opportunity to present his comments on what is taking place in the House.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member knows that a point of order has to be a point of order.

Mr. Blenkarn: He hasn't got a point of order.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, with all respect, my point of order is exactly the same as the one raised by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. He proceeded to complete all his remarks on a spurious point of order. I would like equal time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Benjamin: The hon. gentleman for Vegreville is calling a motion—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Is the Hon. Member suggesting that he himself has a spurious point of order? Is he saying himself that he is seeking the floor on a spurious point of order on the grounds that somebody else has a spurious point of order and succeeded? If that is the Hon. Member's argument, surely it is *reductio ad absurdum*. Surely he cannot expect the Chair to take that kind of argument on face value. The Chair suggests to the Hon. Member that the best course would be to proceed to a debate and, we hope, complete the debate on Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49, at which point the Hon. Member or some other Member of his Party can well reply to what he considers to be the allegations of the Hon. Member for Vegreville. But I suggest it is a matter of debate.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I assume we are back to Bill C-155 and Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49. To bring the House back to where we are in the debate, we have three motions facing us which make some amendments to Clauses 22 and 25. These are the clauses that deal with the way the House is proposing to handle recommendations from the Grain Transportation Agency Administrator. The Bill provides an opportunity for the House to discuss the proposed regulations of that agency and sets out the timetable and the time limits for such debate.

• (1610)

We are operating now under a form of closure under Standing Order 82 which allows for two days on report stage and a further day for third reading debate. The proposed change to the Act would provide for a one-hour debate under these circumstances. The regulations of the Grain Transportation Agency Administrator would go to the Minister who would file them before Parliament 15 sitting days after they had been presented to him. After having been filed and within five sitting days, either 15 Senators in the other place or 30 Members in this Chamber could cause them to be debated. The process of the debate would be that the regulations would be transferred to the appropriate committee where they would be dealt with fairly expeditiously and would be returned to the House or the Senate, depending upon where the initiation had occurred, and be debated for one hour.

The motions question whether the number of Senators and Members of the House should be the same or otherwise. In Motion No. 47 we are saying that it should take the same number of Senators as Members of the House of Commons to initiate such a debate and have it sent to committee. Also the Bill proposes that once the regulations have been put before the House or the Senate, they will automatically become law six months after being presented to the committee, whether or not they are returned from the committee, I presume, or 20 days after they were laid before Parliament by the Minister, if the House or the Senate chooses not to debate the regulations.

It is our contention that one hour is not an adequate amount of time, given the possibilities which could arise from these regulations. According to the wording of the Bill, the Administrator is responsible for laying out the awards and sanctions for all grain transportation participants; not only the railroads—and it may be changed as a result of some of the later votes—but also elevator companies, farmers, truckers, terminal operators, labour unions and perhaps even shippers on the seaway. Not only does he have the job of imposing awards and sanctions on the participants in the industry, he will be laying out by regulation the performance indicators, whatever they are. I presume they will be the basis for judging whether various participants have been doing a good job, whether it is adequate or inadequate, or whether a fine should be levied because it was judged to be inadequate. In short, we see some of the first regulations coming out of this process as being almost as complex and all-encompassing as the Bill. There could be a whole host of regulations going on for 30 pages or 40 pages. We do not think that that can be adequately dealt

with even after committee work—and the committee is limited in its look at the regulations—in a one-hour debate.

The regular rules of Parliament should apply. The regulations in the Bill before us should be debated until the debate is finished. If the Government, whoever is in power at the time, thinks that time is being wasted by the debate, it has numerous ways of reducing debate. It can use Standing Order 82 which would limit the debate to three days, as is the case now, or one of several other Standing Orders and procedures to limit debate to as little as one day. However, nothing is as restrictive as the one hour in this piece of legislation.

Mr. Nystrom: It is closure in advance.

Mr. Althouse: As my colleague says, it is closure in advance.

I am somewhat at a loss to understand some of the arguments of my colleagues in the Progressive Conservative Party who have said that a three-day debate would be more adequate. For some reason three days has become an adequate length of time for debate. At the same time we heard a few days ago, when this debate was limited to three days, how inadequate it was. I think they are right when they say that three days is inadequate in cases where the proposal is very complex and all-encompassing. We say that the same rules should apply for debate on these regulations, which will virtually affect the entire transportation and grain handling system and the economy not only of western Canada but beyond.

These regulations are important enough to be worthy of full debate. Therefore we recommend that the House accepts Motion No. 49 that the question be debated until the conclusion of the debate and that every question necessary shall be put at the end of the debate. We hope Hon. Members will support that suggestion and see that it is the most democratic route to go, given that some of the sanctions, awards and performance indicators as a result of the regulations which will be proposed are so important that they may indeed require much more attention or as much attention as we have had to give to this Bill.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Erie (Mr. Fretz)—Customs and Excise—Establishment of duty-free stores in Ontario; the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen)—Public Works—Surrey B.C. port of entry facilities. (b) Maintenance of security; the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields)—Employment—Admission of workers to skill-training programs. (b) Plight of the functionally illiterate.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motions Nos. 47 (Mr. Benjamin), 48 (Mr. Mazankowski) and 49 (Mr. Benjamin).

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, I rise to give what will probably be my last speech on the Crow debate. I realize that we tried hard in this particular debate but did not really accomplish anything which would basically protect the people I represent in the West. I feel this is very much like a last ditch stand, the last time one had something to say, something which could be very important. It will be appropriate if I could enlarge for a few minutes on the motion of a last ditch stand and how important it is, even if you did not win but stayed in the fight.

● (1620)

As we approach the month of November, in which people of many countries remember their dead, I remember in great detail visiting northern France a number of years ago on November 2, the annual day of the dead in France. The French people go to the old 1914-18 fronts to pray at the graves of their ancestors who died in that period. I had the opportunity earlier to join in a last ditch stand and visit that area of northern France, Flanders, with my father. I visited the old trenches and talked to the old soldiers who had been there at the time. They told about how they had built those early trenches. There was a front line trench and there was a position they fell back to.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I always enjoy listening to the Hon. Member, but with all due respect, I have to remind him that we are on Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 which pertain to Clause 22. It would help this Chamber if he could stick to that clause and those three amendments which were grouped together by Madam Speaker.

Mr. Ogle: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the Hon. Member has just said. At the same time I hope the Hon. Member will give me a few moments of patience. Something that is as profound and important to the western part of Canada where I live is sometimes more clear if we use a kind of parable rather than a lot of statistical facts. I am basically saying that what we have here, as with those early soldiers, is a falling back

trench by trench, trying in every way possible to stop what those opposite are going to do to the people whom we represent. Finally, I have come to the last ditch. I have no more place to fall back. The House has put on closure. The deal has been made. We know what the final outcome will be.

When I speak to Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49, I am basically saying that I have come to the last ditch, as others in my Party have done. I hope people will remember that as far as we could, we put up a good fight to save the Crow for the people we represent.

The motions now before the House are directed to the procedure for reviewing regulations proposed by the Administrator of the Grain Transportation Agency. A mouthful of words like that cannot mean very much to somebody who has not been following this debate word for word. Perhaps they would not mean much to somebody who has. The motions before the House are important. What they amount to is how this whole massive new Bill will operate, who will operate it, and who will call upon the Administrator to see that this Bill will be put into operation.

The motions before the House now deal particularly with the regulations and who can bring them in. As Hon. Members are aware, the first motion talks about the way the Bill is written to request changes in the regulations. It states regulations can be brought in by 15 Senators or 30 Members of Parliament. It is almost an insult to think that somebody would write a Bill like that.

Who represents the people of this country? Is it the Senators who got their seat by failing in a couple of elections, being a good fund raiser or for any of the different reasons that Senators get their seats, or is it the Members of Parliament, those who have gone out in the line, put up their name, stood and fought and presented themselves in such a way that a number of people in a constituency said that that is the person they want to represent them?

How could it possibly be that anybody writing a piece of legislation would make it sound as if a Member of Parliament only had half the wits of a Senator? I do not know what that means, half the wits of a Senator, but it is not very much. However, that is what the motion says. What we want to do in the motion is to make it equal, that 15 Members of Parliament would have the same weight in bringing about a request for reviewing regulations as 15 Senators would have. That would clearly be understood by all who understand the parliamentary procedure of our House of Commons.

The other motions have to do with the whole idea of closure and time allocation when the committee reports to the House. In Motion No. 49, my Party says there should not be closure. That has been demonstrated very clearly and very well by all Members on this side of the House and, in due course, will be demonstrated by Members of the other side. It is an insult to Members of Parliament that they do not have a place for debate. Closure will be automatically applied on debate. There will not be an open debate on regulations, which could be very complicated. There will be great complication in how the regulations will be put forward and how the procedures regarding the regulations will be put forward, as well as the penalty that will be used in the grain trade when people do not keep to the regulations.

This is very complicated material. The Government is bringing in closure as a prearranged device to keep Members of Parliament who are responsible from debating the Bill in the House of Commons. I hope the Government will be willing to see that Motion No. 49 is carried, that the motion will be brought forward in such a way that this House of Commons will not plan closure even before the event has taken place.

My point in this last ditch stand is that it is a rather sad moment. I really felt in this process that the Government would see what the people of western Canada were asking for and would have some kind of feeling and sensitivity with regard to their request that this regulation, which we have come to know as the Crow, which is part and parcel of the lives of western Canadians, be respected. Like the warriors who have finally gone from trench to trench and put up a good fight but have not been able to carry the day and who are now in their last ditch stand, I hope that that will be appreciated and understood by the people whom we represent.

● (1630)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the debate on this. I listened to the Hon. Member's comments with some interest. This morning the Hon. Member for Kootenay West (Mr. Kristiansen) raised the same issue, that only 15 Senators would be required to precipitate a debate whereas it would require 30 Members of the House of Commons to precipitate a debate. Irrespective of what the Members in the New Democratic Party feel about the Senate, we have to all agree that they are Members of Parliament. They have a function to play in Parliament. They play a very useful role as a Chamber of sober second thought.

Apart from that, we should recognize that after the current redistribution or changes which are now before us with regard to the number of Members of Parliament who are to be in this House, we will have 310 Members of Parliament. Thirty Members represents about 10 percent of the House of Commons whereas 15 Senators out of 104 represents 14 per cent of the Senate. If we assume that the Senate has a role to play then it seems to me that to require roughly proportional equality with regard to the number of Members or Senators who would be required to precipitate a debate would be fair. Indeed, the legislation bends over backwards and gives the House of Commons the right to a debate when only 10 per cent of the Members so require, whereas it requires 14 per cent of the Senators to precipitate such a debate. Contrary to the views that are being expressed by the Members of the New Democratic Party, the House of Commons is put in an advantageous position. Perhaps that is by virtue of the fact that we are elected Members and they are appointed, but it is easier to precipitate a debate on this issue under this amendment by the House of Commons than it is in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would point that out to Hon. Members and perhaps

they could take that into consideration when expressing their views.

Mr. Benjamin: Why bother with the Senate at all then?

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to the debate this afternoon concerning Bill C-155 dealing with Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49.

I would like to say how disappointed I am that the Government chose to bring in closure on this particular piece of legislation which has become known as the Crow Bill. It is something we have always viewed as a right for the producers in western Canada. I feel that, as the Hon. Member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle) referred to just a few moments ago, we are in the last stages or in the last trenches. At this point we only have this day and one more to debate in report stage. There will be one more day at report stage and one day for third reading. So we have less than two and one-half days to go on debating Bill C-155 because of the closure the Government felt it had to bring in which does not allow adequate time for debate in this House on the many, many motions that we have.

In the short time I have been here I must say that it has been the most complex piece of legislation that has been dealt with by this House of Commons. I was elected in the February 18, 1980 general election. Since then there has not been any piece of legislation that has had the complexity and the impact on the people and the grain producers of western Canada that this one has.

In regard to Motion No. 47, we are asking to change the current way in which the sanctions and awards can be brought before the appropriate committee. In some cases it may not be the Transport Committee. The way it stands now in Bill C-155 it requires 30 Members of Parliament or 15 Members of the Senate to bring it before committee. We are proposing that it be either 15 Members of the Senate or 15 Members of Parliament, to give it some equality. I know that the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) just described why it was that it should be 30 Members of Parliament and 15 Members of the Senate. One of my colleagues says it is because he wants to become a Senator. I think there is another explanation, and that is what he is describing as a system of proportional representation. If that is what the Liberal Government really wants, let us not play those percentages in the institutions of Parliament that we have now in regard to the House of Commons versus the Senate. Let us put in true proportional representation and have those people in the other House actually run for public office. If they can get elected, then let them deal with legislation that affects the grain producers and the people living in small communities of western Canada. As soon as those people in the other place get elected, let them start referring things to committee, but until that time I would rather not leven see it be 15 Senators or 15 Members of Parliament. My own personal preference is for the Members of Parliament to bring it before committee and not the people in the other place.

I would like to say that in many ways these motions are attempting to expand the role of Members of Parliament in reviewing the awards and sanctions in Clause 21 that will be designed and implemented by the Administrator. We have to realize that the Administrator is an individual who is not responsible to the Canadian Wheat Board, the producers' organization, but a person who is responsible to the Cabinet and who will be affected by all the political whims that result from this piece of legislation and other matters that affect grain transportation in Canada. I do not think that is a good situation. The Administrator should have guidelines in Bill C-155 to state what those awards and sanctions are based on. He should have some measures whereby he can tell whether there is efficiency or more productivity in the system or whether somebody is not honouring their responsibilities in terms of grain transportation throughout the country. The Administrator has quite wide-ranging powers and because of the way this Bill is set out those powers could be applied to those not directly involved in the movement of grain.

We had hoped, throughout the debate and the many meetings that led up to this legislation that the Canadian Wheat Board would find the control it needs over grain transportation in this country. If the producers want to have an efficient system of moving their grain, I think they have to have some real control over getting their products to the ports and to the markets. We do not know what all the final clauses will be, but it appears that this Bill is going to be in place.

Mr. Benjamin: Heaven forbid.

Mr. Anguish: Heaven forbid as the Hon. Member for Regina West has said. How can we tell whether those awards should be given or sanctions handed out? For the railways, there is a guaranteed annual income in this legislation, but what performance do they have to meet to get that guaranteed annual income? There is nothing in this piece of legislation that states what it is they have to do to get their guaranteed return of 20 per cent on their investment. Can the Administrator or the railways concoct some measurement of success a year from now and say, "Well, we have had a 1 per cent improvement in the efficiency of the grain transportation system"? Does that mean they get their 20 per cent return on their investment? Maybe the rail companies and the Government like that, but I do not like that very much. I would like to know what it is that the rail companies have to meet to get their guaranteed return.

I think it is an oversight role, but a very limited one, that Members of Parliament have. As I mentioned earlier, as the Bill now stands the Members of Parliament, or the Senate can refer a matter to the Transport Committee. When it comes back before Parliament we get one hour to debate it. That is shameful, Mr. Speaker. Even on the closure motion which the Government brought down on this piece of legislation, we had two hours of debate. Something as important to the livelihood of western Canada as the movement of grain, its main industry, making it one of the largest contributors to the balance of

payments and international trade in the country, is only to be given one hour of debate.

● (1640)

Mr. Nystrom: Closure in advance.

Mr. Anguish: The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) calls it closure in advance, and that is exactly what it is. The Liberal Government and the Conservative Official Opposition know that when people in the agricultural industry find out the implications of this legislation they will be very angry regardless of which Party forms the Government of the country. This is a regressive piece of legislation. We want unlimited debate when it comes back before Parliament. If the Government does not like what we have to say and what the people of Canada have to say, then it can bring in closure. At least we will get two hours of debate under that system.

I see that my time has expired, Mr. Speaker, and that you are rising to your feet. I should like to ask for unanimous consent to continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I see the Members of the New Democratic Party are glad to hear their Liberal colleagues. I may remind my honourable colleagues opposite that if we had not had this avalanche of motions during the last few weeks, the mood of this debate might have been a little more serene, which would have benefited all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I am supposed to speak today to motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 to amend Bill C-155. The content of these motions, and the speeches we have heard today and on previous days, give the impression that Opposition Members are extremely touchy about their democratic rights, to say the least. I said today in a motion under Standing Order 21 that Bill C-155 had been the subject of frequent discussion, had been debated in public, in the House and in Committee, and probably for the first time in the Parliament of Canada—nor is it usual in our Provincial legislatures,—proposed regulations may be laid before Parliament. I think that in their comments, Opposition Members have neglected to mention that proposed regulations to implement Clause 21(1) of Bill C-155 will be laid before each House of Parliament. In fact, the procedure is that proposed regulations are presented in this House. As soon as they have been presented, they may or may not be referred to Committee. I may refer the Members of the Opposition to Clauses 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 of Bill C-155.

Therefore, as indicated in Clause 22, proposed regulations are laid before each House of Parliament. That is what the Clause says. Second, fifteen Senators or thirty Members of the House of Commons may decide that the proposed regulations be referred to Committee. I must agree with what the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council said earlier, when he said: All right, I realize that to the New Democratic Party, thirty Members may be a bit much if they happen to be the only ones to want a debate on the issue, especially since they cannot be certain about their Party's future. However, thirty Members is still less than 10 per cent of the full membership of the House. I repeat, to say that the Government is taking too big a slice of the pie is taking a rather exaggerated view of one's democratic rights.

Therefore, fifteen Senators or thirty Members of the House of Commons may refer to Committee—

[*English*]

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder if the Hon. Member would be kind enough to entertain a question at this time?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gourde: Mr. Speaker, I do not think we have yet reached questions, and I would therefore like to finish what I have to say, and perhaps later I could answer one of the Hon. Member's questions.

I myself, although unfortunately I have not had occasion to do so, have a number of questions to put to the Members of the New Democratic Party, because when we went to British Columbia, we heard comments by mayors of municipalities of British Columbia who said they failed to understand how throughout the debate on the Crow, the New Democratic Party Members, and they were very clear about this, had neglected to defend the interests of the people of British Columbia just so they could read a series of petitions. Mr. Speaker, we would have to look at the text of the comments made by the mayors of four municipalities. I do not remember their names, when we sat in Vancouver in August, and then we could see, or possibly hear, but in any case we could see exactly what was said, and I am sure that all Members of this House would find it very useful to know the views of British Columbia taxpayers on the performance of the Members of the New Democratic Party.

In any case, what is also important in this Bill is that a committee to which a proposed regulation—

Here I am reading Clause 22(3) of the Bill:

A committee to which a proposed regulation is referred under subsection (2) shall forthwith consider the proposed regulation and report thereon to the Senate or House of Commons, as the case may be, within thirty sitting days after the referral is made.

Now, since this afternoon—I realize I may have missed some of the debate—all I heard Members discussing was this one hour of debate in the House of Commons. However, the

Clause goes on to indicate that proposed regulations will be examined for thirty days before the Committee to which they have been referred.

I think that once the debate on Bill C-155 is over, it would be extremely unfortunate if the first time proposed regulations are laid before the House or its Committees, we would again have to go through a full debate on the Crow in one or two or five years. In the West, we were told by interested parties, both in public and in private, that it took guts to make changes in the Crow rate. They were congratulating us, and perhaps if Hon. Members would give me a chance, I could find in the committee proceedings the part where they congratulated us, and I am not saying that everyone was, because you cannot please everyone, but they were congratulating the Government for acting as it did, because it was not easy to deal with the Crow rate.

In the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think there has been abuse. In committee, all these amendments did not give rise to any lengthy debate among the Parties. They were discussed only for a few minutes.

Not knowing whether the debate will be resumed or not is not the worst. The worst problem with the debate on changes in the Crow rate is that we don't know what the Opposition parties will be thinking tomorrow.

The New Democratic Party showed some consistency in the matter, on Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 and in the entire debate. It showed some back bone, because at least its Members were opposed. I do not agree with them, but at least they were opposed from the start. The Progressive Conservative Party has been less consistent in its policy. I think it is an open secret that the Progressive Conservative Party and its Members, as far as Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 and the rest of the debate is concerned, have changed position four or five times since the debate began. My problem is not whether Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49 and the clauses of this Bill to which amendments are being requested would constitute a valid subject of debate in the future, my problem is, how many times does the Progressive Conservative Party intend to change its position? Not long ago, I read an article in *La terre de chez-nous* by Mario Dumais. It was an editorial, under the heading: The Conservatives and the Crow. One party, three policies. Subsequently, in some comments of my own in the House, said "One party, four policies", because the Progressive Conservative Party had one policy in Quebec and another policy in the West, but in fact, it has none at all. During the debate in committee, if I remember correctly, they changed policies twice, and according to what we are hearing today, the Progressive Conservative Party would have us believe it favors the status quo. However, even the present leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Mulroney), during the last leadership convention, insisted that the Government was going in the right direction. He was discussing the changes in Bill C-155, tabled in May. He insisted that the Government was going in the right direction. He said that the then Minister of Transport should perhaps be willing to compromise, but that he was on the right track with Bill C-155. Since then, we all know what happened. One evening, the Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) was sitting in committee, and he probably decided it was his party's official position, you never can tell with the Progressive Conservative Party, but it probably was, and he suggested maintaining the status quo on the Crow rate.

• (1650)

In the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to conclude on this note, I feel that as far as what has been said up to now about the motions before the House, there has been a marked tendency to ignore the fact that the Committees of the House of Commons would also have a function, and that these Committees would be asked to go through, to scrutinize proposed regulations, that they would be able to meet for up to thirty days—I am referring to Clause 22(3)—and that in fact, the hour of debate that would take place here in the House of Commons would represent the official position of the Parties, considering that at the committee stage, it should have been possible to go through all the minor flaws that might be present in these proposed regulations.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Hon. Member now?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Perhaps I should explain that it is not up to the Chair to decide whether the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville may put a question but to the Hon. Member himself to either agree or refuse to entertain the question.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde) mentioned that democracy is very important in our country. However, according to Bill C-155, to refer the regulations to Committee requires a notice signed by fifteen Senators or thirty Members of the House of Commons, and I would like to know whether there is not a difference between Senators and Members of the House of Commons, since the latter or elected by the people, by the general public, and Senators are appointed by the Prime Minister. That is not democracy at all. Does the Hon. Member agree that this clause is not a truly democratic clause, since Senators are not elected? Does he agree with the principle of elected Senators, or does he agree with an anti-democratic system?

Mr. Gourde: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member's comments are entirely beside the point, and that he should urge the Members of his Party to attend the meetings of the Committee on Senate Reform more often, instead of asking whether or not Senators, because they are appointed, should or should not have the right to refer proposed regulations to Committee. That is not the problem, since the New Democratic Party has, at the present time, more than thirty Members in the House—

Mr. Nystrom: Yes, indeed!

Mr. Gourde: —and, since they have more than thirty Members, this means that today, if the matter were laid before the House, Members of the New Democratic Party could refer proposed regulations to Committee, and I think that is very democratic. We must not forget that it is probably the first time in this House that a Government or Party has decided to suggest to the House that proposed regulations be referred to it and to committee, and this is entirely new and to the credit of the present Government.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is the House ready for the question? No Hon. Members having risen in order to be recognized, I presume the House must be ready for the question, which is on Motions Nos. 47, 48 and 49.

The question is on Motion No. 47 (Mr. Benjamin). All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11) the vote stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 48 (Mr. Mazankowski).

All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11) the vote stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion No. 49 (Mr. Benjamin). All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11) the vote stands deferred.

I understand that Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53 have been grouped for debate. Motion No. 50 is to be voted on separately.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by adding immediately after line 45 at page 14 the following:

"(3) A railway company shall, in a subsequent calendar year, invest in railway equipment and plant for the movement of grain an amount not less than the after tax cost of capital, after tax depreciation, and after tax constant cost portion of payments it received under section 55 for the preceeding crop year."

and by renumbering the subsequent subclauses accordingly.

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette) moved:

Motion No. 52

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by striking out lines 10 to 15 at page 15.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 53

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by striking out lines 10 to 15 at page 15.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, this group of amendments—Motions No. 50 and No. 53 in my name, and Motion No. 52 in the name of the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer)—have been lumped together by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) as being frivolous. I will not bother dealing with the motion of the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette. I presume that Motion No. 58 is frivolous and the Hon. Members do not want the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) to debate that one.

Mr. McKnight: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would just call to the attention of the Chair that I understood we were debating Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53.

Mr. Benjamin: I am glad, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster caught up. I will deal, Mr. Speaker, with Motions Nos. 50 and 53 and I will leave the other motion to the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette, and I hope that he can persuade his colleagues that it is not a frivolous motion.

● (1700)

Motion No. 50, Mr. Speaker, deals with what the railways will do with any profits made as a result of this legislation. We have submitted for a number of years, Sir, that the railways should not be allowed to make a profit on any public funds that are provided by way of investments; that if there is a profit, it should either be reinvested or returned to the inves-

tors. I leave myself open for criticism from my own Party for recommending this free, private enterprise, sound business practice. However, the investor is entitled to two things. He is entitled to have any profits reinvested in capital improvements or he is entitled to a dividend or interest, either one. He is entitled to a fair return on his investment.

In this case, it is the taxpayers who are putting up the money. It seems to me that the ordinary taxpayer is just as entitled to a return on his investment as he would be if he walked to his favourite broker and invested money as an individual investor. It seems to me the taxpayers are just as entitled to an opportunity to have a return. Through this motion, Mr. Speaker, we are saying that any profits made by the railways for the movement of grain not less than after-tax cost of capital, after-tax depreciation and after-tax constant cost portion be reinvested in capital improvements to the rail system. In other words, we would like to see that any surplus funds will not leak out to the private individual shareholders of Canadian Pacific Limited and will not leak out into investments in other things like more shopping centres or highrise luxury apartments in California or another nickel mine in Indonesia. We would like to see any surplus that the railways have reinvested in the railway plant.

Mr. Blenkarn: Dividends.

Mr. Benjamin: Reinvestment is a kind of dividend, Mr. Speaker, that benefits the whole country. The taxpayers, representing the entire population of the country, have made that investment on their own behalf and on behalf of the country. Therefore, Sir, the best return on that investment is for those surplus funds to be reinvested in the expansion of the railway system in every part of the country, not only in the West. The system should be upgraded not only on railway lines or in tunnels but in signal systems, higher speed trains and new and advanced technology as it comes onstream. That reinvestment should be a continuing process.

We in the country, Sir, have seen a boom and bust cycle in investment in the railway transportation system as well as in other modes of transportation. A transportation system will go for 10, 12 or 15 years letting the plant deteriorate and falling way behind in new technology. Then, all of a sudden, when tracks are grown over with weeds and the capacity is insufficient, the railways want to again dip into the taxpayers' pockets. As the railways have been doing since 1881 and since 1923, if there are any surplus funds, the railways will run off with them and invest them in something else. When are we going to put a stop to that, Mr. Speaker?

Another motion that we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker, is Motion No. 53. I am happy that the motion of the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette is worded in exactly the same as my motion which the Hon. Member for Vegreville has called frivolous. I hope he will explain that to the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette.

Mr. Mazankowski: No, your comments are frivolous; that's what I meant.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, this motion deals with confidentiality; that is that any information given to the Grain Transportation Committee or the Grain Transportation Administrator by the railways will be kept confidential. This Parliament, successive Governments since 1881, the Canadian Transport Commission, before that the old Board of Transport Commissioners and even before that the Commission on Telegraphs, Canals and Railroads, have all been denied access to information from the railways because of confidentiality. For Government agencies to get information has been like pulling teeth. Ten years ago when the railways applied to abandon the transcontinental passenger trains, the Canadian Transport Commission had a heck of a time getting information. Then when it did get information, that information had to be kept confidential. The Commission arrived at a costing order with which I am not sure even it was satisfied. In fact, I do not think it was. However, it was based on the figures of the railways which had to be kept confidential.

It has also been put to us by the railways for decades, Mr. Speaker, that those figures must be kept confidential in the name of competition and in order to keep private internal corporation information private so that competitors do not have access to it. What competitors are the railways speaking off? Canadian National and Canadian Pacific compete in name only. They will drop their prices at competitive points, but their prices always remain the same. The overwhelming majority of their shipping points and probably 75 per cent to 90 per cent of their trackage is located hundreds of miles apart. There is no competition; the shippers are captive.

I recall hearing about an incident that occurred regarding a potash mine in Saskatchewan back in 1969-70, a time when international prices on potash products went down the drain. Products that were going for $24 to $30 a ton had dropped to $9, $10 or $11 a ton. In any event, this new potash mine asked the railways for a rate from Colonsay to Vancouver. Officials of this mine waited weeks and months, and finally a rate was quoted to them from each railway. Strangely enough, Mr. Speaker, the rate quoted from each railway company was exactly the same. It did not matter which railway the mining company shipped on. The price had nothing to do with miles. Officials of the potash company could not figure out how the railways arrived at that rate.

I will never forget hearing the general manager of that potash company telling me about the findings of the transportation and tariff experts at their company in Gallup, New Mexico. Those experts spent weeks trying to figure out how CN and CP arrived at that rate. The railways were competitive in this case; they both had a spur track into that same mine. Finally, one day, by pure accident, one of the experts opened a tariff book and happened to be going through the tariffs of the Santa Fe railways from Gallup, New Mexico, to San Diego. He found the potash rate there. The rate that was provided to the company by these competitors, CN and CP, which has to be kept confidential, was identical to the rate charged by Santa Fe from Gallup, New Mexico, to San Diego.

The rate was not related in any way to the number of miles travelled or to the nature of the terrain.

The excuse of confidentiality in the name of competition does not hold water. As it pertains to the railways, it has never held water. We can no longer let the railways use that excuse. It is another form of Blackmail. Officials of the railways say: "We will not give you the information unless it is confidential, and if it is not going to be confidential, we will not give it to you." Therefore, a member of a Government agency such as the Grain Transportation Administrator will be handcuffed when making decisions. The Senior Grain Transportation Committee will be handcuffed unless it agrees that the information is confidential and legislation will require that it be confidential.

The right of the public to have access to this information is involved here as well. There have been many contentious instances in the last number of years both here and in the United States regarding freedom of information, and when disclosure was finally forced, it really did not affect at all the competitive position of the companies concerned. That myth should be put to rest once and for all in this legislation, Mr. Speaker. Information should not only be not confidential but as well it should be mandatory that any information that the Grain Transportation Administrator or advisory committee want should be provided by the railways. It should be entirely up to the people receiving that information to decide whether any or all of it will be confidential. For that matter, the same provision should apply to the Canadian Transport Commission not only concerning railroads but other modes of transportation as well.

● (1710)

We believe that Motion No. 50 and Motion No. 53 meet the kind of criteria that are in place in many parts of the world for transportation not only of grain but many other commodities. It is in place among modes of transportation in many parts of the world as between different participants in each transportation mode as well as between the transportation modes themselves. Surely it is unnecessary to continue maintaining or adding legislation that perpetuates the past practices of confidentiality and the investing of surpluses from funds received from taxpayers. Surely it is time to put a halt to those practices which have been going on for the last 102 years.

The issue of confidentiality is no longer valid. It is no longer relevant to the duties that we place upon the agency established under this legislation. Similarly, it is long past due that surpluses which are made on money invested by the taxpayer should at least be re-invested in that plant. The two choices are to reinvest it or return to the taxpayers a dividend or interest on their money. I prefer the former option because we will need a minimum of $2 billion or $3 billion a year not just for the next decade but for the next 20 or 30 years in order to bring our transportation system, particularly the rail system, up to the level at which it should be.

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, usually it is a pleasure to speak to legislation, but in some ways it is not a pleasure when one must deal with a Bill such as this and the amendments to it which are before us.

At the outset let me respond to the concern expressed by the Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) about being frivolous. Certainly any amendment taken by itself cannot be considered frivolous. Certainly it cannot be considered frivolous if one looks at the Speaker's ruling on it. If they were frivolous, they would not have been allowed.

I suggest that it is all relative because when one considers the number of motions that have been accepted, some of them are much more important than others. The Hon. Member for Regina West has been talking about information to the railroads and other matters instead of using our limited time in the House as a result of the disgraceful closure on this Bill to talk about some very substantive measures in this Bill, such as a method of payment, the freeze, the $450 billion in the B.C. coal lands. If he believes that he is doing a good service to his constituents, the producers whom he represents, by talking about the information railways will be putting out, then I suggest that he is being frivolous in his actions in the House. That is precisely what the Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) was referring to.

Furthermore, of all the Members in that part of the House, the Hon. Member for Regina West should know that better than any one else because he was the only Member from the NDP on the committee during the summer. He is the one who should know what are the substantive issues in this Bill, and which measures are important and should be discussed here during the limited time available to us. His concern about being referred to as frivolous simply points out the nonsensical, frivolous, philosophical and ideological position that the NDP has taken throughout the debate.

Our Party has attempted, and in many ways succeeded, in improving a Bill that is very bad. It remains a poor Bill despite our best efforts to improve it. I do not take a lot of satisfaction in saying that the NDP, who represents areas on the Prairies from where I come, has not seen fit to take part in improving what we consider a bad Bill despite our efforts to improve it. The point is that when we should be discussing measures that are of substantial importance to the producers in the part of the country that I represent, the NDP is using the little time that is available to us to debate this Bill to talk about what are basically frivolous amendments when compared to the more substantial motions in this Bill. That is all I will say with respect to the NDP and the Member for Regina West.

I will not use the full ten minutes allotted to me because there is little time to debate this Bill. Since we need to get on with it, the NDP should let us do so and stop putting up a speaker on every motion. Surely Members of that Party do not need to have the whole caucus talk about information being available from the railway. Surely they could simply put up one or two speakers so that we could proceed to debating the important amendments in this Bill.

Let me talk briefly about Motion No. 52. It simply states that Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by striking out lines 10 to 15. Those lines state:

(5) The members of the Committee shall treat in a confidential manner any information submitted under this section that is identified and treated as confidential by the railway company that submitted the information.

Surely if the Senior Grain Transportation Committee will be able to function, it must have access to information. This motion seeks to ensure that the railway company itself should not be in a position to decide what is classified and what is not. I understand that the Government will not accept our amendment. The Government is asking that members of the committee shall have access to the information. However, Clause 68 states that "Schedule I to the Access to Information Act is amended by adding thereto." Therefore there is a clause in the Bill that provides the access to information. But when we deal with the information that the railways should be making available to people other than those on the Commission, the railways will be allowed to decide what should be classified and what should stay with the members of the committee. That does not make sense to me.

I also question why only the members of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee should have access to this information. I believe that the Government is involved, including the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and the Governor in Council, as a result of the substantial sums of money provided for in this Bill. They are involved with respect to providing rolling stock for the railways. I do not understand why this section allows the railways to limit the information available only to the committee by simply saying that it is classified or shall be treated as confidential and therefore not provide it to anyone but members of the committee. At the very least, this information could be made available to the Minister.

I also believe that this clause is unnecessary. The exclusion of this clause would make the Bill much more straightforward and would make information more available to the public and producers. The Government's refusal to accept our amendment is another example of how this Bill is written for the railways' interest and not the producers. Surely it is the producers who will be paying increases in costs based on some of the costs the railways say they will incur. Therefore, it should be incumbent upon Members of Parliament who are establishing this legislation to ensure that those who will be paying those increases in the future have access to this information. I submit this would be a much better Bill, a much cleaner Bill, it would be simple to read and to administer and it would be in everybody's interest if Clause 5 were simply deleted.

● (1720)

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise to participate in the debate on Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53. Motions Nos. 50 and 53 stand in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), my colleague. In addressing Motion No. 50, I just want to put on the record our amendment which reads as follows:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by adding immediately after line 45 at page 14 the following:

"(3) A railway company shall, in a subsequent calendar year, invest in railway equipment and plant for the movement of grain an amount not less than the after tax cost of capital, after tax depreciation, and after tax constant cost portion of payments it received under section 55 for the preceeding crop year."

and by renumbering the subsequent subclauses accordingly.

The intent of that amendment, to put it briefly, is to require the railroads to reinvest any surplus funds received from public moneys paid to them under the legislation.

The principle underlying that intent and our amendment is that public moneys should be put up to increase rail capacity and enhance the transportation system for grain. Public moneys should not be paid to the railroads to enhance their profit position.

I want to make it very clear that we do not have any argument with the proposition that public moneys or subsidies, in the case of retaining or maintaining an essential service such as the railways provided to many parts of this country, should be used not only to maintain those facilities but to protect the profit position of the railroads in doing that. Our objection is that unless there are adequate safeguards, it is not the purpose of public funds to further enhance those profits beyond what the railroads would be able to earn in normal circumstances in their operation. Protection, yes. Enhancement or expansion, no.

Let me deal briefly with Motion No. 53, which reads:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by striking out lines 10 to 15 at page 15.

The intent is to remove the provision of the legislation that would require the members of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee to treat as confidential any information declared to be so by the railroads.

The purpose is that the railroads should not have the right to impose secrecy on the committee. It could come to pass that public disclosure of information would be one of the most effective ways available to the committee to fulfil its mandate. Decisions on the confidential nature of its deliberations or the information available to it should be the prerogative of the committee, not the railroads.

In discussing that, I think it is fairly common knowledge that one of the major arguments for confidentiality when dealing with the activities of a corporation are normally that you protect that confidentiality in order that the corporation not have its information leaked in such a way as might benefit its competitors. I do not know whether the CPR is worried that I or some of my colleagues or anyone of a group of citizens will start up another railroad in competition with it. But clearly in terms of the railways, the Canadian Pacific Railway in particular, it is not a threat by its competitors of which they might make use to the disadvantage of the CPR. It is not one of the major considerations we have to be dealing with.

Seeing that there is no major reason for that confidentiality, particularly not confidentiality that would not immediately be perceived to place the company at risk by members of the committee exercising their duties, surely there is no other reason for writing a carte blanche exclusion for putting a window into the affairs of a corporation which, over the years, has been, is and will be receiving billions and billions of dollars

from the public purse. Unless there is a very compelling reason for secrecy, and if there is a compelling reason, members of the committee should be the first to see it, then the operating rules and the expenditures of public funds should be made known directly not only to representatives of the public but to members of the public themselves who should have the right to know on what their money is being spent. They should be able to judge for themselves, not just through the minds of their legislators whether or not those funds are being expended in the most wise and judicious manner.

That seems to me to be an argument that would be difficult to counter in any realistic way. I would hope that if the Government intends to vote against this amendment, which I think is exactly the same wording as Motion No. 52, the PC amendment, we would have at least some explanation other than a vote against our amendments from representatives of the Government.

In terms of the need of the public to know what is happening with respect to the expenditure of public funds and, further, as to whether or not public funds should be expended by the billions of dollars without some return coming to the public for its investment, I think it is worthwhile to take a look at some local experiences, not only within the West Kootenays but elsewhere: I hope other Members will look at the experiences they have had with the railways in their areas. All of us, at least in western Canada, have had experience from time to time with rail line abandonment applications. I know we have had two attempts to abandon a certain stretch of railway between Nakusp and New Denver in my constituency in 1974, 1975, 1976 and again in 1980-81. It has been interesting to take a look at what was demanded of the railway when ordered to maintain the line when the railway was ordered in the 1974-75 hearings to upgrade certain portions of it. In the intervening five or six years we were still left with a line to which, in the view of many of the participants in the 1980 hearings, virtually nothing of consequence had been done to comply with the orders of the CTC. If that is the continuing result—and I know from discussions with my colleagues that similar things have happened in areas right across the West and, I suspect, in the rest of Canada as well—then it is not enough to decide after the fact whether or not the taxpayers' funds that we turn over to the railway by the billions and billions of dollars have been expended for the purposes which not only were recommended but for the tasks which were ordered by the Government agency responsible. It is not enough to look five or six years later and say, "Did they do the job and did they expend the funds in the way that we told them those funds must be expended?" You need to have a mechanism. One of them is to ensure that you invest in equity for purposes of modernization and upgrading of the railways so that you have some direct voice. Hopefully, the voice will become more meaningful in the future than it has been in many cases in the past, especially in terms of the CN, to ensure that the purposes for which the public funds are expended are met and complied with.

Let me read from a submission of the Nakusp and District Chamber of Commerce to the abandonment hearings on September 19, 1980, where we find:

> In our reviewing of past history, including the hearing of five years ago, it is evident that the CPR is continuing to defy past orders to improve this rail line plus they are trucking in fuel to the oil bulk plants and destroying what should be their own efforts to make the line pay.

• (1730)

It is just one example of the nightmare story of what has happened to the railways throughout the West over the past number of decades. They have made no effort to maintain many of their lines where for their own reasons they wanted to scrap or abandon them. As they did with passenger services on many occasions, they have done the same with freight lines. They have taken steps which tend to make rail lines look more uneconomic than they are so that they can be relieved of their proper responsibilities.

Surely it is an adequate argument to say that we must have access to the information and that we must be able to relay all information from investigative proceedings to the public we represent. Surely that is not too much to ask. We are being asked to spend billions of dollars of public money, tax dollars of hard working people, from one end of the country to the other. Surely we should insist upon having a direct voice in the management and decisions of the railways. Up to now many of their decisions have not been in the interests of the public. In fact, they have been diametrically opposed, especially when they have undermined in a very calculated way both the railway services and the communities they serve.

I hope Hon. Members opposite will give some explanation fairly soon as to why in certain circumstances they would be opposed to our amendments, unless of course they have had a change of heart and will support them.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) did not address himself to Motion No. 50 which, in this group of motions, is really the substantive one before the House.

In Motion No. 50 we are talking about the fact that the Bill provides a guaranteed income to railways but it does not guarantee particular services or reinvestment in railways. That guaranteed income is 20 per cent over operating costs, in laymen's language, and 20 per cent over the fixed and capital costs and return on investment, most of which we all know was made by taxpayers of Canada. In the case of CNR, all of it was made by the taxpayers; in the case of CPR, a major portion of it was provided by taxpayers.

Motion No. 50 puts some backbone into Clause 29 which deals with the ongoing capital investment of railways. Clause 29 requires that the railways indicate how much they will spend on improvements and capital investments during the next year. The Government is supposed to monitor this investment. Grain growers and taxpayers in Canada will provide a subsidy to the railways which, the implication is, they will use to increase the viability and quality of the grain transportation system. In this amendment we are asking for guarantees on

investments and on fixed costs or constant costs to be linked to the Government's request or requirement of the railways. In fact, guarantees of investment should be linked by the Government to the investment of the railways and the amount they are paid from capital investments. This is covered in Section 55 which requires certain payments to the railways, gives the Government power to hold back certain amounts of money from them and requires them to fulfil their commitments on track maintenance, branch lines or any other requirement to enable them to operate efficiently. We are asking that the investments the railways are supposed to be making should be established relative to the returns they receive from investments, capital maintenance and fixed costs.

Clause 29 of the Bill contains a nebulous commitment on the part of railways to fulfil the requirements to make their operations viable. Motion No. 50 spells out the amounts which can be reasonably expected of investment by the railways. Ordinarily we would ask why this would be necessary. People who have lived in the West and have dealt with the railways know that it is necessary for a specific amount to be included. Over the years a considerable amount of taxpayers' money has been spent supposedly for upgrading railways. For example, a considerable amount was designated specifically to branch line rehabilitation, much of which was never spent. A considerable amount was designated to improve rail cars, much of which was never spent. Consequently, we cannot trust that the railways will use taxpayers' money for the purposes it was given and demand this kind of guarantee.

Also it is important to recognize that statements of intent to invest are produced on a yearly basis under the Act, but they do not commit the railways to making any kind of continued investment. At the beginning of the year they can say that they intend to do something, but within the statement there is no guarantee that they will fulfil the commitment. Our motion suggests that we want a guarantee relative to the money they are obtaining in subsidies from the Government. That is what we call them. They are subsidies because they are relative to the amount of investments made in railways in the past. If they are paid to railways, we want a guarantee that they will be used to develop a good system for many years to come.

As the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) suggested, we will need several billion dollars a year for the next 30 years to be assured that we will have a railway system which is capable of moving grain and all other necessary products in western Canada over the next few years to develop the economy of the West to the extent we feel it should be developed.

● (1740)

The history of public aid to the railways, which Bill C-155 will perpetuate, will continue. The railways will receive continued aid and a guaranteed annual income. The money that flows to the railroads, which is supposed to be returned to the public, and services and guarantees of service do not necessarily occur. As it stands, Bill C-155 does nothing to improve this position. We have put forward this amendment to improve that.

As a matter of history, let us put on the record the kind of public assistance that Canadian Pacific Railways has taken from the taxpayers of Canada in the last few years. The Royal Commission on Railways and Transportation said the Canadian Pacific received the following public assistance as of 1916: Railways and services completed by the Government, $37 million; cash aid, $66 million; value of unsold lands, $119 million; returns from the land sold minus cost of improvement, $55 million; for a total of identifiable aid in a matter of approximately 30 years of something over $279 million.

If you adjust that and other presentations to the CPR for longer periods of time to present value, those investments would be $8.3 billion. We feel very strongly that we must have some guarantee that further money from the taxpayers will be returned to us in some kind of service. If after having received $8 billion they still give the kind of service they do, there is no way that we can guarantee that we will not receive the same kind of service in the future unless we define very definitely in this Act the kind of investment they must make each year relative to the subsidies they receive. We are not asking them to take their own money and put it back in. We are giving them this money and we want them to use it on building up the railways so that they will be better and we can be guaranteed some kind of service.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil):

That this sitting of the House continue beyond the ordinary hour of adjournment for the purpose of considering the report stage of Bill C-155.

I move that under the provisions of Standing Order 8(4)(a).

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The motion seems to be in order. I will put the question. Those Members who object to the motion will please rise in their place. There being no Members rising in their place to object to the motion, the motion is deemed to have been carried.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I thank Hon. Members for allowing additional time to debate the very important substantive amendments that have yet to be debated, thanks to the New Democratic Party who denied earlier the House the opportunity of debating some of the very fundamental, integral and vital parts of this Bill.

Perhaps through the extension of time we will have an opportunity to debate the safety net, the method of payment, the farmer's ability to pay, the B.C. coal lands and other matters of that nature. We in this Party have come here to debate this issue to try to work toward a better Bill and a more satisfactory solution than that which is contained in Bill C-155. We hope that the people of Canada will recognize that throughout the course of our deliberations ours has not been one of obstruction and stonewalling, but one of constructive criticism and providing constructive proposals.

An Hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Mazankowski: The Hon. Member says shame. In the course of their moving an amendment today to adopt their version of a safety net, they threw the Crow out the window. By virtue of their presentation of their version of the safety net based at 3 per cent, they are in fact contributing to the dismantlement of the Crow. This Party says the country is not ready for the kind of increases that are contained in this Bill. That is why we have advocated a freeze.

Getting to the motions under debate, I can sympathize with the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) in what he is attempting to do under Motion No. 50. He is trying to ensure or put some onus of accountability in this legislation on the part of the railways to ensure that they invest money into the plant and equipment that is necessary to move grain.

This issue was debated at length in committee. We in our Party addressed it, and I think we addressed it very effectively because it is contained as a rather substantive amendment in the Bill. I refer to subclause 29(2) which has a large section in it dealing with the monitoring of programs and investment.

While not arguing with the good intentions of the Hon. Member for Regina West, I think he has adopted a rather convoluted way of attempting to attach some strings to the railways' ability to invest. It is rather strange. I heard the previous speaker crying about the guaranteed annual income for the railroads. It is that Party that insisted that any Crow benefit or government contribution be paid directly to the railways, therefore denying the opportunity to develop a system that would be more streamlined and efficient, denying producers the opportunity to cash in on a bit of that Crow benefit.

If we allow for the ingenuity of producers and their innovative ability, they will find a way to move their grain at a reduced price as well as their products to market. In so doing, they will assist their operation and improve their cash flow, bringing about a more efficient, effective and reliable grain handling system.

The Members of the New Democratic Party said no. They want the bundle of $658 million plus to go to the railways. They stand up and say in the same breath that it is awful that we are giving the railways a guaranteed annual income. what is worse is that in the course of doing that, you perpetuate a cost-plus system. The railways will receive all of their out-of-pocket costs, which include such things as depreciation and an 18 to 20 per cent return on investment. Those are two very major items in the cost components. In addition, they are going to get a 20 per cent mark-up for profit. There is not a farmer in Canada that works on that kind of an operation. I recall during the course of the committee hearing one farmer doing a calculation and figuring out he lost $3 or $4 on every bushel of grain he produced. I suggested to him that he must have been using railway accounting, because they can certainly manipulate their figures in such a way that they can show a loss on literally everything. In this case the railways are going to receive full cost recovery for the movement of grain plus a 20 per cent mark-up. The New Democratic Party say that is great and it should all go to the railroads. In the same breath they are saying there should be some constraints placed upon them, charging them with the responsibility of investing this money in plant and equipment.

• (1750)

We dealt with that issue and we moved a very substantive amendment which charged the CTC with the responsibility of monitoring. The CTC is a very important component in this piece of legislation. The proposal that was accepted by the committee as sponsored by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) really gave the CTC some authority to analyse the general investment plans of the railway and to submit a report. That is contained in Clause 29(2) at page 14. This really beefs up the monitoring device. It says:

> (2) The Commission shall monitor the programs of the railway companies for the maintenance of the grain dependent branch lines and the investments of the railway companies in railway equipment and plant for the movement of grain—
>
> (*a*) annually verify the investments referred to in paragraph (1)(*a*) and report to the Minister any difference between the statement of investments referred to in paragraph (1)(*a*), and the investments actually made;
>
> (*b*) analyse the general investment plans referred to in paragraph (1)(*b*), and not later than 90 days following the submission of the statement referred to in subsection (1), submit a report to the Minister on the appropriateness of those general investment plans and proposed investments in ensuring an adequate, reliable and efficient railway transportation system . . .
>
> (*c*) audit the expenditures referred to in paragraph (1)(*c*) not later than 120 days following the submission of the statement referred in subsection (1) and report to the Minister any differences between the audit and the expenditures claimed to have been made by the railway company.

This is a very constructive amendment which accommodates quite well the objective the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) wants to implement.

I want to get back to what the New Democratic Party has been saying about this payment to the railroads. In a Wood Gundy research document dated September, 1983, in which they recommend that their prospective clients buy Canadian Pacific shares, we find this:

> —the Crow should contribute net income of $262 million or $3.66 per share through 1985.

With that kind of windfall clearly there has to be some monitoring device which will make the railways accountable for their performance in terms of providing service and in terms of investment.

This Bill is wrong in so many ways. It is dramatically and fundamentally wrong in that it is paying the $658 million in perpetuity to the railway companies. We hear talk on the other side about what is in the best interest of agriculture and what is best for western Canada. I want to draw to your attention a summary of western perspectives on the Crow as enunciated by the Canada West Foundation, which is an independent think tank which did this analysis. They looked at it in terms of winners and losers. The biggest winners in the Crow debate were the two national railways. Together they will be the recipients of some $658 million per year in constant 1983 dollars, plus they will be receiving an additional portion of the increases. The major losers in the Crow debate are the prairie livestock interests as represented by the feed grain producer and the livestock associations.

Bill C-155 clearly discriminates against these groups by encouraging farmers, through its subsidy structure, to produce grain for the export markets. The biggest loser is the western Canadian agri-business. By paying the Crow benefit to the railways the Government deals a near-death blow to the existing future agricultural processing in western Canada. There are many reasons why this Bill is wrong. It does not provide an enabling device to change the method of payment at some future time.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words on the three motions before the House. Motion No. 52 is in the name of the Hon. Member for Portage Marquette (Mr. Mayer). Motion No. 53 is in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). I will be very brief on those two. They are calling in the Bill for less confidentiality than the Minister would like. The intent of these motions would be to remove the provision of the legislation that requires members of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee to treat as confidential any information declared to be so by the railways. The reasons for supporting this motion would be that the railways should not have the right to impose secrecy upon the Senior Grain Transportation Committee and hence the population of Canada. I think it is just another argument in a long string of arguments that were started by a Conservative Member, the Hon. Member for Peace River, Mr. Ged Baldwin, many years ago when he talked so long and eloquently about the need for freedom of information in this country. These two amendments, one by our Party and one by the Conservative Party, are going in that direction.

The other amendment before the House is Motion No. 50 in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West. This would require that the railways invest in each of the subsequent years at least as much money in upgrading the railway system and components of that system as they invested in the past year. The reason for that is that we have often felt in western Canada that we have been short-changed by the CPR and the CNR in terms of the lack of money they have put into the system.

I want to put on the record what I think is one of the real scandals of Canadian Confederation, the history of what I think is one of the biggest welfare bums in this country, the CPR. When I say "welfare bum" I mean welfare bum. We often have complaints about people on welfare because a few extra bucks are given here or there for a few extra services. The biggest welfare bum is the CPR. I want to spend a few minutes telling you why.

In 1917 we had a Royal Commission on Railways and Transportation which said that the CPR in 1917 had received the following public assistance from the taxpayers of Canada: For railway and surveys completed by the federal Government, they received $37.8 million of taxpayers' money. In direct cash aid, they received $66.9 million. In the value of unsold land, the CPR received $119.3 million. Returns from lands sold, minus the cost of improving those lands by the railway company, was $55.5 million. The total of identifiable aid by the 1917 Royal Commission on Railways and Transportation to the CPR in 1917 dollars was $279.5 million. Adjusted to 1982 dollars by 5 per cent for the inflation rate in 1917 and 5 per cent in 1918, and by the average yield on long-term Government securities between 1919 and 1982, the value of that aid would come to $8.3 billion. That is what was given to the biggest welfare bum in the country in taxpayers hard earned, money.

● (1800)

That is not all. In addition, there have been subsidies to the Canadian Pacific Railway for operating losses on railway services of $2.9 million in 1982 dollars. I could give all kinds of breakdowns, year by year. The source of my statistics is the annual reports and the books of the CPR.

As of 1981 the Canadian Pacific owed $1.65 billion in deferred taxes according to its annual report. Adjusted to 1982 dollars that is $1.83 billion. If the ordinary worker in this country, the ordinary farmer or, indeed, the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson) owed deferred taxes, National Revenue would be on his back very quickly to take him to court. But in 1981 the CPR owed $1.65 billion in taxes. It is the biggest welfare bum in the country yet the Government wants to give it extra handouts of money contributed by the taxpayers in my constituency.

This big welfare bum could not even afford to buy its own railway cars to move its own grain. It could not afford to fix up railway cars or buy hopper cars so it came on bended knee to the federal Government saying to Otto Lang and his boys a few years ago "Buy us some hopper cars". So 7,500 hopper cars were purchased by the federal Government with the hard earned money of taxpayers from places like Kamsack, Yorkton and Melville and so on. At about $6,500 per car that cost $490 million.

When you add all the subsidies, the value of land, the value of grants, hopper cars and the improvements in tracks and railways and so on, since the CPR began, in 1982 dollars the value of aid given to the CPR was $13.5 billion. It is the biggest welfare bum in the history of the country, Mr. Speaker.

Motion No. 50 would go some way toward making sure that it paid its fair share, that it paid for some of the rail line upgrading in the country, that it provided some of its own equipment and did some of its own work instead of coming like a beggar to the people of Canada asking for more and more handouts.

In return, Government after Government has prostituted itself giving handouts without taking any equity. For $13.5 billion the taxpayers of this country do not have any equity whatsoever in the CPR. I do not know of any Conservative, Liberal or NDP provincial Government that would stand for that kind of handout of the people's money to the CPR with no return. It is another reason why we on this side of the House will not stand by and let the Government impose closure on this Bill.

That $13.5 billion was given to the CPR in handouts, yet if some poor soul in this country who is on welfare or unemploy-

ment insurance gets a few extra dollars or if someone owes a few extra dollars in taxes, they are liable to be taken to court and fined by the federal Government. It is not fair and it is not just, Mr. Speaker. It is an economic system that must be changed and it will only be changed if people, through Parliament, say to the CPR that the people of Canada are the boss and they want a transportation system that is run on their behalf. If they are going to give money to the CPR they should take equity in the railway. We do not have the liberty of throwing away the taxpayers' money on the CPR or any other large corporation in the country. For these reasons I appeal to all Members of the House to pass Motion No. 50. If we do not, the CPR will ask for more of the same.

I have some very interesting statistics here from the annual reports of the CN and the CPR showing how much they have invested in railways in Canada in 1981. The CPR invested $511 million and CPR $317 million for a total of $828 million. Adjusted to 1983 dollars that comes to $1.33 billion.

The plan of the former Minister is called the "Pepin plan" in the west. It calls for less money to be spent now than was spent in 1981. For the CNR it is $491 million and for CPR $315 million for a total of $806 million. That is a decrease of 22 per cent for the CNR and a decrease of 20.5 per cent for CP. That is another reason for Motion No. 50. It would make sure that in the years ahead the railways would invest at least as much as they invested last year on improving the rail lines.

For these reasons I suggest that Motion No. 50 be adopted. It would make sure that farmers in all constituencies would receive a better rail service. I could name rail lines in the Melville area, in the Yorkton area, and in the Kamsack area and tell horror story after horror story about them.

I see that my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I could go on and on giving concrete examples that would persuade you, as a big city Member of Parliament, of the necessity of passing Motion No. 50. It would assure my constituents of some value for the handouts they have given to that welfare bum year after year. It has taken more out of the pockets of my constituents than any other corporation or institution in the country. I am not going to stand for it, Mr. Speaker, and if you will give me extra time I am prepared to put on the record some examples of where that kind of money could be used in my constituency.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Does the Hon. Member seek unanimous consent to continue, as he knows, his time has expired?

Mr. Nystrom: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) to continue?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

● (1810)

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Éva Côté (Rimouski-Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me an opportunity to say a few words about Bill C-155, especially at this stage where we are discussing, more specifically, Motion No. 50, presented by the representative of the New Democratic Party. A careful scrutiny of Bill C-155 shows that in Clause 29, provision has been made for obliging railway companies to submit to the Canadian Transport Commission, to the Administrator and to the Senior Grain Commission, to the Administrator and to the Senior Grain Transportation Committee, investment plans and programs by which users, that is, grain producers, will be assured of a sufficient number of railway cars and adequate railway facilities as such.

Sub-clause 2 of Clause 29 sets the criteria for monitoring programs and investments.

Mr. Speaker, sub-clause (2) was added to the initial Bill, following extremely useful and interesting discussions among Government Members, the Official Opposition and New Democratic Party Members.

I feel that all important points have been covered and that the railway companies are being asked to make a very serious commitment, looking only at the obligation to submit their investment plan for the current calendar year, to state subsequently what their results have been, while the Commission or Committee is to annually verify the investments requested, analyze the general investment plans and especially the expenditures incurred by these investments.

Therefore, I feel that adopting Motion No. 50 as proposed would be useless and redundant, since it adds absolutely nothing to the Bill itself, on the contrary, and I think that the real purpose of Motion No. 50 is to make the Members of the New Democratic Party feel they have achieved something. They blithely object to the fact that the Government of Canada, by helping the railway companies provide an adequate and necessary service in that part of our country is giving the railway companies a free ride. That is certainly not true if we consider the geography of our country, the enormous distances that must be travelled and the considerable cost to the railway companies if they are to provide the service required by their users, and, as we all know, since Section 262 of the Canadian Railway Act applies here, railway companies are obliged to provide that service.

As for confidentiality, this is referred to in Motions Nos. 52 and 53. I think it is a bit too much to demand that Members of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee not be subject to the same rules of confidentiality as the Canadian Transport Commission. And especially, if we consider the quality or the importance of the members of the Senior Grain Transporta-

tion Committee. It consists of the Chief Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board, the chief commissioner of the Canadian Grain Commission, the Administrator, Members representing grain producers from three provinces, including representatives of the Canadian Corporative Wheat Producers Organization and the United Grain Growers. Add to this representatives of the Canadian Wheat Pools, and all those engaged in the operation of grain elevators.

I think it is a bit too much to demand that documents or information submitted to this Committee, which is responsible for the management, administration and quality of users' services with respect to transportation of grain, not be subject to the same rules as the Canadian Transport Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it is 6:14 p.m., Monday, October 31, and I think that we are again debating a Bill that should have received the full support of Members on both sides of the House, if we consider the economic situation prevailing in Canada today and the commitment made by the Government of Canada and the railway companies with respect to the investments that must be made in the Provinces concerned, the thousands of jobs that must be created, that are being created by this Bill and by the funds that are being invested both by the Government and the railway companies, and when I consider the many hours that have been utterly wasted on motions and petitions presented by both opposition parties over a period of two days. And today, the Official Opposition has the audacity to ask us to sit beyond the normal time of adjournment of the House, which is 6 p.m. I just wonder how the Members of the Opposition, the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party, expect people to take them seriously on this very important issue. We have lost a tremendous amount of time on this matter, and now they want to make up for lost time because everybody on both sides of the House is hoping that at last the House will be able to adjourn for a week.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that this Bill is extremely important to the railway industry, to the Government of Canada and even more so to railway users. And when Members decide to waste the time of the House in order to defend indefensible options which in some ways run counter to the public interest, I hope you will allow me to censure this attitude on the part of the Opposition.

As for the motions before the House, Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53, I think they add nothing at all to the Bill. On the contrary, Motions Nos. 52 and 53 weaken the Bill, and Motion No. 50 does not add anything as such and even diminishes the impact of the Bill through finicky measures that would require railway companies to provide details or information, as well as investments in proportion to taxes payable to the Government.

The Government of Canada has always invested enormous sums in railway transportation. The railways are part of our history, and Canada owes its present position on the international market, especially with respect to grain sales, to the development of its railway network. Today, we must upgrade our railway facilities and ensure that Western grain producers get better service from the railway companies. This is a commitment that should be dear to the heart of all Canadians. By objecting to the passage of this Bill, the Official Opposition and the Members of the New Democratic Party are merely postponing measures that are necessary and indispensable for Western grain producers and for the Canadian economy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we shall get through this Bill this week and that Canadians will finally be able to take advantage of the benefits, both direct and indirect, of this legislation.

As I see it, this Bill was the result of a presentation made by a large number of Canadians and parties concerned by these measures, including grain producers, elevator operators, railway companies and railway users engaged in the shipping of goods other than grain. We all know that our present railway system is not adequate to carry all the commodities and consumer goods that must be transported, and I think today, more than ever before, after the many hours wasted as a result of the inconsistency or lack of judgment of the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party Members, we should have the common sense to adopt a Bill that is absolutely essential to the Canadian economy.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53, I would just at this time draw to the attention of the House that now, because of a motion put forward by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), we are attempting to debate these motions and get to those matters which most people in Canada feel are at the crux of the problems with its legislation; that is, whether the producers have the ability to pay, what the social ramifications of the increased cost will be on the fabric of western Canada, how the method of payment should be distributed, and whether the contributions of Government to the railroads should be distributed directly to the railroads or distributed to the producers in some form. We would also hope to deal with the issue of the British Columbia coal lands.

• (1820)

If we are successful in dealing with those very important issues it will be because of the responsibility this Party has shown in trying to debate them in a reasonable way. These are the issues that the people in our ridings want to have resolved and want to make the Government aware of. By making the Government aware, we hope the Government will respond to the wishes of the people who will be affected by these changes that we on this side of the House are proposing to correct.

It is encouraging that there have been at least two speakers from the Government side today. Those two Hon. Members travelled sporadically with the Standing Committee on Transport in western Canada and other parts of Canada this Summer. I am sure that the translation of the speech of the Hon. Member from the Government side who just spoke was

accurate. She mentioned how much support there was for this Bill and how many people want it passed. She said that we should get on with it and create all of these great and wonderful things the Government is promising through this Bill. However I do not see that the Bill is very promising. The Hon. Member who just spoke should certainly be aware of the facts because she did avail herself of the opportunity to travel across Canada with the Standing Committee on Transport. I was there and I did not hear anybody demand that this Bill be passed in its present form.

When individuals appeared before that committee who represented interests other than interests of grain producers or the cattle industry in western Canada and who wanted to see a change in the statutory rate and wanted added railway investment they were asked: "Do you want it done on the backs of the grain producers and the cattle feeders and the processing industry in the prairie basin? Do you want it so bad that it should be rammed through the House of Commons? Without exception, Mr. Speaker, they answered: "No, not on that basis. We want the added investment but we do not want to harm the grain producers or the cattle feeders or the processors in the prairie basin." That is what every group that appeared before us said, even those groups that mildly or even enthusiastically supported added investment in the railway system in western Canada. Those groups want to see a change but they do not want to see it done on the backs of the grain producers of western Canada.

I am sure that the Hon. Member who just spoke realizes that fact, and was for some reason supporting her Party; a party which at this time needs support. I suppose that is why she made the personal decision to support this Bill.

When I look at Motion No. 50 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), it almost appears to me to be a form of nationalization. It is a very cumbersome way of forcing upon two corporations—one a Crown owned corporation and another a privately owned corporation—investment decisions that may or may not be in the best interests of those corporations. However, what is striking, Mr. Speaker, outside of the nationalization aspect of the motion, is that this Party put forward an amendment to Clause 29 during committee stage which would make it fairly straightforward that the railways are at liberty to make all of the necessary investments for grain movement. We said that the Canadian Transport Commission would be in the position to monitor and verify those investments. The commission would be verifying annually and reporting to the Minister on the investments made in the prior crop year. It would analyse the investment plans for the present and subsequent crop years, and within 90 days submit a report to the Minister on the appropriateness of those plans to ensure an adequate, reliable and effective railway service.

Thus the railways would be at liberty to use those funds and make those investments relating to grain movement, but they would have to contend with the Canadian Transport Commission rather than with people who have studied railway performance and shortfalls or with an American based consulting firm.

Under the amendment to Clause 29, Mr. Speaker, the railways would make investments which would have to be verified by the Canadian Transport Commission which is composed of very capable commissioners located in the City of Saskatoon in western Canada, people who are very familiar with branch lines and with grain handling lines located in the western part of the country.

We might wonder, Mr. Speaker, why we have problems with this Bill and what the concerns are of the people in western Canada. My friend, the Hon. Member for Vegreville, quoted from a summary of western perspectives of the Crow by the Canada West Foundation. Just for the interest of those in the House, the goals and principal objectives of the Canada West Foundation are as follows:

1. To initiate and conduct research programs regarding the economic and social characteristics and potentialities of western Canada.

2. To initiate and conduct informational and educational programs to encourage an appreciation of the Canadian heritage and to stimulate an awareness of the future throughout western Canada.

The foundation agrees that Motion No. 50 deals with one of the biggest problems in the Bill. The Canada West Foundation explains why that is a concern to the people in western Canada who are involved in the basic movement of goods. That is explained on page 6 of the report under the heading "Railway Performance Guarantees" and reads as follows:

THE ISSUE: A lack of trust by westerners of both the Federal Government and the railways has been one of the most significant stumbling blocks to an amicable settlement of the freight rates debate. This issue amounts to an attempt to balance the need to free railways from their serious economic squeeze in order to ensure the necessary large scale investments are undertaken and the need to offer some protection to Prairie farmers who represent in many respects a captive market.

That, Mr. Speaker, essentially expresses in one paragraph the concerns that were expressed during the three months of travel of the Standing Committee on Transport in western Canada. That captive market is at the mercy of the railways that, under this Bill, operate under a cost-plus system in perpetuity. We do not feel that the Government has provided adequate methods for making sure that those railways will not continue to add cost and add cost and come back to the public treasury of Canada to have those costs again increased.

Returning to the report of the Canada West Foundation, under the subheading "Provisions of Bill C-155", it reads:

Bill C-155 requires railways to submit investment information to the Canadian Transport Commission for review. The legislation also lays the groundwork for a system of sanctions and awards to railways to ensure that improvements are made to the system. If the railway investments are deemed inadequate, the Minister of Transport is empowered to withhold a portion of the subsidy equal to what the railways ought to have spent.

We are debating Motion No. 50 together with the next motion, Motion No. 58, which stands in the name of an Hon. Member of the Conservative Party, and deals with the accommodation for traffic which would satisfy what the Canada West Foundation calls the "Western Response" to the problem by forcing the railways to spend money properly. The report reads as follows:

Although most groups appear to be in agreement with the general principles contained in the proposed legislation, they would support amendments to the Bill providing for somewhat stricter control over railway performance.

That comes about, Mr. Speaker, because of the way the Bill was designed. I am not saying that the Government knowingly attempted this. I do not see how any Government could knowingly, with knowledge aforethought, design a Bill that is so disastrous as Bill C-155. I am sure, leaving aside all of the inadequacies of the present Government, even though it has traded pallbearers around the casket by shuffling Ministers, that this Government would not have done that knowingly.

● (1830)

What it did was establish a system which it built up in consultation with people it felt were experts in the field. Those people happened to be of the Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific Railway. While I admit they are knowledgeable in their field, they are not the ones that one would suspect to be the best at defending the interests of the grain producers, the livestock feeders and processors in the prairie basin region. The railways are very good at looking after themselves, and the Government has accepted that. It said it would allow the railroads to write a Bill that guarantees them a 20 per cent return. That is something every grain producer and every cattle feeder in western Canada would love to have.

Therefore, when we reach the other amendments in this Bill that will cause the Government and the railroads to provide service and carry grain you will see the determination of this Party to ensure a good return for investment on behalf of the Canadian taxpayers.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, the motion we are discussing at this time deals with the type of monitoring which will be done to make certain that railway commitments are carried through. We believe this is probably one of the more substantive motions that we are offering and concerns one of the most important parts of the Bill.

I am very disappointed when someone who is supposedly knowledgeable about transportation matters, as is the Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), stands up while we are discussing this motion to say that the NDP is offering frivolous motions and wasting the time of the House.

Mr. Mazankowski: And frivolous speeches.

Mr. Althouse: What we are doing here with our frivolous speeches, Mr. Mazankowski—

Mr. Mazankowski: Order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Althouse: —is pointing out the real problems with Bills such as this that are supposed to be aimed at improving the railway system and the investment climate of the country. I do not know how any body can support a Bill that allows the Government to dip into the public purse and the purse of the farmers of this country to such an extent without having some form of assurance that the railways perform. There is no performance guarantee in this legislation, only something that is similar to the old ironclad guarantee that we saw with the pipeline of a few years ago which never went anywhere. It is a guarantee from the railway companies to the former Minister of Transport and the present Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin). It is in the form of a letter from CN and CP who wrote to the Minister on January 28 of this year with a so-called commitment to invest $807 million in the railway system in 1983 if the Government cancels the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. After major concessions by the Government the railways have committed themselves to invest, in today's dollars, less than they had invested prior to doing away with the Crow.

In 1981 CN Rail invested $511 million and is now proposing under this new plan to expend $491 million in 1983 dollars, which would be a reduction in investment in real dollars of 22.9 per cent. That is not an investment but a reduction in investment.

Similarly, CP Rail, which actually invested $317 million in 1981, is proposing to invest $315 in 1983 dollars. The total investment for the two railways represents close to 21.9 per cent less in real dollars than that invested in 1981. That is the kind of guarantee that has been proposed under this Bill.

Motion No. 50 attempts to make the railways more accountable and provide the kind of employment initiatives that the Government continually says it is applying with this policy. We hear much about this employment initiative. However, we have no guarantees about what the railways will invest.

The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) who just spoke pointed out that we can rely on the Canadian Transport Commission. He said that the Canadian Transport Commission will make certain that investments take place. Virtually every Member of this House from western Canada, if they have been watching what is happening in their ridings, knows that this does not happen. We all have branch lines in our riding that come under some regulations from the CTC.

While the railways have been receiving money to maintain those branch lines the funds have never been spent on the branch lines. For instance, in the community of Wishart Bankend in my riding, the railways received several hundred thousand dollars to maintain that branch line before it was finally given up and abandoned. None of that money was spent on the branch line although it was specifically for that purpose. This means that the CTC does not necessarily provide the answer.

Many examples can be given to show that the CTC may rule or monitor but has no way of enforcing construction to take place or saying how expenditures will be made. The railways simply ignore the CTC until such time as the line is in such terrible shape that equipment can no longer be used on the track. The railways then apply for abandonment of the line which is granted many times.

Again, I cite the Wishart case as an example. Clearly, the railways received the money for five years, did nothing with the line or the physical plant on that line and then applied and

received from the CTC a total abandonment. That line is now completely abandoned.

These are the kinds of ironclad guarantees I am talking about and the kind of thing the former Minister was attempting to get. Since these guarantees are not in the Bill we believe that Motion No. 50 would attempt to establish some of those guarantees in the legislation.

I indicated that in the letter to the former Minister on January 28 the railways made very few written commitments, and those few only for 1983. At the time, the Minister had been telling the House that the railways would be investing $16.5 billion in the coming decade. But the railways reserved for themselves the option of reducing that amount. They made it quite clear at the committee stage that their plans were not being presented to the committee and that they were not making any guarantees beyond 1983. In fact, they said in their letter of January 28, which was tabled:

> Variations from this expectation could lead to changes in the railways' capital plan during the period beyond 1983.

That was from Canadian Pacific. Canadian National wrote:

> —CN will inform you quarterly of capital investment progress with particular emphasis on major projects in western Canada, and a final review will be made at the end of 1983.

That statement came from the Crown corporation, the railway, over which the Minister would be expected to have some control.

There are even fewer guarantees from CP. Canadian Pacific is the railway which I submit has basically been built with the taxpayers' money and maintained to a great degree with the taxpayers' money. We get virtually nothing back from CP other than the strips of steel across the country.

What does that cost us? The total identifiable aid in 1916, when a royal commission looked into the matter in 1917, amounted to $279.5 million. That included railway and surveys completed by the Government of $37.8 million and direct cash aid of $66.9 million. The value of unsold lands is estimated at $119 million. Returns from lands sold minus the cost of improvements amount to something over $55 million.

Assuming a 5 per cent return on capital at that time, the present value in 1982 dollars of that aid would be $8.3 billion. If you add the present value of the subsidies for operating branch lines of some $2.9 billion you will see that the total current value of aid from federal sources to the CPR exceeds $11 billion and comes very close to the total current value of the CPR.

● (1840)

This company's shares have increased with the announcement of the policy change by more than 40 per cent in just five and a half months. It seems to me the market is guaging the policy proposal more accurately than some of the parliamentarians. The market has decided that the cash incentive this Parliament will give to the railways will be translated very directly into increased dividend payouts, in fact almost dollar for dollar. It is a direct transfer from the people of Canada to the shareholders of CPR.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on these motions. I am a little astounded as I follow the remarks of Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse), particularly about two things, one being aid to the CPR. When we were intensively trying to convince the NDP to support payment of the $651 million to the producers rather than the railroads we got no support at all from those Members.

Mr. Althouse: What is the difference?

Mr. Schellenberger: Surely, if there is concern about how the railroads were spending the money, then the support ought to have come for the payment to the producers so the producer had some way of ensuring his product was delivered in a proper fashion.

Mr. Althouse: You pay the producer and charge him ten times rather than five times. What is the difference?

Mr. Schellenberger: Now we see the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre has moved a motion which will, in effect, destroy the Crow.

Mr. Althouse: No.

Mr. Schellenberger: The Hon. Member's motion refers to the number of percentage points by which the freight-to-price ratio in that calendar year exceeds 3 per cent; which means the shipper should not pay any more than 3 per cent. I see the Hon. Member is getting a little agitated. I can understand why. He will have a lot of problems defending what he has just put before the House.

If you look at the statistics, Mr. Speaker, you will find now that the producer is not paying any more than 2.5 per cent. That is the Crow rate today, not 3 per cent. The Hon. Member for Humbodt-Lake Centre has just stood in the House today and moved a motion that in effect destroys the Crow. What is this Party saying? You should not destroy the Crow. The farmers can in no way spend any more of their money for moving grain. That is why we proposed the Bill be frozen for three years.

An Hon. Member: That's an act of desperation.

Mr. Schellenberger: What is the Member proposing? The NDP Members felt they had to put some motions forward that were not frivolous. They ran out and quickly tried to draft a few amendments to put them before the House for unanimous consent. They did not even know what they were doing.

An Hon. Member: They copied a Government amendment.

Mr. Schellenberger: The NDP and the Government have been together for some time. It is no wonder the NDP would copy a government amendment and put it before this House.

Members of the NDP will have to go to their prairie producers and try to defend this action but they will not be able to so. You can see what is happening by now in the polls, and it is no wonder, when you consider the way the New Democratic Party has operated in this House on this Bill.

Let us look at Clause 29 of the Bill. The NDP is trying to amend that clause through Motion No. 50. You will find that in committee the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) moved a clause that would provide verification of railway investments of the $651 million. That clause was substantially amended by this Party and agreed to by all sides of the House.

The NDP now comes forward and says that we should have restrictions under Motion No. 50 that in effect would allow the railroads to have after tax constant cost portion of payments allowed for the movement of grain. That is very difficult to support. I agree the railroads have not been very good in expending moneys voted by this Parliament in the manner in which we voted them; for example, for branch line upgrading. Many Members have stood in this House and put forward examples of how moneys have been voted for branch lines and nothing has been done with those branch lines.

It is important that we have verification of investment by railways. This amendment says that the Canadian Transport Commission will have the ability to look at past expenditures and decide whether they have been made in relation to the movement of grain. It will then be able to give a report to the Minister. I have great difficulty in being concerned about confidentiality as far as the railroads are concerned.

At the time we got into branch line difficulties the railroads were saying they were not making any money moving grain from branch lines, yet at the same time the railroads were running on those branch lines moving fuels, lumber, hardware and produce into those farm communities. Then they got into the trucking business. They found that the profits, of course, were greater by truck than by rail along the branch lines. Immediately there was an end to investment in the branch lines, despite the fact the grain had to go out by rail. That is why I have so much concern and difficulty understanding this need for confidentiality.

In Motions Nos. 52 and 53 we are proposing that there is no need for confidentiality as far as the information being requested from the railroads is concerned. In fact, most of the information that would be secured would be about investments made in the past, and would probably be in the annual reports of the companies at any rate.

My second, concern is whether or not the money involved in the $658 million proposal will be spent in an adequate fashion. That money is taxpayers' money. The information about how it is intended that that money be spent should be available to the taxpayers. Therefore, there is no need to have Clause 29(5) in the Bill, which reads:

> The members of the Committee shall treat in a confidential manner any information submitted under this section that is identified and treated as confidential by the railway company that submitted the information.

That information ought to be made available to the public.

I always have a little laugh about the railway's concern about competition. In my area there is only one railroad. There is no other railroad competing. The railroad has control over most of the trucking companies that run into those areas. Very few other trucking companies can compete. I have great difficulty in being concerned about the corporate confidentiality of investments in those areas where there is a monopoly. Even if that line were not a grain related line with a federal subsidy going to it, I would still have some difficulty supporting a clause like that. But when this relates to a grain carrying line, whether or not it is supported by direct investment from the Canadian public, then I have a great deal of difficulty in supporting that clause. That is why I strongly support the motions put forward to delete that clause from this Bill. Hon. Members should consider carefully which of the two amendments they should support. I suggest they preferably support ours because it appears first on the Order Paper.

● (1850)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell).

An Hon. Member: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The situation is difficult for the Chair. Apparently Hon. Members are outwaiting one another—

Mr. Waddell: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): —in due course I will put the question.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It seems in terms of Hon. Members who are rising to speak that they are playing the cat and mouse game. I appreciate the fact that Members of the Conservative Party moved us into extended hours because there are many motions. With time allocation placed on us by the Government, it does not seem that we will be able to deal with many of the important motions we would like to cover.

In light of that fact, and coming directly to my point of order, if it is important for other Parties in the House of Commons, not just the New Democratic Party, to see the Bill disposed of, we would like the Chair to seek the unanimous consent of the House, in keeping with the spirit of covering adequately all the amendments and motions, to remove the ten-minute limit on speeches. Hon. Members could then fully express their concerns about the various motions they want to cover this evening. Would the Chair seek unanimous consent of the House to dispose of the ten-minute time limit and seek either a 20-minute limitation or, more preferably, remove the limitation on the length of time Hon. Members can speak on any motion with which we are dealing during the extended hours?

It is uncertain as to when the extended hours will cease. I imagine they will cease when no more Members rise in their places or when we have covered all the motions with which we

want to deal during report stage of Bill C-155. I ask the Chair to seek unanimous consent of the House to dispose of the time limitation on speeches this evening for the remainder of extended hours.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. We certainly would not have any objection to that. However, I re-emphasize that the basic reason for our Party moving the extension of hours was simply in the hope we would be able to get to what we consider to be some of the very fundamental issues and points which have yet to be debated.

Mr. Speaker, if you have followed the progress of the Bill, you will know that in the course of committee consideration we were not able to deal with the subject of the safety net because it was ruled out of order in that it went beyond the Royal Proclamation or the intent of the Bill as expressed in the vote on second reading. We were unable to debate in a meaningful way the issue of the method of payment because it was ruled out of order. While the particular subject of the British Columbia coal lands was debated somewhat, we were constrained in debating it fully by virtue of the time deadline on the committee. Originally the committee was to report on September 12, and there was a two-week extension. However, we ran out of time.

These are the things we were unable to debate fully. I have referred to the safety net. There was also our proposal which would result in the maintenance of the existing statutory freight rate until the review process was completed; that would be July 31, 1986. Also there was the whole question of the commission of inquiry. It was another issue that was not debated in committee because it was found to be beyond the scope of the Bill.

The thrust of our motion for extended hours was the hope and anticipation that we would be able to deal with those very important matters. If Parliament is to discharge its responsibilities in an effective manner, particularly on this very important and contentious Bill, a Bill which enjoys relatively little support, if any, other than from the railway sector, it is incumbent upon Parliament to debate it. Canadian people, in particular those in the agricultural community, are expecting their representatives to debate these important issues. Within the framework of those thoughts, I would hope Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party would reconsider their tactics and allow progress to be made so that we can get to those issues and have the opportunity to debate them.

Just a few moments ago a member of the Press Gallery telephoned and asked me when we were expected to debate the amendment of the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) concerning the safety net. I said that if it went to the bottom of the list it might never happen. We would like to debate it. We would like to hear what the Minister has to say. We would like to hear him elaborate on what is meant by the 4 per cent and the 5 per cent escalating safety net.

I hope NDP Members will reconsider their tactics. We would certainly support an extension in the time limit of speeches, but I implore them to allow the debate to move ahead. Surely it does not require 30 Members of that Party to debate a motion such as the one proposed by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). I will not comment on whether or not it is important. I think that issue was well dealt with by an amendment which was accepted by the committee. Here we are rehashing a lot of the information which was dealt with, in some detail, in committee. Some Hon. Members of the NDP are really trying to get their feet wet on this Bill. During the course of committee hearings they had one "Lone Ranger" who really carried the whole burden. Now all these followers, these trained seals, are trying to get into the act.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Both the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) and the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) will recognize that the Chair has attempted in every way to facilitate them so that they might proceed. However, at this point I think the Hon. Member is entering into debate rather than a point of order.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, this is the first we have heard of the proposal of the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish). There seems to be some disposition on the part of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), however I am certainly not in a position to give unanimous consent right now. If we could defer any such decision until we have had time to consult and decide exactly the form of the proposal, there might possibly be unanimous consent at a later time. Perhaps we could now return to the debate on the motions, and in the meantime we could discuss these issues and attempt to come up with something which is agreeable to all Hon. Members. Perhaps we could reach an agreement a little later.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. It is very difficult for me to give unanimous consent to extend the time length of the speeches of Members beyond ten minutes. If a Member cannot express himself in ten minutes, perhaps that Member should not be on his or her feet. I do not think the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) should get away with sloughing off all the blame on the NDP. Between those two Parties, they wasted two full days on the presentation of petitions, procedural wrangles and putting up speakers on one frivolous amendment after another. Now they want more time in which to debate, after wasting two full days of the House.

● (1900)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair did try to facilitate what Hon. Members appeared to be interested in. A point of order has to sound like a point of order, not a particular debate or attack on the Government. Let us keep to a point of order.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that I do have a point of order. If the Parliamentary Secretary is suggesting that the presentation of petitions, a time-honoured

and perfectly legitimate form of making representations on behalf of Canadian citizens, is out of order and he is imputing that we on this side have engaged in that in a frivolous manner, I suggest that he reconsider those remarks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Are there any other Members who wish to address the point of order? Does the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) rise on the same point of order?

Mr. Anguish: Yes I do, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I would ask the Hon. Member, now that we have reverted to a more reasonable application of the rules, to address himself to the point of order, not debate.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I did not think I was entering debate when I initiated the point of order. I was asking for unanimous consent that the time limitation on speeches be extended, not only the hours but the time limitation on speeches. This is the most complex piece of legislation that has come before Parliament in my time here.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member should address himself to the point of order, not debate. If he wants me to put the question as to whether there is unanimous consent, I will do so. I know immediately that there is not unanimous consent. Would the Hon. Member take his seat please.

Mr. Anguish: On a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I will recognize the Hon. Member on a point of order as soon as I have completed putting the question.

Mr. Anguish: It is on the same point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member may not speak twice on the same point of order. I would ask the Hon. Member to take his seat while I put the question.

Mr. Anguish: I rise on a new point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for the Battlefords-Meadow Lake seeks unanimous consent of the House to remove the time limit of ten minutes on any and all speeches during this process of debate under Standing Order 8(4)(a). Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I distinctly heard the Parliamentary Secretary rise in his place in this House and ask for time to consult with his Caucus. Subsequently you called for unanimous consent, although a Member of the Government had asked for time to consult with his Caucus. I think it was very unfair to put that question to the House. If it had been on a different point of order, I suppose, or connected to that, they would have had time to consult and consider the wisdom of extending the time of the speeches.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I do not understand the Hon. Member's difficulty. There is no problem whatsoever in putting the same question to the House for unanimous consent later on. May I recognize Hon. Members for debate. The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for ten minutes on the Crow debate. I have not spoken often in this debate. I want to speak to Motion No. 50. Before I do and as a preface to that, as a Member from Vancouver, British Columbia, I am against this Bill and the changes in the Crow rate. I admit there will be some benefits to railway construction and so on. However, those benefits would come about anyway. I am told by my colleagues who are doing a magnificent job of trying to block this change in the Crow rate that while we may get a billion dollars in investment down the line, our farmers will lose a billion dollars down the line.

I believe my colleagues. They are honest men. They are sincere. Unlike the Government, they know western Canada. They tell me that the whole way of life in western Canada will be changed as a result of this Bill and that a culture will be destroyed. That is serious. That is what makes this debate important.

I listened to the Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger). I thought what he said was in pretty bad taste. He referred to "the way the NDP have operated in this House". The NDP have operated in one way, consistently, unlike the Conservative Party. The NDP has consistently opposed the changes in the Crow rate. The NDP has consistently taken the position that this legislation is no good. The Conservatives, in proposing this debate, are basically, if I can use the expression, just trying to protect their asses in this debate tonight. They are trying to protect their inconsistent position and the fact that the people in western Canada are very disappointed with the Conservatives and the way they have conducted themselves throughout this whole Crow debate. They are not fooling anybody by pulling this act tonight.

Let me speak on Motion No. 50, which is why we are here. The way the situation is now, the railways can state their intent as to what they are going to do with investment each year. We say in Motion No. 50 that the railways should have to state the intent as to how they are going to invest in railway upgrading. We want to put a specific amount into the upgrading and investment so that a decade from now we will know that we will really have an upgraded rail system and that the investment was put to good use, not piddled away by the railways as they have done with public grants in the past. That seems to be reasonable. My colleagues in the NDP, especially the prairie Members, have made reasonable amendments

throughout. They have, unlike the Conservative Party, the branch plant of American Ronald Reaganism, been consistent.

Motion No. 50 puts some backbone in Clause 29 which deals with railway capital investment and Government monitoring of this investment in return for the subsidies which the railways will receive under this Bill. Specifically, we ask for guarantees of investment linked to Government payments to railways as outlined in Section 55. Section 55 gives the Government the power for holdbacks if the railways do not meet commitments for track maintenance on branch lines and investment in grain handling equipment. Our Motion No. 50 spells out the amount that can be reasonably expected in railway investment.

Why is this necessary? Because of the past and present railway statement of intention and investment. It is important that the country realize that railway statements of intention to invest are made on a yearly basis. The companies have made no statements committing themselves to the railway megaprojects that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) continually speaks of in this House. Second, there is a history of public aid to railways that Bill C-155 perpetuates. Money flows to the railways. The return to the public is always in the forms of regulations and guarantees of service and nothing happens with these guarantees and regulations. Bill C-155 does nothing to improve this.

Motion No. 50 sets identifiable levels rather than nebulous ones. It does not guarantee the public equity in the CPR that we would really like. At least it makes the company put its money substantially into grain-related items rather than non-transport, non-Canadian items which CPR has helped itself to in recent years, such as buying railroads in the United States.

● (1910)

That is what we are trying to do in Motion No. 50. Those of us who come from Vancouver—after all, the CPR got half of Vancouver as a result of the famous settlement to build the transcontinental railways—know that you have to keep close tabs on what they do with the public grants that they receive. The CPR has been the biggest corporate welfare bum in the history of Canada. Motion No. 53 deletes the provision of confidentiality. It is the same as Conservative Motion No. 52. I agree with what the Member for Wetaskiwin said on this.

Let me conclude with these two remarks. First, Motion No. 50 makes sense. It is a practical motion and a good motion. It requires the railways to put their investments where their mouth is. Finally, I take great umbrage at what the Conservatives have suggested to be the way the NDP has operated in this House. I have tried to make a speech in which I make a rational amendment and explain it in a practical way. I think that that is what we have been doing.

I was at the Committee hearings in Vancouver. I could not go all across the country but I was in Vanouver and I saw the hearings. The NDP have been perfectly consistent. What you are seeing tonight is the Conservative Party trying to save their derrieres because they have been caught in the squeeze of offering an amendment to postpone the Crow changes for three years. Either you are for the Crow changes or you are against the Crow changes. We are against the changes in the Crow because we are afraid that it will bring a tremendous cultural change and destroy the present prairie farm life. I can understand that cry from prairie farmers, even though I am from Vancouver. That is why I have supported my colleagues here tonight in this motion and in their general, consistent stand against changes in the Crow rate.

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight), the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer), and the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), have worked tirelessly and consistently on this Bill.

Tonight is a revealing evening. As we are coming closer to the end of this debate, it is the NDP who have made the greatest flip-flop in this House since Jack Horner joined the Liberals. Mr. Speaker, they and the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) say that this motion makes political sense, it makes economic sense, and it is consistent with the position the NDP have taken. Those are his words.

What does the motion say? It is as badly constructed as other motions by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). I do not consider the Hon. Member for Regina West necessarily wanted to do this, but it again shows his lack of attention to detail. The NDP have been saying consistently that you cannot kill the Crow. They have been saying consistently no change. Today we have a motion which does just that. The NDP has moved an amendment which would kill the Crow, which would alter the Crow. They do not know what they are doing.

An Hon. Member: Get a lawyer or learn to read.

Mr. Epp: The Hon. Member says get a lawyer. I think he is a farmer and I would think he also knows what the average price is that farmers are paying for the Crow.

Mr. Benjamin: He got a lawyer, you didn't.

Mr. Epp: His amendment deals with the shipper share limitation adjustment, which in layman's language means what the average price paid for the commodity moved will be. Right now the average is 2½ per cent. What are they asking for? Three per cent.

Mr. Speaker, today they are asking for a 20 per cent increase to farmers to pay for the movement of grain.

An Hon. Member: That is all the Government wanted in January.

Mr. Epp: They are as bad as the Government.

Some Hon. Members: They are part of the Government.

Mr. Epp: I know some people would say that is impossible. I thought so too until tonight.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I look forward to debating with my colleague from Provencher (Mr. Epp) the motions that were presented today on which there was unanimous consent. He has yet to say a word about the motions that are in front of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Hurts, doesn't it?

Mr. Benjamin: Since he and his colleague from Vegreville felt at liberty to complain about some of my colleagues' remarks, I would like to invite the Chair to invite the Member for Provencher to talk about the motions that are on the Order Paper which we are debating and not the motions—

Mr. Waddell: They have the wrong one.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is endeavouring to speak on a motion which the House gave unanimous consent to be debated and which will be debated later. Would he mind saving that for later and I will be glad to take him on?

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, am I to understand the Hon. Member for Regina West to say that he does not want the Member for Provencher to get up in this House and debate his own motion? Is he so embarrassed by his own motion that he does not want the Hon. Member for Provencher to discuss his motion? Is that what he is saying?

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Member for Portage-Marquette, I was inviting the Hon. Member for Provencher to debate the amendments that I have moved and also one which is from the Member for Portage-Marquette which the Hon. Member for Vegreville called frivolous. I am inviting him to debate our amendments and one of their own amendments.

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Hon. Member for Regina West is attempting to take over the function of the Chair. It is the function of the Chair to make a decision as to whether or not the Member is debating the motions. It is not up to another Hon. Member to direct his remarks to a Member who is speaking.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): After due consideration of the argument presented, the Chair is of the considered opinion that the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw makes considerable sense in the circumstances. I would invite Hon. Members to continue this important debate.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, with all respect, you no doubt are perfectly correct about what the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw just said. Would the Chair now invite the Hon. Member for Provencher to quit talking about motions that were moved today by unanimous consent but which are not yet before the House and speak on Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53?

Mr. McKnight: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the Chair that Motion No. 50 talks about the after tax constant cost portion of payments. When you look at the after tax constant cost portion or the tax cost of the capital and after tax depreciation as included in Motion No. 50, any contribution increases on behalf of producers that would be over the existing Crow rate, which is about 20 per cent less than the NDP amendment that my colleague for Provencher is referring to, he would be indeed referring to Motion No. 50 by talking about the safety net and the 20 per cent increase that the NDP have proposed.

Some Hon. Members: Good point.

Mr. Benjamin: That is a long bow.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I have been in this chair since 4.30 this afternoon. Perhaps Hon. Members will do me a personal favour and give me ten minutes without a point of order to get something to eat!

Mr. Benjamin: Wait until 4.30 in the morning.

● (1920)

Mr. Epp: I will try to comply with your human needs and desires, Mr. Speaker. I find it interesting that we are debating the amendment moved by the Hon. Member for Regina West and he does not want us to debate it. His ill-conceived, ill-thought-out and badly drafted amendment would increase the price that farmers are paying for the movement of grain. No matter how you look at the amendment, the effect would be a 20 per cent increase. We will not support that kind of amendment. We are not going to do that to the grain farmers of the prairie basin.

The NDP should at least be consistent in their amendments with the words they are using outside the House. That is all we are asking. It is absolutely amazing that after all these months of debate in the House, in committee and back in the House again, Members of the NDP cannot see that.

The actual cost to the railways of the movement of grain has been a long-standing issue on the Prairies and it has always been difficult to find information on this. Many Members appeared before the Railway Transport Committee when applications were made for rail line abandonment. One of the frustrations of that experience is that the railways would ask Members if they wanted to spend taxpayers' money for secondary rail rehabilitation or maintenance against the amount of grain moved.

The last time I appeared was at the hearing on the Emerson Spur, a distance of 5.8 miles. It was costing taxpayers $140,000 per year to maintain that line. Before the last rail line abandonment hearing I contacted the CTC and the CNR to get a breakdown of where the money was spent. I wanted to know if it was on snow clearance, rail maintenance, ballast, locomotives or whatever. I never got that breakdown and I am sure almost every Member has had a similar experience. It is regarded as confidential, commercial information. The company claimed that the line was non-viable but that the taxpayers should pay up without asking questions. That is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker, and that is why I support our motion.

What our motion would do is put that information in the hands of those who need it to analyse whether the railways are performing the service and meeting the requirements under the law and that they are doing it under a financial structure which they say they need.

There is another matter on the Prairies that is difficult to analyse. During the past year when commodity transportation volume was down because of the recession, we had record grain movements. The railways always argue that they lose money on that so the financial picture is interesting for this year when they moved more grain and less of other commodities.

The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) has been arguing that the amount of money that would go to the railways, which the NDP say should go totally to the railways, is greater than the railways have shown they need to maintain the railways, improve the system or the so-called short haul movement of grain. That is what these amendments would do.

By an ill-drafted amendment, the NDP is willing to increase the amount that farmers pay for the movement of grain by 20 per cent. They are ready to destroy the Crow, no matter what they say. On the other hand, this Party's amendment would result, without question, in the railways not only being forced to allow us to monitor their performance but also to monitor their actual expenses.

I say to all Members of the House, please do not kill the Crow as the NDP wants, but support the amendments that make sense across the Prairies, the amendments moved by this Party.

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a few comments on the record regarding Motions No. 50, No. 52 and No. 53. I was very surprised to hear some of the arguments of the Conservatives to the effect that we want to kill the Crow. I can say unequivocally that the NDP has always stood for maintaining the statutory rate by which western producers move their grain.

I am particularly surprised at the Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger). I know him quite well and I have sat on committees with him. He is a member of the special committee set up to study Indian self-government and I have found him to be very conscientious in the work he has done on that committee. His comments on Bill C-155 surprised me when he maintained that the NDP would do away with the statutory Crow rate because we want the payments to go to the railways from the Government instead of the producers. The argument is that if the payments go to the producers, then the producers cannot put leverage on the railway companies for better movement of grain in western Canada.

This is something like the old story that Tommy Douglas used to tell about the elephant doing the dance among the chickens, Mr. Speaker. How could the farmers put pressure on the railway companies for the better movement of grain? Farmers do not have the means to pressure the railway companies that the Government has.

I could use a little parable about Members of Parliament putting pressure on the Government compared to farmers putting pressure on the railway companies for better movement of their produce. In the general election of February, 1980, not one Member of Parliament ran as an independent and was elected. If people are serious about getting elected and feel that they want to do something for their country, they would not run on their own but under the banner of a political Party. That is because there is strength in numbers, Mr. Speaker, in standing for policies, which most Parties should have.

However, it is becoming obvious this evening that there are no policies of the Conservative Party in regard to Bill C-155 because it keeps changing its stand on the statutory rate in Bill C-155 whenever it feels it convenient to do so in its best political patronage interest across this country. That Party finds itself slipping seven points in the Gallup poll and all of a sudden it becomes paranoid. It calls through petitions for the country to go to an election because that Party knows that if it goes on much longer it will not have the public support even to form a Government in this country.

• (1930)

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Anguish: I believe that scares those Hon. Members somewhat. I can hear their nervous laughter over there. The Official Opposition and other Hon. Members of this House of Commons must make sure that the Government, whether it be Liberal, Conservative or NDP, protects the best interests of the producers in Canada. I want to dispel the argument that Conservatives are using here this evening that the New Democratic Party is opposed to the statutory Crow rate. We have unequivocally always maintained that the Crow rate is the right of the producers in western Canada and nothing that the Tories can say will detract from that so far as anyone who has followed this issue for any period of time is concerned.

The first amendment, Motion No. 50, which we are dealing with here, is a New Democratic Party amendment. It requires the railroads to reinvest any surplus funds received from public moneys paid to them under this legislation. Why would we want them to do that? I feel there are some very good reasons, Mr. Speaker. If one looks at the hisotry of the rail companies in this country, particularly Canadian Pacific, one will see that Canadian Pacific received over the period of time since it has been in existence some 43,962,546 acres of land. It has also received hundreds of millions of dollars to invest in the transportation system of this country, not only to haul grain, not only to haul manufactured products from other areas of the country, but also to tie the country together. It was part of the Confederation agreement. I do not care how many times Hon. Members of this House hear that. It was part of the Confederation agreement to hold this country together.

It is especially important for the people of western Canada who wanted that link with the great country of Canada as opposed to joining the United States of America. It worked,

Mr. Speaker, but the cost was very high. Almost 44 million acres of land, hundreds of millions of dollars invested in rolling stock, in upgrading of branch lines, in upgrading of the rail beds across the country, particularly in western Canada, and grants when the railways said they were losing money. But they did not reinvest that money in the rail transportation system in this country. The decided to expand.

What are some of the companies which Canadian Pacific owns today which have reaped the financial rewards of that land and money which was given to them by the people of Canada to keep an efficient, modern transportation system? They are numerous, Mr. Speaker. They are Canadian Pacific Air Lines Limited, Canadian Pacific Steamships Limited, Canadian Pacific (Bermuda) Limited, Canadian Pacific Express & Transport Limited, CanPac International Freight Services Inc., Soo Line Railroad Company, CP Telecommunications, Canadian Pacific Enterprises, PanCanadian Petroleum Limited, Cominco Ltd., Fording Coal Limited, CIP Incorporated, Pacific Forest Products Limited, Great Lakes Forest Products Limited, The Algoma Steel Corporation Limited, Maple Leaf Mills Limited, Marathon Realty Company Limited. Marathon Realty Company Limited was not interested in Canadian Pacific in terms of upgrading the rail transportation system in this country. It was interested in selling off a great amount of that 43,962,546 acres of land in order to reap more profits for Canadian Pacific.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we would like to see Motion No. 50, put forward by this Party, locked into this Bill so that the money which Canadian Pacific receives from the people of Canada will be invested in the rail transportation system of this country and the agricultural producers will have much better movement of their products than they have had in the past.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): With all due respect, the Hon. Member is out of order at the moment. His time has expired unless he has the unanimous consent of the House to continue.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Anguish: The other motion, Mr. Speaker, in which I am interested—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): Not having had unanimous consent to continue, I turn now to the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson).

Mr. Benjamin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The only "no" I heard was from an Hon. Member on the Government side who was not in his seat. He was standing in the middle of the aisle. He said no, he would not give unanimous consent. No one else said no.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): To resolve this difficult issue in the most judicious way, I will again call for the vote. Does the Hon. Member have unanimous consent to continue his address.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

An Hon. Member: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): I detect a certain no.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, since the first vote was improper, unbeknown to the Chair, how could another vote on the same motion which was improper take place? You must have had unanimous consent on the first occasion because the only "no', came from someone standing in the aisle.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): The Chair was very mindful and respectful of the intentions of the Hon. Members of this House. The Chair did not hear unanimous consent having been proffered in order that the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake could continue. Could we have the next speaker, please.

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to see that the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) and the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) are very concerned about the developments in the last few hours, particularly in respect to the motions which they have moved relating to the statutory Crow rate. When one looks at the increases which that Party is proposing, Mr. Speaker, which are in fact 20 per cent, one finds it has in fact used exactly the same wording which was used by the Government in the Bill. The New Democratic Party has again crawled into bed with the Government and is facilitating increases which the farmers are very, very opposed to.

Mr. Benjamin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As I had to point out earlier to the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), when we get to the motions to which unanimous consent was given earlier today, I will be glad to take that Party on those motions. With all deference, in the meantime, would the Hon. Member for Assiniboia address himself to the matter of the railways reinvesting their surplus money and would he address himself to the matter of confidentiality of information?

• (1940)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): I would endeavour to ask, in the name of civility, that all Hon. Members address their remarks to the motion at hand and I would ask the Hon. Member for Regina West whether he in all good conscience feels that his intervention was strictly a point of order. On that basis, I would again ask the Hon. Member for Assiniboia to continue with his remarks.

Mr. Gustafson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just pointing out the nervousness of Hon. Members of the NDP which was again manifested by a series of points of order that had been raised around the motions about which we are speaking as well as other incidents relating to Bill C-155.

We are dealing here with Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53. Two of those motions were put forward by the Hon. Member for Regina West and Motion No. 52 was put forward by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer). I think it is very important to realize that we are talking about accountability of the railways. We are talking about information that is submitted to the general public, to the farmers and to everyone involved with increases in freight rates.

I do not know how the Hon. Member for Regina West intends to interpret the issue, but what we are dealing with here in regard to rate increases does not fall under the category of information, nor does it fall under the category of accountability, which is really the crux of the whole situation. In fact, in regard to the primary producers and the prairies farmers, we have at this time a situation in which the Government has not fully inquired into the ability of the farmers to pay. We on this side of the House have not had any qualms about the development of the rail lines. We hear the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) constantly saying that we do not want to go ahead with the work of advancing the rail lines and we want to stop the job. That is not so. That has never been the position of our Party. Our Party has constantly said that the work should go ahead and that the double tracking in areas over the passes and ports and so on should be dealt with. Our problem is with the farmers' ability to pay and that is where we come to accountability and access to information.

The Hon. Member for Regina West was the only NDP Member who travelled constantly with the committee and informed himself of what was going on. I find it strange that Members of the NDP and especially the Hon. Member for Regina West should suddenly be so concerned about the fact that they have moved a motion to break the statutory Crow rate. The Hon. Member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton) has said again and again in the House that the importance of the statutory Crow rate to western farmers relates to two things. One is the fact that we in the West are 1,000 miles from open water. The second is that the Crow rate is actually the Magna Carta of the farmers and the grain producers. Members of the NDP have broken down that statutory rate by moving in the House an increase of 20 per cent to the statutory Crow rate as it now exists. They are now arguing—

An Hon. Member: They wouldn't support the freeze.

Mr. Gustafson: They certainly would not support the freeze which in fact was a retention of the statutory Crow rate.

I shall deal more specifically with the motions, Mr. Speaker, as they stand before us in the House. The Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette is saying that he would delete these words from Clause 29(5) of the Bill:

> The members of the Committee shall treat in a confidential manner any information submitted under this section that is identified and treated as confidential by the railway company that submitted the information.

The Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette is simply saying that we will delete those words and we will make information public in every way to the primary producers and to the general public so that they will know exactly what is going on.

I dealt with the farmers' ability to pay a little earlier. I would like to make this point again, Mr. Speaker, because I think the most serious omission the Government has made in forcing closure in the House is in regard to the farmers' ability to pay. There has not been an up-to-date inquiry into that ability. The Gilson Report was made two and a half to three years ago.

Mr. Mazankowski: It didn't look at the ability to pay.

Mr. Gustafson: That report did not deal with the farmers' ability to pay but looked at everything in a roundabout fashion. Those who sat in on the committee hearings in Regina, Edmonton, Ottawa, Winnipeg and so on were well aware that the one major point that the farmers and all other groups were making was that they did not have the ability to pay, they did not have the ability to deal with the freight rate increases that would be called for under this Bill. Now today, of all things, Members of the NDP have come along and have put forward the same type of program as the Government.

A Government that would move closure without really digging into the situation to determine the ability of those farmers to meet obligations is beyond our comprehension. Accountability of the railroads to the farmers is very important. It is also important for the Government to have some accountability and to look into the ability of farmers to pay the increases that they are asking them to pay. If I had more time, Mr. Speaker, I would elaborate upon what this type of action and this type of Bill could mean to the country and to the producers if the Government moves ahead with closure on a Bill that will have serious economic effects on the country and the producers.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member was asking for more time and I would like to assure him that if he needs more time, we would be glad to give him more time so that he could elaborate even further on his point.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I certainly defer to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson). He made an outstanding and brilliant speech, but I would simply say with respect to the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) that I think it is about time we heard from Members of the NDP about where they stand on this particular issue.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise again on that same point of order. It is not a matter of where we stand. The Hon. Member for Assiniboia, in the last seconds of his speech, indicated that if he only had more time, he could elaborate further. I can say on behalf of my colleagues that although we found his speech boring and completely irrelevant to what we are dealing with, we would gladly give him more time if he wanted it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It is evident that what I ought to do, with the consent of the Hon. Member for Assiniboia, is to ask whether there is unanimous consent to allow the Hon. Member to continue. From my position in the chair, it is clear to me that the Hon. Member is asking for that unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue his remarks?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just wanted to ask you, Mr. Speaker, how your peripheral vision is. I know that I sit very far to the left, but I wonder if your peripheral vision does take me in when I do stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Debate.

• (1950)

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments with respect to the amendments that are before us at this time. I might say that I listened with interest to several Members of the NDP debating the amendments. Certainly, they wandered far and wide and tried to move away as far as possible from the amendment that their agricultural critic brought in today which in effect would be the first blow to kill the Crow.

Mr. Benjamin: Order. Which amendments are we debating?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We are dealing with Motion No. 52 and Motion No. 53. I recognize the ploy that the Member is involved in but perhaps he could dispense with that form of intellectual dishonesty.

Mr. Neil: I hardly think that was a point of order. They talk about intellectual dishonesty. They have spent the last several months saying keep the Crow and today they bring in a motion, a proposed amendment that increases the rate paid by the farmers—

Mr. Anguish: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Neil: It increases the rate paid by the farmers.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If you are not going to keep the debate to the motions at hand, we want to know about the aspersions that the Tories are casting on anything the NDP has ever done to do away with the Crow rate. We have never moved any motion. We have never uttered words in this Caucus to do anything to alter the statutory rate. If you are going to allow these allegations to continue, either keep them to the point of the amendments we are discussing or have them tell us what the motion is so we can debate that motion on the floor of the House.

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, as the minutes go by the voices of the NDP get louder and louder until the last speaker was almost screaming, because he understands what they did. They have effectively killed the Crow by their amendment.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The man is in anguish.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Member exactly what motion and to describe the motion to us so that we know what is being dealt with. I see the Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) showing the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) how he can cover his argument that he has been making here this evening in his seat in the House.

I ask that you either keep the debate on the amendments or I challenge the Conservative Party to point out in the House where in fact that motion lies and to describe it to us.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. I think it is perfectly in order for the Hon. Member to call to the attention of the Chair that relevance is one of the rules of parliamentary debate, but I do not think he ought to call upon the Chair to force one Party or Member to do or something. I am quite ready to do my very best to enforce relevance, although I would remind the Hon. Member that if I enforce it on one Member in the debate, I have to enforce it on all Members in the debate.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly on the same point of order. We on this side have confidence in the Chair to keep the debate relevant. I do not think it becomes the demeanor of the House at all to have Members from one particular Party getting up and using the judgment of the Chair in such a way that it would draw attention to their own Members' concern in this case. Speaking for myself and our side, I certainly have faith in and support the Chair in seeing that the debate at this extended hour stays as relevant as possible, given the circumstances.

Mr. Neil: I just have one comment to make. If the Member for The Battlefords-Kindersley had been here earlier in the day he would have heard the motion that was proposed by his Party's agriculture critic.

Mr. Deans: He was here before you were.

Mr. Neil: And it was given unanimous consent to be set down for debate.

Mr. Anguish: The Tories accepted it.

Mr. Neil: As I said, if the Hon. Member had been here he would have understood what had taken place.

Mr. Anguish: I was here.

Mr. Neil: He would have heard the motion.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is my recollection that in seeking unanimous consent, the Conservatives agreed to have the question debated, just as we agreed to have some questions that they proposed debated. I can only assume that by agreeing to have them debated they must have thought them worthy of some consideration.

Mr. Neil: That is an interesting comment. I will not comment further on the matter. It does not warrant any comment.

Mr. Deans: You cannot think of any.

Mr. Neil: I can certainly think of many comments.

Mr. Deans: Why don't you think? Why don't you make them?

Mr. Neil: I am going to talk about the amendments we are debating right now.

Mr. Deans: Come on, big mouth, make them.

Mr. Neil: A few moments ago the Hon. Member was saying that I was out of order in my comments—

Mr. Deans: I am saying you are irrelevant.

Mr. Neil: Now he is inviting me to make comments that would not be in order. I would not waste my time arguing with the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans).

Mr. Deans: Come on, show us how much you know, Moose Jaw. That is an interesting name for a guy like you.

Mr. Neil: I would like to make my comments with respect to the motions we are debating at the present time.

Mr. Anguish: Do you know what they are?

Mr. Neil: Certainly I know what they are.

Mr. Deans: Tell us about them.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: They partly reflect the NDP flip-flop.

Mr. Neil: It is an indication of the fact that the NDP are very nervous when they will not allow a Member to continue to debate.

Mr. Deans: Tell us about them.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is relevant and I will be very brief. Earlier, the Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil) referred to the Member for "The Battlefords-Kindersley". Since there is no such riding I am not sure to whom the Hon. Member is referring. I want him to know that there is no longer any such constituency in the Parliament of Canada represented in the House.

Mr. Neil: If I said The Battlefords-Kindersley, it was an error. I meant The Battlefords-Meadow Lake.

With respect to the motions that are before us, particularly Motion No. 50 put forward by the Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), I would suggest that our Party was successful in committee in amending Clause 29(2) which basically does much of what the proposed amendment of the Hon. Member does. This amendment to Clause 29(2) in committee, which was approved by all Parties, strengthened the CTC position to monitor and verify the investments to be made by the railway. Consequently, we do not believe we can support Motion No. 50.

Motion No. 52 and Motion No. 53 are identical. They delete Clause 29(5) which requires the Members of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee to treat any information submitted under the clause by the railways as confidential.

The taxpayers of Canada will be contributing well over $600 million annually to the railways. In addition, the producers of grain will be called upon to pay double and up to five times the present rate. Under these circumstances I believe it is important that the investment plans of the railways should be made public. They should not be held in confidence because the taxpayers are providing a substantial amount of money and the producers are paying a substantial amount of money. I suggest that to treat the information with respect to the investment by the railways as confidential removes the possibility of the public and the taxpayer of being critical or capable of analyzing what are the investments of the railways. It seems to me with respect to Motions Nos. 52 and 53 that these are amendments in the interest of the taxpayers. They are in the interest of the producer and they are certainly amendments which should be supported by all Members in the House.

• (2000)

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53. I would like to deal first with Motion No. 50 and try to encourage some Members on the Government side and some Members on the Tory side to respond in some relevant way to this motion. It is really not that difficult for them to deal with. It is a requirement to put some backbone into Clause 29. Motion No. 50 simply states that the money raised through the changes proposed in Bill C-155 must go back in terms of reinvestment into either main-lines, port development, branch lines, grain facilities or something related to the transportation, storage and movement of grain.

I would like to start with a few facts to which I would like to hear Government and Tory Members respond in terms of figures obtained in recent years from public accounts. First I will speak with respect to what has been given to the CPR for the movement of grain and what has happened over the years.

Let me start with 1958. According to public accounts it was given, in present 1982 dollar values, $15.9 million. Ten years later, in 1968, this amount had jumped to $107.9 million, by 1978 to $190.3 million, and in 1981 it had jumped to $253.7 million. Indexed, the total present value of public aid in dollars has been $13.5 billion. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) pointed out, CP was given 44 million acres of land which has been used for oil and gas development, for various real estate and other development proposals. What we do know is that the total equity ownership by the public in CP Limited is zero, absolutely zero.

One of the themes that we have been trying to pursue, and I know there is a great deal of support in the country for it, is that when you are involved in giving money, whether it is to a Crown Corporation or to the private sector, you get some kind of equity back. I know that is not supported by the Tories or

the Liberals. They like to open the barrel and give all the money they have to their friends. A lot of their friends sort of run off into the hills with it and do whatever they fancy.

What we are trying to do in Motion No. 50 is to bring some kind of legitimacy and have some kind of framework whereby those hundreds of millions of dollars which go each year to the railroads are at least brought back and reinvested. I do not think any Members in this House need to go too far for information. The parliamentary Library is here and the recommendations of Mr. Justice Hall's Royal Commission are lying there waiting for any Liberal or Tory Member to read. Mr. Justice Emmett Hall points out what has happened in terms of the very pale and weak legislation that has been passed historically by the House, the failure of the House of Commons in terms of public accounts to make sure that moneys from the public Treasury are used to rehabilitate branch lines or used to maintain the main-lines.

A lot of Members, particularly on the Government side, including the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), and the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) in particular, have taken to saying in the House in recent weeks and months that if Members on the Opposition benches would stop slowing down passage of Bill C-155 there would be a half a million more jobs in Canada. We are speaking directly to that in Motion No. 50. The Government is not being entirely open and honest when it says that, once Bill C-155 is passed, suddenly there will be hundreds of thousands of jobs. My constituency is a case in point. There is over $100 million in rail line upgrading going on right now in terms of planning. But I know that when Government Members are talking about the Prince George to Prince Rupert line they always say that if Bill C-155 is passed, there will be upgrading. That is sheer poppycock. Upgrading is going on now and the railways planned it a long time ago.

I would be interested in hearing from Government Members why they oppose having some teeth put into Clause 29 which would require public money and money from producers, that has been duly paid for the transportation of grain and some specialty grains either to Prince Rupert, Vancouver, Churchill or the Lakehead, why those moneys—if there are moneys left over each year and if there are additional moneys that have been raised—should not go back into reinvestment in the rail lines. I have heard nothing from the Tories or from the Government Members as to why they do not support that. I will come back to Motion No. 50 in a moment.

The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) this evening has taken to saying that this group of amendments, Motions Nos. 50 and 52, is frivolous. I am sure the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) is interested to know that. One of the amendments is his. Perhaps the Tories could get their act together on that. I think the amendment put by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette is identical to that of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). I think this is something that Members in the House clearly should support if one can reflect on recent speeches made by all Parties in this House on access to information. I think any Canadian who wanted to go back and read those debates would think there is something quite different going on from day to day in this House depending upon the politics of it.

Motions Nos. 52 and 53 are identical and are really quite simple in their intent. It is to remove the provision in the legislation that would require members of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee to treat as confidential any information declared to be so by the railroads. There are three principal arguments for that. One, the railroads should not have the right to impose secrecy on the Committee. I think all Members in the House would support that. Second, it could come to pass that public disclosure of information would be one of the most effective ways available for the Committee to fulfil its mandate. I think that is clear in any case. Information should go out to the public whether it concerns the damming of a river or, as in this case, the hiding of information about what is really going on in the Senior Grain Transportation Committee, because the producers cannot mobilize themselves politically and ask questions of their Members or direct questions to this House unless they have access to that information.

I know this side of the House at least is united on Motions Nos. 52 and 53. I think Canadians have a right—I know we will not get it—to hear from the Government side why it opposes these amendements, which are really access to information. The third point in support of Motions Nos. 52 and 53 is that decisions of a confidential nature on the Committee's deliberation or the information available to it should be the prerogative of the Committee, not the railroads. I think again that speaks for itself.

I would like to touch briefly on the points made by the Hon. Member for Vegreville when Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53 were just coming up. The point the Hon. Member was trying to make was that somehow Motion No. 50—and I know other Members of the Opposition have tried to make this point—is breaking the Crow. Tory Members should come clean. The public record is clear. The Hon. Member for Vegreville, as Minister of Transport, in fact started the changes to the Crow rate. He was the implementor of Bill C-155. The Tories at least three years ago decided they were going to kill the Crow. They support Bill C-155 but are trying various parliamentary manoeuvres to try to make that seem to their constituent not to be the case. But the Tories want a review after the fact. I do not know if anybody goes to visit physicians very often, but you do not ask for open heart surgery and then have a heart specialist check to see whether or not you needed it after the fact. The problem with Bill C-155, as producers know, and as Canadians generally know, is that the impact on farmers, whether it will bankrupt 30,000 or 40,000 farmers in Canada, is still a bit of an unknown. For the Tories to say, "We do not want five times Crow until three years from now", sure, farmers will grab at that, but the fact is the Tories want a review after the legislation is passed. They expect to be Government. They may not be but they expect to be Government. I think they would do this House a great deal of credit, as would Hon. Members on the Government side, if they

would deal with Motion No. 50. Why should CN, CP and the other railroads not be required to reinvest the dollars they obtain from this? If the Government has some good reason, I would like to hear it.

● (2010)

In terms of freedom of information or access to information, I would like to hear the position on the Government side. It is pretty clear that the entire Opposition in the House is in favour of accessing information from the Senior Grain Transportation Committee. I would like to know the reason for its position.

I would like to refer to another point, the one which the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) attempted to make. I encourage him to stick around for a few hours tonight because the kind of intellectual dishonesty he contributed to the House is something I do not accept. I dealt with him while I was the Constitution critic and did not find that to be part of him then. I would be interested in hearing his comments later tonight to see whether or not there has been a serious change in his character.

Mr. Epp: I will speak again, if you want.

Mr. Fulton: The Hon. Member is trying to paint a picture of the NDP position which is not fact. Canadians out there know what it is.

Mr. Epp: It is a 20 per cent increase.

Mr. Fulton: His blustering and flustering in the House will not change what is known across the country as our position in maintaining the statutory Crow rate.

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in the debate tonight, but first I must make a couple of comments on remarks made by certain Members of the House in the debate so far, as I think it is only appropriate.

The last speaker indicated the intellectual dishonesty which exists in accusing certain Hon. Members of the House. I will point out some intellectual dishonesty which I hope he and his colleagues will consider. The Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) said that farmers did not have a way to put pressure on the railroads and that if the money were paid to farmers, they were not capable in any way of running their own business; that is basically what he tried to tell Hon. Members of the House of Commons. The Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton), the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake, and a couple of Members from British Columbia went on to state very emphatically that the payments should go directly to the railroads. On the other hand, they turned around and talked about the railroads, particularly CPR, as being the biggest corporate welfare bums that exist in Canada today. However they voted against a motion in the House which indicated that we would give farmers the freedom to take the money directly from the Government or we would give farmers the option to pay to the railroads. They said "No, you have got to pay it to the railroads". That is where the intellectual dishonesty comes from with the New Democratic Party.

How can Hon. Members of the House representing the New Democratic Party stand and decry on one hand the corporate welfare bums and flail away at them unconsciously and on the other hand turn around and say to little individual farmers, "No, we are not going to pay you directly. We are going to make sure that we pay it to the railroads because we cannot trust you to handle your own money"?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I know that the Hon. Member would not want to mislead the House. He indicated that at some point in time we voted in the House on a matter which he has now raised with regard to the payment schedule and the method of payment. There was no such vote, ever, during the entire time that this matter has been before the House. Quite clearly the Hon. Member is lying.

Some Hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Kempling: Withdraw.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Do you have no respect for the Chair? It is the old NDP disregard for the parliamentary institution.

Mr. Stevens: They have done it again.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I ask the Hon. Member to withdraw his words, please.

Mr. Deans: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, what exactly was it that you wanted me to withdraw?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: You wouldn't know the difference between the truth and a lie if somebody put it in front of you.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. This is a debate on extended hours. Perhaps we are all becoming a bit tired. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) knows very well that I wish him to withdraw the words "lying".

Mr. Deans: Withdraw the words "lying"; you mean withdraw the word "lying".

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Yes.

Mr. Deans: Obviously the Hon. Member was not telling the truth, but of course I will withdraw the word "lying". However, I would not want to leave the impression that I thought he was telling the truth.

Mr. Kempling: Isn't that smart?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Whatever happened to the old CCF tradition?

Mr. Deans: Whatever happened to truth?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I will do my best to sense the mood of the House. I personally do not regard that as a satisfactory withdrawal. On the other hand, I recognize that Hon. Members have sometimes been called upon to withdraw a word and have used phrases something like that. I think it is a marginal situation. My hope is that the Hon. Member will give second thought to using such an expression.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the rules of the House, of course I withdraw the word.

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that the Hon. Member—

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to suggest to the Hon. Member that, in making his speech to the House, reference to any vote having been taken with regard to the method of payment is quite untrue inasmuch as there has been no such vote taken. For him to rise and to say such a thing is an attempt to mislead the public.

Mr. Epp: Order.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Now you are getting back into trouble; you were doing so well.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. For very understandable reasons, the debate is emphatic, but it seems that the best way for Hon. Members to proceed is not to have the debate on points of order. Where there is a disagreement, there is nothing prohibiting Hon. Members on various sides of the House from standing up and entering the debate. If Hon. Members persist in doing it on points of order, which are not points of order, then I will have to become somewhat more difficult in applying the rules of relevancy.

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) reacted in the way he did. Obviously he does not know that the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), as a representative on the committee at its 66 meetings—and I doubt if the Hon. Member for Hamilton-Mountain attended one of them—voted on behalf of his Party against—

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Not one meeting, and that is the truth.

Mr. Deans: A point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Would it not be possible for Hon. Members to underline their differences in debate rather than in points of order?

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is wrong again. I wish, if he is to make allegations, he would be accurate in what he says.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I indicated to the Hon. Member and to all Hon. Members that I will have to be more strict in terms of what constitutes a point of order.

Mr. Shields: I suggest the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain talk to his colleague, the Hon. Member for Regina West, and find out how his colleague voted on behalf of the New Democratic Party during the hearings when the question was put and the amendment was put concerning the freedom of choice option. He will find that the record is clear. If the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain looks at the record, he will find that the Hon. Member for Regina West voted against the freedom of choice option which would allow the farmer a little control over his own destiny.

Mr. Deans: Now you weasel out.

Mr. Shields: It was not the Big Brother approach of the New Democratic Party, which is consistent with its philosophy. The little guy, the individual on the street, according to the NDP, does not have the knowledge or the brains to handle his own business; they as Big Brothers have to do it. Now I would like to turn to Motion No. 50.

Mr. Epp: Chase them out of the House, Jack.

Mr. Shields: Yes, they have to get their marching orders from the union bosses. There is no doubt about that, as Hon. Members have indicated. Motion No. 50 seeks to amend Clause 29 by adding:

"(3) A railway company shall, in a subsequent calendar year, invest in railway equipment and plant for the movement of grain an amount not less than the after tax cost of capital, after tax depreciation, and after tax constant cost portion of payments it received under section 55 for the preceding crop year."

and by renumbering the subsequent subclauses accordingly.

● (2020)

That creates a whole new department within the Department of Transport, a Department of about 100 people, including accountants, lawyers and good socialist hacks who will come in, sit down, go through the books and spend hours and hours on reams of paperwork. That is the Big Brother approach.

We put through an amendment in the committee hearings that was accepted by the NDP, accepted by the Government and, of course, accepted by our Party. The position was very straightforward, one that was accepted by the NDP. It it exactly what the NDP wants in their Motion No. 50. However, the NDP is using politics. It is making some noise, saying to the farmers that it will look after them, that they cannot look after themselves. I read basically the amendment as was put forward in committee:

The railways are at liberty to make the necessary investment for grain movement.

We put an amendment during the committee hearings, a successful amendment to Clause 29(2), which strengthens the Canadian Transport Commission position to monitor and verify its investments by, first, annually verifying and reporting to the Minister on investments made in the prior crop year, and second, analysing the investment plans of the present and subsequent crop year and within 90 days submitting a report to the Minister on the appropriateness of those plans to ensure an adequate, reliable and effective railway service. The rail-

ways, under this approach, are at liberty to make investments related to grain movement, but it will be the Canadian Transport Commission, not American-based consulting firms, that will determine their appropriateness as it relates to grain movement.

Those are just some of the comments I had to make. I am sorry that the New Democratic Party Members are using the time of the House in a frivolous manner. I am sorry that they continually stand up, Member after Member, and decry the corporate welfare bums, pointing out that they have millions of acres of land, millions of dollars in rolling stock given to them, millions of dollars in branch lines, on and on and then turn around in the next breath and say that they will not give the farmer the option of payments, that they cannot trust the farmer, that he cannot handle his now affairs.

They are saying to the same Government that they want it to pay the railroads, the same corporate bums, as the NDP would put it. Motions Nos. 52 and 53 are the same. The one before us is the Conservative motion. All we are asking for is freedom of information.

I see that you are signalling that I have one minute, Mr. Speaker. I will try to wrap up. We are signalling to the Government, which brought in and passed recent legislation on freedom of information, that the farmer has to pay the shot the way the Bill has come down now because the majority Liberal Government is forcing the farmer to pay more. There is a clear understanding and a clear commitment that this money will go to upgrade the rolling stock of the railroads and the transportation system, yet we have a clause that does not allow the information to go to the farmer as to where his money will be spent. That is a shame. It should be looked at. I hope Hon. Members will consider that.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53. Basically those motions say that when the railways reap the benefit they will reap through the legislation being debated today, that money must be put into the improvement of the transportation system in this country. That is an important and necessary motion.

Many of us who were brought up on the Prairies remember the history of the CPR. As we have heard many times over the last few months, the CPR was given acres and acres and millions and millions of dollars to build the railway system for which the Canadian taxpayers paid. In return for that, they were to maintain a proper railway system in this country, but as we all know, the Canadian taxpayers are always paying to upgrade the rail lines of this country.

What has happened with the profit of the CPR in the past and what will happen with the new profit of the CPR under this legislation is that the money will leave the railway system, and sometimes even leave the country. One need only look at the corporate structure of the CPR to realize what a great Canadian company CPR is.

I only have a few minutes to speak, so I will list only one or two of the great Canadian Pacific companies. Canadian Pacific Steamships Limited is wholly owned and incorporated in Great Britain. Canadian Pacific Bermuda is wholly owned and incorporated in Bermuda. What happened is that Canadian Pacific is not even a good Canadian corporation.

How can they be trusted to take the money they will receive under this Bill to maintain the railway system in this country? If we do not specify this, they will go back to the history they have had since day one. They will reap the benefits but not reinvest them in Canada or in the transportation system. We say the amendment is absolutely necessary to the integrity of the transportation system in Canada. If we do not have it, we run the risk of, five years down the road, having another Bill basically the same as this Bill which will provide more money to the railways in one shape or another in order to maintain the rail lines.

It has been the history of the last 10 or 15 years that we have had to fight with both CP and CN to maintain those tracks. In my riding of Churchill, more Government money comes in than CN money to maintain those tracks. Year after year CN tries to discontinue service throughout the North. How can we trust one Crown corporation and one private enterprise corporation which have in the past so often betrayed the people they are supposed to serve? They have often neglected the communities concerned, cut out passenger rail systems, discouraged the use of freight, and cut back on the use of express service for the transportation of goods. Even when it is the only means of transportation, which happens so often in northern Manitoba where there are no roads to a community and people must rely on the rail passenger and freight traffic, the company has talked about taking out the rail system altogether, both the transportation system for passengers and the freight service.

If we are to be responsible legislators, we must provide protection for the farmers and for the consumers of our railway system under this Act. As I said earlier, we have a history in this country of having one Act after another which gives money to the railways in one form or another. That is the very purpose of the Act which we have in front of us today which is going to kill the Crow rate. Why do we continue to give them money without any real control of the future of the transportation system? One hundred and two years is a long time to keep dumping money into the CPR. It is a long time to be maintaining what is a private enterprise system. It is a long time to be paying for something that we have paid for time after time. I wish we would not pass this Bill but if we do pass it we should put an end to the charity that we have allowed to exist when it comes to dealing with the CPR and the CNR.

• (2030)

The second motion, which is supported by both the New Democratic Party and the Conservative Party, is basically a freedom of information motion. It says that the profits of the CN and CP cannot be kept hidden from the public. If CN and CP provide information to the Senior Grain Transportation Committee, that information can be made public. It does not say it must be made public; it says it can be made public. If the Senior Grain Transportation Committee feels that that

information is what the public, the consumers and the farmers need to know, then I think they should have that ability.

We are passing a Bill which is going to give a lot of money to the railways. We do not know what their corporate profits are. We do not know how much it costs them to maintain their lines. We do not know what the conditions of the contract between VIA and CN is. In this country we have so much secrecy, especially when it comes to the rail lines. I, as a Member of Parliament, cannot find out how much CN charges VIA and how it determines the actual costs. Why not? The reason is that we have had similar clauses in past Government legislation. The public has been denied the ability effectively to challenge CN, CP and VIA when they ask for freight rate increases, to abandon lines and for increased tariffs. I suggest that if we are to give more money to the railways, they will have to use that for maintaining the railway system in this country. Second, we must also find out what the real profit and cost structure is in the railways, otherwise it is useless for us to be discussing and debating legislation about whether or not they are profitable and whether or not they need the money to improve the railway system in this country. The public and the House of Commons have a right to know, and without that knowledge it is ironic that in time of freedom of access to information we have spent so many months here without having the very information before us that we should have had prior to the introduction of this Bill.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with the principle involved in these amendments. When I read Motion No. 50 and apply it to Clause 29 as it is to be applied, it appears that the amendment and the section illustrate in a very definite way the difference in approach to this problem between the NDP and the Progressive Conservative Party.

The amendment states "shall invest". The NDP wants the Government to tell the railways how they are going to spend the money, where and when. When I look at how the Government spends money in Canada Post and several other places, I am not sure we are not jumping from the frying pan into the fire. That is the approach of Members of the NDP, and I give them credit for it. Dictation is part of their philosophy. They tell the people what is good for them and run the people's business. This motion is in line with their philosophy. I would go one step further and say that the motions that have been presented by the Progressive Conservative Party are in line with our philosophy which is accountability. We are not telling them how to spend the money once the money is theirs. It shall monitor the program, annually verify the investment, analyse the general investments and audit the expenditures. In other words, they are responsible.

There are no two clauses in the Act that illustrate the two philosophies better. One, dictation, the other, accountability. If we are going to have free enterprise in this country, whether for the CPR or the small entrepreneur or farmer, the Government has to keep its nose out of it. If we want to have dictatorship and nationalization, then the Government puts its nose right into it and runs it. That is the difference between the two Parties. The people across this country will have to decide which Party they want.

Section 55 gives authority to the Government to pay for certain expenditures. If that work has not been done and the year's crop was not transported satisfactorily, the Government should never have paid that money, and it is responsible. We want accountability for the money being paid to the railways. We do not want simply to hand it to them as in the past. People across the country are saying, "Is the CPR the Government of this country?" Sometimes they think it is.

The Canadian Transport Commission decided that it would close a branch line in the Province of Alberta. One of the lawyers found that an Act of Parliament had authorized that line to be operated in perpetuity. That was brought to the attention of the prairie section of the CTC, so they shrugged their shoulders and ordered the line abandoned. I made representations to the Cabinet that this was wrong, that CTC has no authority to defy an Act of Parliament. If the Act is wrong, rescind it, but certainly civil servants have not that right. The Government condoned the action of the CTC. It did not look into it. It could not have because its lawyers would have informed it that civil servants have no right to rescind laws passed by this House. Only this House has that authority. We took it to the Appeal Court of Canada and that court said that the CTC had no right to order the abandonment under that Act. The court ruled properly, but the Government went along and did it. That is not accountability, nor is it accountability if under Clause 55 we pay $600 million or $200 million to the railways, unless they have earned it. If they have, then we cannot tell them what to do with it. The next thing, we will be telling the farmer how to spend the money we give him for his crops—that he cannot buy liquor or take his wife to Hawaii. Once you earn money, it is yours. That is our way of life. We are not living in Moscow, although sometimes I wonder. We are not supposed to be living under a communistic Government. When we earn money, it is our own. If I want to take a trip on my own money, that is my business. If a farmer wants to buy a car for his wife or his son, nobody has any business telling him that he cannot.

● (2040)

That is the principle at stake here, Mr. Speaker. Once the CPR has earned the money, it is theirs. If the Government is just handing the money to them anyway, then the Government is at fault and it should be accountable to the people. That is what Clause 55 is all about, and that is what the motions proposed by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) and his team mean—accountability. We are not going to dictate to the railways how they should spend their own money. They are accountable for certain things for which the money was paid to them, and that accountability is included in the Act.

I do not support Motion No. 50, Mr. Speaker. It is in line with the NDP philosophy but it is not in line with mine. I do not believe in the Government telling me how to spend the money I have earned and I do not believe in the Government

telling the CPR how to spend the money it earns, although the Government has a responsibility to make sure that it earned the money before it is paid.

I do not understand how we can have two amendments that are word for word the same, one proposed by this Party and the other by the NDP. Surely one amendment should have stood the test without another being put. I do not know how that happened and I know it did not happen in provincial politics.

An Hon. Member: You didn't have the NDP.

Mr. Taylor: We had one or two Members, but not very many. The motion comes down to a definite principle—whether accountability is going to be secret or public, whether things are going to be done under the table or above the table. The amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) provides that it be done above the table, not under it. We want to know what is going on. The principles involved in these two clauses illustrate what the Progressive Conservative Party is trying to do in this Bill. The first is that you pay only when money is earned; the second is that you hold the receiver responsible; and the third is that you keep everything above board.

Can anyone tell me that the Government will not support those three principles? We are in a more serious position than I thought if the Government is going to oppose those three principles which are the heart of the Progressive Conservative action.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I want to support the arguments put forth by my colleagues in connection with these motions and to deal with some of the arguments from the Members of the Conservative Party. The Hon. Member for Peace River (Mr. Cooper) suggested that if we oppose freedom of choice, the farmer should have the choice of taking the money—

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member for Peace River has not spoken tonight but I have. If the Hon. Member is referring to me, I would prefer that he use my constituency.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) said that we oppose the so-called freedom of choice because we were getting orders from union bosses. I want to tell him that I probably have as many railway workers and railway union locals in my constituency as any Member, and I have not had a single request, let alone an order, about what I should do. While I have lots of union members, I have very few farmers in my constituency and he has many. It was the prairie pools, which represent more than 50 per cent of all grain producers of western Canada, that opposed freedom of choice. If the Conservative Party wants to put forward freedom of choice, it is entitled to, but its Members should not argue that people who disagree with them, and not just Members of the NDP, are somehow being unpatriotic.

If I had known that the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) would speak tonight I would have brought in a copy of *Hansard* for the day some months ago when he made a speech about CPR in which he was as critical of it as any Member of this Party has been. I could have read that speech into the record word for word and taken the credit for it myself. Yet today, in a roundabout way, he seems to be defending the CPR.

The Hon. Member suggests that the Conservative Party stands for free enterprise, that it must not be controlled, directed or dictated to and that this Party stands for state ownership of everything. I find it interesting that in Alberta for years the Conservative Government and the Social Credit Government, in which the Hon. Member was a member of Cabinet, either on its own or in partnership with the private sector, has been involved in business much more than the NDP Government of Saskatchewan has ever been.

That proves that when you get into the real world, this concept about the great free enterprise system which must not be directed or controlled but must be allowed to operate freely, just does not work. I do not have time to put on record all the corporations in which the Government of Alberta is involved, but one good example is Pacific Western Airlines which, as far as I know, is still 100 per cent owned and operated by Government. That is something which none of the New Democratic Party Governments which we have had in recent years in British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, have attempted to do. We had a very good example of how Governments get involved in the last month or so in Atlantic Canada where the privately operated fishing industry was in fact bankrupt. The only thing which had not happened was that the banks had so much out in loans they could not afford to call in their loans, the way they do with the small businessmen and farmers. So what happened, Mr. Speaker? The Liberal Government got together with the provincial Governments of Atlantic Canada, the Conservative Government of Newfoundland, the Conservative Government of Nova Scotia, and they worked out a deal whereby the Liberal Government and the provincial Conservative Governments got together with the private sector to refinance and reorganize the industry.

● (2050)

I point that out, Mr. Speaker, simply because it proves again, as we have learned so many times in the history of Canada, that if the people of Canada are to be served, if their needs are to be met, it can often be done only by the Government or only by the Government in partnership with private interests.

That is the real lesson, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this country. Motion No. 50 says that the public's money, that is, the money which comes from the taxpayers of Canada, should be put up only to increase rail capacity and to enhance the transportation system for grain, and that money should not be paid to the railroads to enhance their profit position. We are not talking about some small corner grocer. We are talking about the largest corporation in this country, whether it is

Canadian Pacific Railways or Canadian Pacific Investments or Canadian Pacific Enterprises or any of its many corporations. They are much too large and too many for me to list them all tonight. The Canadian Pacific, Mr. Speaker, is not only into the transportation business, as has been indicated by one of my colleagues. It is not only in the rail business. It is in the air business, and shipping, and probably in bus transportation. It is in real estate, in mines, in forest products. It is in every field in which it can make money.

An Hon. Member: Good.

Mr. Orlikow: Precisely. That is good. That is what it is in business for. No one faults the railways for that. However, when the people of Canada help that company—or any other company—make money they are entitled to receive a return. How did the Canadian Pacific become the largest corporation in Canada? Did it become the largest corporation because investors put their own money in? No, of course not. It became the largest corporation because the Government of the day, 100 years ago or more, believed, quite properly, that without a transcontinental railway, there would be no country. Therefore, beginning with the Conservative Government under Sir John A. Macdonald, and continuing ever since, Liberal and Conservative Governments have given to the CPR cash grants, loan guarantees, hundreds of millions of dollars, and millions of acres of land. Way back, Mr. Speaker, in 1917 a Royal Commission on Railways and Transportation estimated that the CPR had received the following public assistance as of 1916—almost 70 years ago: Railroad and surveys completed by the Government, $37.8 million; cash aid, $66.9 million; value of land, $119 million; return from land sold minus the cost of improvement, $55 million; a total way back then, Mr. Speaker, of $279.5 million.

Those grants to the CPR—and there have been many since then—have made the CPR the largest corporation in this country. This corporation has made hundreds of millions of dollars of profit over the years. What we are saying, Mr. Speaker, in Motion No. 50 is that we want to ensure that the people of Canada have the right to say to the CPR, "When you get money in the form of subsidies for moving grain, we want you to invest that money to improve the system." They are not asking CPR to invest some of its own money. That is a separate matter. At least CPR should invest all the money it receives from the Government in the form of subsidies in improving the railway system. I do not understand why this upsets the Conservative Hon. Members so much. It seems to me to be something natural to want to achieve.

Having heard the speech of the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) a few months ago in which he was so critical of the CPR, which is pretty unique for a Conservative Member of Parliament, I am surprised he did not greet our amendment with enthusiasm. We are not trying to tell the CPR how to run every facet of its operation, although it needs to be told to do many of the things which it ought to have done and which it has not. What we are saying is that we want to ensure that at least the money it receives in the forms of grants for improving the system will be spent on that improvement. As I indicated, the CPR did not just grow like topsy. It grew because it was able to use the money which it got from Governments for railway improvements and so on, and divert it into other forms when it thought it was profitable, into a steamship line, into the airline, into real estate, into mining, and so on. It has not always been successful in what it decided to do. In the last week or so I—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I have been trying to indicate to the Hon. Member that his time has expired. Perhaps he might like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to continue.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank you for allowing our Hon. Members to get some practice in the Chair. I am sure they will reciprocate after the next election. I had some encouragement this evening when the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) sat down in the House Leader's chair. I thought maybe there was going to be another switch in Cabinet.

An Hon. Member: What a funny man you are.

Mr. Fennell: We have heard common sense, finally, when the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) talked about these amendments. He has been around in politics a long time and he got very basic points across about these amendments. I notice a lot of noise from the Liberals. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in the last three hours there have been no speakers from that side. That indicates there is no one over there who knows what is going on with this Bill. No one over there understands the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. No one over there wants to understand it.

After listening to the debate on this Bill and having an opportunity to speak, I know what this Bill is. It has nothing to do with the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. It is a Crowsnest Pass tax. If this tax does as much damage to central Ontario as the National Energy Program tax has done to central Ontario, I believe we had better bring a Bill up next to give central Canada a bit of a chance.

• (2100)

Mr. Shields: Relief.

Mr. Fennell: Well, we do not need relief. That is one thing that we do not need. I do wonder, Mr. Speaker, what Liberal Members have against western Canada. Obviously they are really mad at western Canada because the two most dreadful Bills that have faced the House in the last four years have been the National Energy Program and the Crowsnest Pass Tax.

I will address myself to Motion No. 50 which has been proposed by my colleague from the New Democratic Party. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that early in the evening NDP Members were making a great deal of noise. Their

numbers are falling, but if you think their numbers have fallen now, Mr. Speaker, wait until after the next election. They will be lucky to have six Members to form a Party. They can hoot and holler all they want. I do not understand why they are hooting and hollering about this motion.

Dealing with this motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that once we in the Conservative Party form the Government, because of this motion the CNR will be forced to have the Auditor General do a comprehensive audit. That covers half of the problem they are talking about. If they were to bring in eastern auditors at $125 to $150 an hour, that would create a further burden on the taxpayers of Canada, and in particular those of western Canada. The auditors in the country do not need any more business. Some auditors exist only to analyse and justify Government expenditures.

I do not understand why Hon. Members of the NDP brought forward such a convoluted motion. Even a tax lawyer could not understand that motion. Why would they try and bring forward this amendment when there has been a logical amendment accepted by the committee, and agreed to by Liberal Members, already before the House? That motion simply relates to analysing the investment plans for grain movements. That is what it is all about, Mr. Speaker.

Members of the NDP keep on talking about CPI, Canadian Pacific Investments, which has nothing to do with the CPR other than common ownership. Even if they had their way, they could not touch all these companies they are talking about because it is the railway sector of CPR that would be dealt with because only it relates to the grain movement. Furthermore, if the railways want to take in more depreciation, they can take in depreciation on hotels and aircraft through this particular amendment. If you look at the converse, Mr. Speaker, it is a stupid amendment.

I shall now turn to Motions Nos. 52 and 53. One of the thorns in our side is the absolute difficulty we have getting information out of the Government. We as the Official Opposition represent a large portion of the Canadian population. At this point, we represent the majority of Canadians. We should have the right to know what is behind these Bills and what information is discussed in secret. When we go to a Ministry today, we are boondoggled with bureaucratese. We are not given any direct answers on any subjects. It is time that the Government accept the Freedom of Information Act in the spirit in which it was considered and in the way it was put through the House in the first place. Keeping a secret from the people is wrong. It is not fair to the people.

Just as an aside, Mr. Speaker, I am from Ontario. I should be standing here defending the farmers of Ontario. However, the farmers of Ontario are self-sufficient. The grain growers in the West will be relegated to being only grain growers. I would like to know what the Government is thinking when it is not giving the fifty-fifty option to the farmers and the railways. What will happen to the livestock industry? What will happen to the grain processing industry in the West? Those are serious questions, Mr. Speaker. What may possibly happen is what happened to the drilling industry in the West. The National Energy Program killed the oil drilling industry in western Canada. This program will kill the secondary industries in Canada.

We need to broaden our manufacturing base. We need to convert more raw materials into finished products. I cannot think of any more logical approach than feeding cattle in the West, butchering them and sending them in refrigerated cars to Ontario, at which point they would be perfectly tender, edible and ready for market.

It is wrong for the Government to have taken so much away from the farmer. If the Government would give half the amount involved in this Bill to the farmers it would then be giving more to the farmers than ever before in the past. As far as the railways are concerned, I shall not shed a tear for them. They have been subsidized and looked after for long enough. This Bill provides a further subsidy to the railways.

I really must return to the point that the manufacturing sector in central Canada is very important. If money is taken out of the hands of the farmers, then, as mentioned by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor), those farmers cannot buy another car. That is what we in central Canada make. We make cars and refrigerators and stoves and consumer products of all kinds. We manufacture textiles for use throughout the country. If those funds are removed from the farmers through a tax, we are hurting the rest of Canada.

I do not think the Government really understands the implications of this. I think it should go back and review what has transpired since the National Energy Program was implemented. I think this additional tax is a burden on all of the taxpayers of Canada because it is paid for by the farmer. Thus it takes money out of his pocket that he could spend on finished products.

I trust that somewhere down the line the Government will come forward with a provision to alow the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), who is answerable to Members of this House, to be provided with information. Members of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee at this time are all Liberals. I am worried that when our Party forms the next Government that committee will still be composed of Liberals. Then when the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) tries to get information from them they might refuse it. That would not be right, and we would be hurt by it. The country would be hurt by it and nobody in Government would know. Perhaps the present Minister of Transport, who may not be in the House then, may be able to get that information, yet the Hon. Member for Vegreville might not be able to get it.

This entire Bill must be re-thought. The Minister of Transport employed a very clever and intelligent man to do a study on this subject. He came up with a solution that was acceptable to all Canadians until it hit the Liberal caucus. The Liberal caucus stopped that proposal from going to the House in the way it was originally conceived. That is inequitable and unfair. I plead with the Government to return to the House with more amendments which, if fair to the farmers, we will not debate but will accept very quickly.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, the motions now before us are Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53. I began my remarks with those words because I want you to know right from the start that I know what motions we are talking about.

Bearing in mind that we are dealing with Motions Nos. 50, 52 and 53, I would like to tell you, Sir, that the bottom line is the question of trust. What frightens me most about this whole proposed legislation is that the New Democratic Party has found it necessary to put some motions before us. In essence, they are saying that if we follow the Minister's policy by which all the money goes to the railway with no competition in the transportation system on the Prairies, and competition is eroded to the point where there is only one mode of transportation, we will need an enormous bureaucracy so the Government can control that system. This would result also from the present motions. I submit that it is a dangerous precedent for us to set.

● (2110)

Mr. Althouse: You better read Motion No. 58 before you go on.

Mr. Malone: What the NDP ought to do is to make their own speeches instead of coaching mine.

Mr. Althouse: Read the motion.

Mr. Malone: Would the Member from Mount St. Helen's quit blowing his top. Calm down for a moment.

We are faced with a situation in which enshrined in the amendment is the whole question as to whether we are to have a bureaucratic structure telling the private sector in the country how to run its business. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) says that we are not dealing with a corner grocery store. He says that we are dealing with one of the largest industries in all of Canada. I say to him, so what? There is a principle of business. When one deals with principles one does not deal with the cost of money or whether a business is large or small.

The NDP claims that it is for small business. Let me tell the truth about the NDP. It is for small business until such time as those businesses become successful. Because the NDP has that kind of hate legacy for anything it deems to be big it does not like them. The NDP likes smallness because it can control it. It is against anything that is large because it competes with its ideology of Government control. NDP members believe that the Government should control, and therefore do not follow business practices but introduce motions which dictate to the private sector how it should spend.

One of the amendments to this legislation would offer freedom of choice in the system of transportation. Consequently, if the railways do not compete as the public feels they should there are competitive modes of transportation available. This means there are other modes of transportation competition, such as the use of trucks, which would then make the railways chase the dollar. When they have to do this in order to make money, since their profitability lies in the farmers, the railways must perform in order to get that dollar. Therefore they will function in a way that is acceptable and in accordance with business practice.

The NDP does not want that. It wants to allow the railways to concentrate on one mode of transportation and then throw the bureaucracy of Government on top, laden with layers of performance tests, bureaucracy to make sure they spend the right amounts on the right things and another layer of Government to run out to the Prairies to monitor the hopper cars. The NDP do not want to see competition. As the Member for Winnipeg North said, "We are not dealing with the corner grocer, we are dealing with the biggest industry in all of Canada."

If business principles are followed and the money is put into the pockets of the farmers, and they are allowed to make their choice as to how to deliver their grain, there would be no need for the bureaucracies that the Liberals and the NDP would find necessary to build. Furthermore, the country would be on the road to efficiency if those principles were to be used. We would be on the road to finding a way to move our grain. This would make us competitive in the world and enable us to earn money in terms of our balance of payments, money that otherwise would be sucked up by governments with their many layers of bureaucracy. It is incumbent upon all Canadians to demand efficiency. This is especially important to demand of the Government which only practices fiscal responsibility by borrowing until responsibility is total irresponsibility.

The issue concerns the difference between the approach taken by Motion No. 52 and Motion No. 53 and the concept of freedom of choice by the producer. That freedom of choice on the Prairies would include choosing between CP and CN for grain transportation. A producer could haul his grain a further distance to a different line and this would give competition between the railways. When that takes place we would then have the business principles being exercised by the producers throughout Prairie Canada, thus forcing companies as big as CN and CP to perform in order to chase the dollar to get the business.

I submit that we are going to end up with something I fear; the Government favouring one mode of transportation. Since it would favour and pay that one mode, it would need the bureaucracy to support it. Even before this Bill has passed third reading or has been enacted, there are amendments on the books providing for that very occurrence. It is a principle that you need to have bureaucracy to control and direct how the money is spent, and that is a sham.

Since there is a more efficient and profitable way to do it, why should Canadians believe that this socialist, left-leaning aberration of economic principle, could ever lead to anything except more debt, higher taxes and less money in the pockets of Canadians, once the grain has been delivered to port and sold to other nations?

The sale of grain is the greatest contributor to Canada's federal coffers of any single commodity. The sale of grain has contributed $6 billion and provides money for the Canadian economy in a way that no other product can. For that reason I

believe that this legislation does not only represent a western Canadian issue. The question of the Crow rate is a Canadian issue, because when farmers in western Canada receive extra money for the sale of their crops they can spend that money. They can buy commodities such as refrigerators, automobiles and farm machinery, all of which are probably manufactured in central Canada. The money which comes into Canada from the export sale of grain to the tune of $6 billion means that this is not purely a western issue. The grain industry is a major economic contributor to this country and one of the engines of growth. We should not be foiled by the examples of Motions Nos. 50, No. 52 and No. 53 which set forth false pretenses of economic principle that would burden us with more layers of bureaucracy that are totally unacceptable.

I conclude therefore by saying that these motions are unnecessary because of the provision for freedom of choice. They would be a burden upon us in terms of paper, bureaucracy and layers of Government becoming involved in the private sector. These motions would have the Government run the private sector and breech the principles that business has a right to manage its own affairs.

● (2120)

Sir, that might be the NDP way to say that Government has the right to tell business how to run its business. That is not the accepted way of the majority of Canadians. They believe there is a position in this country for the individual. They believe—the majority of Canadians—that there is a place in this country for families and businesses to run in accordance with the law that allows them to do with their money that which they believe they should do. But not the Liberals or the NDP. They think Government should be able to dictate to business and say what business should do with its money.

I simply say let us open this up to competition, to different modes of transportation. Not only will it be more efficient, not only will it mean we do not require Governments meddling, it will mean that commodity markets on the Prairies, which do not normally export but want to have value added within the Provinces, can ship their barley to feed lots, to poultry barns—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member, but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat of a pleasure to follow the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone). One could spend all of one's allotted time just going through his remarks and picking up some of the errors and correcting him. Let me deal with a few.

The Hon. Member suggested that the amendments before us, Nos. 50, 52 and 53 are all socialist amendments and interfere with the free enterprise system. I wish to remind the Hon. Member that Motion No. 52 is a Conservative amendment. It is a Conservative amendment which requests that the information given to the commission by the railways be not kept secret.

Mr. Epp: That is why it is a good amendment.

Mr. de Jong: In other words, this information should be public. Amendments Nos. 52 and 53 are almost identical. One comes from the New Democratic Party and one from the Conservative Party. There are some Members in the Conservative Party who realize that this information should be public and should not be secret. It is true Canadian Pacific Railways is a private company. But there are some Members in the Conservative Party who do believe that information should be public because the decisions of the CPR do have a tremendous effect. Because of the tremendous public effect this company has the public should be aware and have access to that information. It is the friends of the CPR across the way, the Liberal Party, the Liberal Government, who are opposed to making this information public.

Essentially what we are asking for in amendment No. 50, to which the Conservatives are so opposed and about which the Liberals are essentially dead silent, is that we guarantee in legislation that we get what we pay for.

I am amazed when I listen to Members, like the Hon. Member for Crowfoot, who talked as though the CPR were just an ordinary private company carrying on its business and that our amendment really interferes with the operations of that private enterprise and therefore we should not do this. Does the Hon. Member not realize that what we are asking for is that public moneys given to the CPR be spent in a way that benefits the public, that those moneys given to the CPR be spent in the way they are supposed to be? Does that not really make more business sense? I am surprised that Members of the Conservative Party and Members of the Liberal Party, who pride themselves in being good business people, should feel that the public, giving money to this private corporation, should not have the right in legislation to determine that the money indeed gets spent in the way it is supposed to be spent. In other words, that the public gets what it pays for. That is all that we are asking for.

Is this such an outrage to free enterprise? I fail to see it, Mr. Speaker. I think it is irresponsible of a government, whether Liberal or Conservative, to hand out moneys and not ensure that those moneys are spent in a way for which they were paid. To do otherwise is truly irresponsible. Essentially what the Liberals and the Tories want is a blank cheque written for the CPR.

Mr. Epp: Read the motion.

Mr. de Jong: The Liberals want a blank cheque for the CPR. Our good Conservative friends want a blank cheque for CP trucking. The CPR wins both ways.

Mr. Taylor: Baloney.

Mr. de Jong: The CPR wins both ways.

Mr. Taylor: That is more baloney.

Mr. de Jong: One of them is supporting one section of this CP enterprise and the other supports the other section.

Mr. Taylor: More and more baloney.

Mr. de Jong: This Party has consistently taken the same position, over and over again. Let me explain it as simply as I can to both sides of the House.

We claim that the Canadian public throughout all these years has paid for a transportation system, the CP Rail. In 1982 dollars the public invested through various subsidies, grants, et cetera, close to $13.5 billion in CP Rail. We insist that that rail system be used for transportation of grain, that we do not splinter that system. We insist that CP Rail start doing what it was paid to do, that is all. Is that so complicated? Is that an outrage against private enterprise? If it is, I think we are lost. This country is lost. It does not matter really whether it is the Liberals or the Tories who are in power, they will just continue handing out money; one to CP Rail and the other to CP trucks. The Canadian people and the taxpayer will continue to be losers.

Our Conservative friends charge that we are against "the free choice." If you start allowing massive trucking in western Canada you will end up with two systems of hauling grain, both inadequate. You will have a trucking system which depends on public subsidies for roads and the maintenance of those roads, and you will have a railway system which will start making the claim that there is not enough traffic moving along certain lines. This will accelerate branch line abandonment.

Mr. Shields: Big brother knows.

Mr. de Jong: You will end up with two inadequate systems. Our friends in the Conservative Party say this is dictatorial.

Mr. Shields: Big brother again.

Mr. de Jong: Hear the Member crow. It is "big brother", he says.

Mr. Epp: It is.

Mr. de Jong: It is "big brother" to ask the railroads to do what you pay them to do. He calls that being big brother.

Mr. Shields: You want the whole thing for the railroads.

Mr. de Jong: The logic escapes me.

Mr. Epp: You haven't studied it.

Mr. de Jong: I think it escaped those Members a long time ago. Can those Members not get it into their heads that if you start paying it all to the farmers you will fracture the railway system, fracture the transportation system?

Mr. Shields: Big brother knows best.

Mr. de Jong: Surely every study that has been done, as well as the recommendations of various provincial Governments, including Conservative Governments, ask this Committee and ask this Parliament not to allow a system that will fracture our transportation system. Hon. Members on my right are so adamant about this, even though the largest producer organizations—

• (2130)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but his allotted time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, while we address the entire question about the accountability of CPR to Canadian taxpayers, in face of the large amount of moneys that were transferred from the pockets of taxpayers to that corporation over the years, it is worth while to take a look at the history of the Crow rate, in particular.

In 1881 the CPR syndicate accepted from the people of Canada land, cash, rail lines and other benefits in exchange for a commitment to "thereafter and forever efficiently maintain, work and run the Canadian Pacific Railway". Clearly Parliament intended that the vast land grants and other benefits were to permit the syndicate to finance the railway's ongoing operation. In general terms, the Crow rate is one half of an indivisible national policy dating back to Sir John A. MacDonald to provide tariff protection for central industry and low cost transport to develop the eastern and western regions.

I have no doubt that the House will be interested in what another Member of my caucus will have to say about past Conservative policy on rail transportation. He managed to find, I believe in a used bookstore in Montreal, a 1882 policy document of the Conservative Party which had been used in an election campaign at that time. I am sure the House will be interested in the historical significance of what my colleague will have to say later in the debate.

Specifically, the Crow rate was agreed upon by CPR and the Government of Canada and remains a valid and binding contract. Sir Clifford Sifton, party to the negotiations that established the 1897 Crow rate agreement, said in 1929:

I remember when as a young minister in Laurier's cabinet, Van Horne and Shaughnessy said a line into the Kootenay mining district would not be considered for fifteen years. Also I remember that within six weeks the same two gentlemen came into my office and said that they had to build this line and wanted a large bonus for doing it, that the CPR was on the verge of bankruptcy.

He went on to say:

We gave them this bonus against the public sentiment of two-thirds of the people of Canada. They built the line and the Kootenay mining development—

Of course that was the nucleus of Cominco:

—saved the CPR and saved a good many other things in Canada.

In 1925, Parliament put the Crow rate into statute when the railways offered to keep grain on the Crow rate if they could be relieved from the agreement for low rates on other commodities. At the time CPR made it clear, and again I quote, "we are not asking for any change in the conditions established in 1897 in regard to grain and grain products".

A member of the MacPherson Royal Commission on Transportation, A. R. Gobeil, at the time said:

—the grain rates were not imposed by Parliament. They were not only freely accepted by the railway but were offered by them as an inducement to persuade Parliament to lift that part of the agreement which pertained to westbound rates on other commodities.

At no time in 1925 was there ever a suggestion by either party that the agreement of 1897 was being terminated. The Crowsnest Pass Agreement is a binding contract, and if CP wishes to be relieved of its obligations under the Agreement it must also relinquish the benefits.

The benefits have been rather substantial over the years. Government statistics clearly show over the years the subsidies paid to CPR with taxpayers' dollars. The amounts of money have been rather substantial. I am sure that the House would be interested in hearing what the subsidy levels have been.

For example, in the fiscal year beginning in 1958 the amount was $4.6 million. In 1982 dollars that would equal some $15.9 million. In 1959 the subsidy from Canadian taxpayers was $5 million, and in 1960 it was $12.9 million. In 1961, it was $32.3 million; in 1962, $32.5 million; in 1963, $31.6 million; in 1964, $31.9 million; in 1965, $37.8 million; in 1967, $52.2 million; and in 1968, $38.7 million. These were subsidies paid to CPR by taxpayers of Canada.

Mr. Nystrom: Corporate welfare bums.

Mr. Young: David Lewis, former Leader of the New Democratic Party, was absolutely correct in making charges against some of those corporate welfare bums.

To continue with the figures in 1969, CPR received $33.5 million; in 1970, $27.8 million; in 1971, $32 million; in 1972, $35.5 million; in 1973, $54.9 million; in 1974, $61.1 million; in 1975, $93 million; in 1976, $84.6 million; in 1977, $112.8 million; in 1978, $129.1 million; in 1979, $186 million; in 1980, $221.6 million; in 1981; $232.7 million, for a total, in the years between 1958 and 1981 of some $2,919.8 million from the pockets of taxpayers.

Mr. Forrestall: Who wrote that?

Mr. Young: This is detailed research on which I have worked over the past several months, since my colleagues in the New Democratic Party first brought to my attention what the Government and the Conservative Party were trying to do to western Canadian farmers, and indeed farmers elsewhere in the country. It was because of their eloquence that I decided to dig in and do thorough research. I am glad I did. It has an edifying process. I see my time is up, Mr. Speaker. I thank you for your attention.

● (2140)

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, interestingly enough, earlier today I thought we had come to the end of the discussion on this Bill and that that would be the last time I would have to speak. I am glad that the motion put forward by my colleague in the Conservative Party to continue without interruption has made it possible to say a few more words on this most important piece of legislation to those people in western Canada whom I represent.

Historically, as has been mentioned by some, this Bill has been part and parcel of the lives of Canadians since the time of Confederation. That is why I believe it is important that we consider seriously in great detail each of the motions before the House at this time.

It has always been a thrill to realize the vision of the forefathers of our country when they were able to stop at nothing to see that Canada would be a united country. One of the great historical works that took place within this land was the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was, as we know, a joint effort between private enterprise and government.

As such, with the vision of the founders of this nation, it tied together this country from one sea to the other. I do not believe that people today have that kind of vision. The people at that time with the materials and machinery available built something that historically would still have to be one of the great human endeavours of Canada.

As that was being done, and as funds were being found in this country, and in foreign investments from Britain and other places, there had to be built into the structures of the railroad's operation system a means of financing that would continue to keep that railroad alive, make it operative and working in such a way that the purpose for which it was built would continue to be met. It was built to give a viable life line to all parts of Canada so that Canadians could live as a family, grouped together, able to communicate and travel back and forth.

One of the ways in which this lifeblood was pumped into the CPR was through public moneys which, as my colleage just said, came in the form of public subsidies paid to it by the people of Canada through the Government. In Motion No. 50 which we are now discussing, proposed by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), we would change the legislation in Clause 29 paragraph 3, which reads as follows:

A railway company shall use Canadian goods and services in carrying out investments in railway equipment and plant for the movement of grain and more particularly shall use goods and services from the region where the investment is being made to the full extent to which they are procurable, consistent with proper economy and the expeditious carrying out of the investment.

My Party believes that that is not clear enough. It does not specify clearly, surely and without doubt that the moneys that will be received in public subsidies will be put into the construction and the maintenance of the railroads so that the purpose for the railroad, the carrying of goods and in this case the carrying of grain so international markets, will continue

without flaw. We are proposing under Clause 29 that paragraph 3 read as follows:

A railway company shall, in a subsequent calendar year, invest in railway equipment and plant for the movement of grain an amount not less than the after tax cost of capital, after tax depreciation, and after tax constant cost portion of payments it received under section 55 for the preceeding crop year.

We are simply saying that the railroad is bound to put into railroad equipment and maintenance of the system the amount of money that comes to it that year by the subsidies that are paid to it for the carrying of the product. That makes perfectly good sense. The subsidy is given to keep the system operating and functioning. It is directed toward the railroad company to see that the machinery, locomotives, cars railways and necessary maintenance to keep the operation mobile and moving is there and in place. We are asking that each year the railroad use the subsidies that have been given to it during that calendar year to put it specifically into upkeep, maintenance and carrying out of the cost of the running of the railroad. Those who have travelled know that because Canadian Pacific Railway is such a huge company with such vast holdings in many different areas that is not always taking place.

We hope that this motion will carry when we come to vote on it so that each year the moneys that have been procured by the public subsidy will be put into the care, upkeep and maintenance of the railroad and not into some other sector of the company's business. For that reason, we have, in union with our colleagues from the Progressive Conservative Party, asked in Motions Nos. 52 and 53 exactly the same basic thing, that this information become public information, that it not be something that could be restricted by railroad companies and kept from the public. Motion 52 as proposed by the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) reads:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by striking out lines 10 to 15 at page 15.

That simply says and I quote:

To remove the provisions of the legislation that would require the members of the Senior Grain Transportation Committee to treat as confidential any information declared to be so by the railroads.

In exactly the same words, the Hon. Member for Regina West has proposed the same amendment, and I quote:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by striking out lines 10 to 15 at page 15.

It was a surprise to hear the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) speak against the Motion. I could not understand why he did that. He was actually speaking against the motion put forward by one of his colleagues. The Motion was exactly the same as that of my colleague from Regina West.

It is important to have this Clause amended in that way so that this cloak of secrecy that the railroad company wants to impose upon the Senior Grain Transportation Committee about its operation, where the funds and subsidies have gone, will not exist, that it will be public information for all Canadians, including the farmers, taxpayers, those in the Maritimes and in the rest of the country. They put their money into the system and they should know exactly where it has gone. No railroad company should be given the power to keep that secret from the public.

I trust that the Government will hear very loud and clear that the Opposition Parties, both the Progressive Conservative and the New Democratic Party, have put forward the same two Motions, numbers 52 and 53. I hope that the Government hears what is being said by those on this side of the House, and that when the vote is called on the motions they will pass. That is what the people of Canada have a right to have. They should know what has happened to the subsidies.

I see that you are signalling me, Mr. Speaker. I am happy to have had this opportunity to speak, for which I thank you very much.

• (2150)

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I want to add something new to the debate.

An Hon. Member: That will be a change.

Mr. Deans: I listened with interest to my good friend and colleague, the Bard of the Conservative Party who muttered *sotto voce* "that will be a change." I want to suggest to him that perhaps if he would listen he would understand that the arguments we are putting, though similar, are intended to complement each other in an effort to change the Government's mind.

I want to say that the amendment we are proposing is fundamental to the contract which was entered into between the Government of Canada and the builders of the railroad. It was never intended that the railroads would have access to public funds without explaining fully how those funds were to be used. I would go further and say that it was never intended that the railroads would have access to public funds at all other than through grants for the purpose of building the railroad.

I know you were probably around at the time the railroad was built or maybe just shortly thereafter, Mr. Speaker. You will remember, if not from personal recollection, certainly from your study of history, exactly what took place back in the late 1800s. I can recall reading the history of elections at that particular time. There was a booklet put out by the Conservative Party for the purposes of the election of 1882. At that point in time the Conservative Party, under perhaps the greatest Conservative leader ever, was trying to explain to the electors of Canada the facts. He called it "A record of the Conservative Administration, Claims of the Government for the Support of the People". I intend to quote just two or three paragraphs from this.

I make reference to this because it bears very heavily on the debate we are having here today. The Conservative Party of the day back in 1882 put forward policies as follows:

A national policy for the encouragement of Canadian Industries, Agricultural, Manufacturing, Mining.

A Pacific Railway from ocean to ocean, on Canadian soil, for the development of our Great West and the building up of Canadian commerce.

They went on to put on as their third initiate the "British Connection. A determined opposition to everything calculated to weaken the tie binding us to the Mother Country".

As you look at those headings you have to think of how far the Conservative Party has wandered today. I must say that Sir John A., resting as he no doubt is, and watching the proceedings here, is probably twisting and turning with anguish as he sees what has happened to his Party.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I used that this morning and it was a lot funnier.

Mr. Deans: Let me read what the claim was in those days and you will be able to see quite clearly why I contend that this particular amendment is an essential part of any redefinition of the agreement between the Government of Canada and the railroads of Canada in terms of how they will serve the economic needs.

On page 15 of that book it says:

The Canadian Pacific Railway

The Opposition—

The Opposition in those days, of course, were the Liberals.

—describe the contract entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to construct the Pacific Railway as the "Giant among Swindles," and as "the most disastrous public contract" and "the greatest railway swindle of the 19th century."

I want to stop at this point because—

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Agreed.

Mr. Deans: —their opposition was clearly misguided. That can happen. I want to suggest that just as their opposition was misguided then their opposition to what we are proposing now is equally misguided. Just as the opposition to the development of the railroad system back in the late 1800s was a misguided opposition, their opposition to our demand that the railroads be clearly accountable publicly for the expenditures that they undertake using public funds is misguided today, as it was in those days.

The Conservative brochure goes on to defend their position. They say:

At that time both parties agreed that it should be built by a company, aided by subsidies of land and money—

And this is the catch.

—but so as not to increase the burden of taxation.

In our presentation we suggested that there was a clear betrayal of the original agreement. The railroads had been given, in return for their commitment to build what was deemed at that time, and undoubtedly was in the national interest, a link between the West and the central and eastern parts of Canada, substantial amounts of capital by way of grants, and they were given substantial numbers of acres of land by way of outright deed. But they were not to be given public subsidy out of the tax dollars. what we are saying today is consistent with that particular principle.

We are saying that if the railroads are to be provided with additional funds, as they have been over the last number of years in order to enable them to live up to their commitment, surely it is not too much to expect that in return for those funds they should be prepared to provide an accurate dollar accounting of how the funds are spent.

I heard the Conservatives moaning and groaning over the course of the last four hours about the inconsistency of our position.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Hear, hear! Right on.

Mr. Deans: They say with some degree of glee "hear, hear".

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Hear, hear, with a hell of a lot of glee.

Mr. Deans: All I can assume is that that particular response is out of ignorance. Quite frankly, if they were to be true to the original tenets of the Party they belong to, they would appreciate that those people who entered into this agreement in the first place quite clearly entered into it with an understanding that there would be no public funds made available on an ongoing basis out of taxation.

Since that point in time no doubt a number of changes have taken place. The one thing that is reasonable to ask is an accounting of how the money is going to be spent. I cannot understand why we cannot gain the support of the House of Commons on a matter such as this. I hear Conservative Members rising one after the other and speaking about the right of the company to maintain its secrecy, to maintain the confidentiality of its affairs. Mr. Speaker, confidentiality has a place, but there is no place for confidentiality if there is the involvement of public expenditures.

● (2200)

I can see that you are on the edge of your seat, Mr. Speaker, and you probably want to make a speech in support of my position. I simply want to ask Members of the House to consider this carefully. I say to the Tories, do not leave your roots; hang in there; you were right in the first place. I say to the Liberals, you were wrong in the beginning; you are wrong again; hear what we have to say.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, after such a forceful presentation on such an important position one would not want to make a judgment without having slept on the topic. In light of that very sound and sober advice that we need to cogitate, reflect and assess with the proper degree of sobriety and clearheadedness that such an amendment requires, I wonder if the House would like to consider the means by which we could expedite our business so that Members of the Opposition could allow me to give this the consideration they so devoutly wish.

I should like to respond to the concerns they have expressed. They may want to spend at least tomorrow's proceedings examining some of the amendments that were brought forward and placed on the Order Paper today that deal with the fundamental issue of ability to pay. I wonder if we could gain

the consent of the House that the safety net amendments which I introduced this afternoon might now be considered. In that way we could use our time very well in examining the debate that has passed, at the same time using the time left in report stage debate to examine items of great seriousness and concern to the western farmer, namely, how we can provide protection during the time of the cost-price freeze that we all face. I should like to ask for consent for such a judgment by the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair suggests that there might be a disposition to dispose of the amendments currently under discussion and then, with the unanimous consent of the House, the House would be free to adopt any other amendments for consideration. Would Hon. Members care to comment?

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak to the point raised by the Minister of Transport. This Party is on record as early as this afternoon as expressing a willingness to debate those fundamental issues. The Minister referred to the proposition of the safety net. We would certainly have no objection to moving that forward for debate as it is very central to the Bill. We have not had an opportunity to debate it in committee or indeed to consider it in any form, since it was considered out of order.

I hope that in the course of consideration of the concept of the safety net we would be allowed to consider some of the motions we have advanced today, namely, the proposal to freeze the existing freight rate structure at least until July 31, 1986—that is this Party's version of a safety net—until such time as a review and study of the farmers' ability to pay and the impact upon producers, can be conducted. Second, we hope that we will be able to deal with the motion that was put forward with respect to the method of payment. Third, there is the motion dealing with the issue of the coal lands. As I indicated earlier today, it was only considered in a rather cursory fashion in committee because we ran out of time.

Mr. Benjamin: We moved an amendment.

Mr. Mazankowski: Yes, we did consider an amendment but the guillotine had been imposed and it was not dealt with in detail.

Subject to those conditions we would be prepared to move on to the amendments suggested by the Hon. Minister of Transport.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly clear what the Minister of Transport was asking. Does he suggest that we should now move on to other amendments tonight? I have no objection to moving on to the next set of amendments. We have been dealing with what I consider to be a vitally important matter, the question of accountability. I do not think any Member of the House would disagree with that.

The next set of amendments to be called in the order set down by the Speaker will deal with another vital and important matter. I do not doubt that by five o'clock or six o'clock tomorrow afternoon we will be reaching the point of dealing with other important matters. We are prepared to sit continuously for as long as it takes to deal with the Bill in total.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, to clarify this, I recognize the noble spirit of debate expressed by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). If we look at the record of debate during report stage—and the pattern has not changed during today's proceedings—we will see that the possibility of encountering the 30 or 40 amendments still on the Order Paper by five o'clock or six o'clock tomorrow afternoon is highly unlikely.

An Hon. Member: You should have thought of that before you moved closure.

Mr. Axworthy: The issue that I raised is not simply that of proceeding seriatim to allow the House to reorder its priorities by consent—not to dispose of any amendments but to reallocate the order in which we would deal with them. I suggest that in order to give full attention to the central issue in the time allotment available to us—the ability to pay issue which focuses around the safety net amendment—it might be brought forward as the next order of business when we conclude the group of amendments that we are dealing with.

I suggest this in the interests of debating the issues which are of critical importance. Members from western Canada know that when they go back to their constituencies there will be no issue of more importance. The Government believes that it is answering that issue through the amendments introduced this afternoon. I think it would only be fair for the Opposition to be in a position to respond and have an exchange of views across the floor of the House.

If we go according to the time pattern established by Members of the Opposition in the way they have conducted debate, the chance of our getting to the point of examining the matter within the time allocation, no matter how long we stay, is remote. In the interests of serving the right of the public to know where we stand on this issue, I would like to see if there is some way of arriving at an agreement.

Mr. Deans: Now I understand more clearly what we are dealing with, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Minister clarifying the matter for me.

If we continue as we are and it gets to 5.45 p.m. tomorrow afternoon and we have not yet dealt with this matter, we would be quite happy to extend the sitting to accommodate whatever additional time is necessary to deal with any amendments at that time outstanding.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief but I want to refer to the hallucinatory intervention of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). He alluded to a number of things in the course of his speech. In the course of reading a speech prepared by one of his researchers he gave a history of the evolution of the Crowsnest Pass rate.

● (2210)

I want to recall to the House that I believe it was Mackenzie King who said that there really was no difference between the Liberal Party and the CCF Party, that the CCF Party was really composed of Liberals in a hurry. After listening to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, I must change that particular observation because the last three or four speakers of that Party have been dealing with the 1880s, the 1885s and the 1887s. The New Democratic Party are making the Liberals look like people who are full pace runners in comparison. As my colleague, the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), pointed out quite accurately some time ago, the NDP are really the true reactionaries of our time. It has never changed its point of view. It repeats and repeats the catechism which was originated with their Party under the tutelage of the trade union movement in 1961: never an original thought. Do not address the issue before us but stay with the same old—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order, please. Is the Hon. Member speaking to the motions?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Yes.

Mr. Epp: It sounded good to me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am pleased to hear that. Will the Hon. Member please proceed.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That is why, Mr. Speaker, you hold high office. You are so observant. You are able to see that I am dealing in relevance with this particular set of motions in pointing out the fact that in terms of the approach which the Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party take with respect to these particular amendments, they are the true reactionaries. You, Mr. Speaker, understand the relevance of that because you have been subjected to their various speeches. They like to go back in history. I can go back in history, too. I can refer to the fact that the Crowsnest Pass rates are regarded as part of the Magna Carta of western Canada. In fact, I looked at that Magna Carta just to make sure and refresh my memory as to the relevance of that document to the debate today.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, because you will understand that what we are dealing with now is the question of accountability of the railways. One of our amendments was in fact accepted in committee. It was a very important amendment which forced the railways to have an accountability before the CTC with respect to its operations under the provisions of this Act. The Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party have raised some examples of past history, so I thought I would look back to the Magna Carta itself to see whether or not if we went back to 1215 in the time of King John and the barons we could find out exactly what happened then which may have had an influence on the accountability of the railroads.

I am fascinated at the relevance of this document, Mr. Speaker. I draw to the attention of the Minister that the Magna Carta says, and I quote:

> No constable or other royal official shall take corn or other movable goods from any man without immediate payment, unless the seller voluntarily offers postponement of this.

The Government should listen to what the Magna Carta says as to the basic rules of our democratic system in the British tradition, because what it is proposing with this legislation is very much like taking the farmers' corn without payment. I quote again:

> No sheriff, royal official, or other person shall take horses or carts for transport from any free man, without his consent.

The Minister should listen to this because that is what the Government is doing with the transportation vehicle—the railways—with respect to the grain producers in Canada today. I quote again:

> No town or person shall be forced to build bridges over rivers except those with an ancient obligation to do so.

I would like to say one thing, Mr. Speaker. If one looks at the railways today and the obligations they put on towns and persons in our society with respect to maintenance of their railways, their crossings, the snow removal obligations these agents, in the case of the CNR, the Crown, puts upon towns and persons in our society, one can understand that the barons who went up and demanded equal rights, justice and democracy from King John knew what they were talking about. It is too bad that the Government does not understand the relevance of the Magna Carta as it affects this particular legislation.

I want simply to deal with the provisions here because we are talking about the obligations of the CPR and the railways to the people of Canada under this particular legislation. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) and other Members of the New Democratic Party have made reference to the fact that they are the protectors of the Crowsnest Pass rate. They say that they are not working hand and glove with the Government. They do not support the Government in any way in this regard. When one looks at the question of how much the railways are going to be receiving with respect to the transportation of grain, and at the whole question of accountability and how the profits are to be applied in the amendment which is brought forward by the New Democratic Party, one has to consider the full implication of what that Party did today. That Party brought in its own amendment with respect to the safety net.

Mr. Mazankowski: They said that the Crow must go.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The Hon. Members of that Party did not even have the good grace, Mr. Speaker, to use their own typewriter. They took the Government motion which is tabled. They went to a photo copy machine and copied exactly word for word the proposal of the Government with respect to the safety net provisions.

The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain will probably not understand this because he attended exactly zero of the hearings with respect to this matter of the Transport Committee. He never appeared. He never showed his face once. At least the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-St. James (Mr. Keeper)

came to have his picture taken with the committee once and attended for 15 minutes.

Mr. Deans: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It may surprise the Hon. Member who has just spoken to know that not only did I attend hearings, but I read every word of the proceedings. As the House Leader, that is my job.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the consequence is of the amendment which the NDP brought in today, that so-called defender of the Crow rate, these Hon. Members who have been trumpeting their dedication to the statutory rate. By using exactly the same amendment as the Government presented with the exception of blocking out part of Subsection (a) of Motion No. 59 which deals with the number of percentage points of the freight rate price ratio, they removed the graduated scale and put in their own maximum of 3 per cent.

Mr. Epp: Three per cent! That is a 20 per cent increase.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: This is an amazing thing, Mr. Speaker. Here it is, the Liberal-NDP coalition, reading from the same song sheet! They have different figures, but these people are talking about precisely the same thing. What they are talking about is the destruction of the Crow rate. They know they are as guilty as the Liberal Government with respect to the destruction of the Crowsnest Pass rate. I challenge them to stand up in western Canada with a straight face and suggest that they have anything—

An Hon. Member: Any time you want it, Ray.

Mr. de Jong: You are getting red in the face. You must be lying or something. Are you not telling the truth? Why are you blushing like that?

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that if the Hon. Member is reading a motion, he should give the proper interpretation to it. The safety net is a ceiling, not a floor. It provides a very adequate protection in the event—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, order. The Hon. Member is not making a point of order, he is entering into debate. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) will continue his brilliant remarks.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Let me just say to the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse), Mr. Speaker, that 10 per cent is a ceiling as well. I can tell him that 15 per cent is a ceiling and 50 per cent is a ceiling. Three per cent is a ceiling. The Hon. Member knows, Mr. Speaker, in the situation today, that if we were to take the figures right now in terms of half a cent per tonne mile, it would be the equivalent of a 2.5 per cent figure. The NDP Members are suggesting that they are going to raise this to 3 per cent. That is a 20 per cent increase.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that you are getting ready to stand up and compliment me on my acute observations. However, I would just like to conclude my remarks with one sentence. The NDP Members have declared their true feelings with respect to this matter through this amendment. What they have now proposed is the destruction of the Crow rate. I say to my hon. friends in the House of Commons that I will not let western Canadians forget this during the course of the next election campaign.

• (2220)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 50. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion will be deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 52. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion will be deferred. A vote on Motion No. 52 disposes of Motion No. 53.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 55

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 33 by striking out lines 11 to 43 at page 16 and substituting the following therefor:

"for the purpose of moving grain and the Minister shall take every reasonable initiative to ensure that an adequate supply of rolling stock will be provided for the efficient, reliable and effective movement of grain.

(2) The Minister may enter into agreements with the owners of lessees of railway cars.

(3) The Canadian Wheat Board shall administer and control any railway cars acquired or leased by the Board or by the Minister on behalf of Her Majesty.

(4) The Canadian Wheat Board may, in respect of railway cars under its administration and control, enter into agreements with the railway companies respecting the operation of the railway cars."

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 33 by striking out lines 24 to 30 at page 16 and renumbering the subsequent subclauses accordingly.

He said: Mr. Speaker, when dealing with Motions Nos. 55 and 56, we are dealing with another serious and fundamental issue in this proposed legislation, namely, the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board and its jurisdiction over the allocation of railway cars that have been purchased by the taxpayers, let alone the railway cars that the railways own. There gets to be fewer and fewer of those cars every day.

Several speeches have been made by my hon. friends from the Official Opposition on a motion which we have not dealt with as yet. I only want to say, Sir, that a 3 per cent cap on a safety net means that if, as and when grain prices go down, we could end up in a situation where the railways would even have to refund money. I invite my colleagues from the Conservative Party to go back to the drawing board and take another look at that 3 per cent cap.

The Government's motion regarding the safety net refers to 4 per cent, 5 per cent, 6 per cent, 7 per cent, 8 per cent, 9 per cent and 10 per cent. Our motion would mean that 3 per cent is the maximum forever and a day. Since grain prices will probably keep going down as they have over the last three years, I invite my Conservative colleagues to take another look at that before they start shooting off their mouths about breaking the Crow rate.

The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that Members of the Conservative Party to this day have yet to say that they are in favour of keeping the Crowsnest Pass rate as is. In fact, they are in favour of doing away with it. However, they are not in favour of doing away with it today as are Liberal Members. Oh no, they are speaking about three years and then two and a half years and now they are speaking about two years. But they are still in favour of killing the Crow.

I have in my possession some Conservative literature from the last provincial election in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Bloomfield: Who won?

Mr. Benjamin: Well, talking about false pretences, the literature read:

The Crow Rate must remain!
The shortfall must be paid for by the federal government.
We oppose any plan to use Saskatchewan dollars—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must call to the attention of the Hon. Member the rule of relevance. Remarks made at report stage of the Bill, as the Hon. Member well knows, must be strictly relevant to the amendments before us.

Mr. Benjamin: Exactly, Mr. Speaker, and when dealing with Motions Nos. 55 and 56, keeping the Crow rate means keeping the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board. On my right is the outfit that is in favour of decreasing the powers of the Wheat Board in cahoots with the Liberals. The Tories said: "Let's keep the Crow rate, vote PC in Souris-Cannington, vote for Eric Berntson; a Progressive Conservative government will say that the Crow rate must remain." That comes from their literature, Mr. Speaker. Keeping the Crow rate means keeping the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board and we cannot separate the two.

I could go on and read some more Tory literature about keeping the Crow, but Members of the Conservative Party in the House and outside of the House have yet to say unequivocally that the statutory grain rate must remain in place. It must remain in place not for a year and a half or for two years or for two and a half years or for three years: it must remain in place for western grain producers.

During the committee hearings we heard from officials of the Canadian Wheat Board, from officials of the Canadian Wheat Board Advisory Committee, from Mr. Charlie Gibbings, former Commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board for some dozen years or more, and from the prairie Wheat Pools. They all said the same thing, Mr. Speaker. I invite my colleagues who were on the committee to refresh their memories. I am quoting Mr. Jarvis:

> The board, like any other sales organization, must control the shipment of its own product in order to ensure performance. For these reasons, the board has always held the view that overall control of the system as it is developed in co-ordination with the total of the grain industry should be administered by the board.

Motions Nos. 55 and 56 retain the control of the railway cars that have been purchased by farmers and taxpayers in the hands of the Canadian Wheat Board. For the reasons given by the Board and by the Board's Advisory Committee and for the reasons that we gave when dealing with earlier amendments for facilitating sales, knowledge of the location and grades of grains and protection of the block system, these cars must remain under the control of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Motion No. 56 takes away from the Government or the Grain Transportation Commissioner the ability through Order in Council to transfer any administrative control over those cars away from the Canadian Wheat Board. Throughout the history of this legislation, the Canadian Wheat Board Act, the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement and the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, it did not matter if it was a Tory government, Liberal government or the CPR because their word was no good. A deal is a deal. We specifically know why the Conservatives in the last couple of weeks are interested in going along with the Liberals to do away with the statutory grain rate. The reason is that Canadian Pacific Limited doubled their contribution to the Tory and Liberal Parties last year. They raised it from $25,000 to $50,000 each.

• (2230)

An Hon. Member: Do you have proof?

Mr. Benjamin: Yes, thanks to the Chief Electoral Officer and thanks to the fact that during a minority Parliament we were able to have legislation on election expenses passed which allowed us to get this information.

Furthermore, Mr. Burbidge, President of CP, did not give the Tories anything but gave the Liberals $221.68.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, he does appear to be straying from the amendment before the House. I would invite him to return to the amendment.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, we already know but I am trying to have the Chair understand why the Liberal Government and the Tory Opposition are prepared to weaken the Canadian Wheat Board and orderly marketing. They want their friends in the CPR and the private grain trade to further decrease the powers of the Wheat Board and its ability to allocate cars in a proper proportion to the elevator companies that are owned by the farmers in order to give more cars to their friends in the Winnipeg commodity exchange and James Richardson and Son. I see the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson). He is in bed with Otto Lang. That is a strange couple, or maybe not so strange.

When we tried to get the mineral rights which was given to PanCanadian Oil in 1881, approximately nine million acres of oil and gas rights, I could understand why the Grits and the Tories were not very happy about that. While it was not a great sum, the Tories received $1,200 and the Liberals received $650 from PanCanadian Petroleum. That is a totally owned subsidiary of Canadian Pacific Enterprises. I think PanCanadian bought banquet tickets from the Tories. That is how they fill their banquet halls. The Liberals and Tories have the corporations pay for the tickets and then hand them out to their friends.

We know why the Conservatives have yet to say that they want to keep the Crow rate and stop this legislation, which they could have done weeks ago. The Tories have moved all these motions on unanimous consent which they will debate if we are lucky and then vote on. But they will vote against the Bill. It may look good but they still do not want to stop the Bill. They never have.

The architect of the legislation was hired by the Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). We must have an idea of what is happening since the Liberals kept him on the payroll. The architect of the legislation refused to accept amendments No. 55 and No. 56 in the committee on behalf of the Government.

The control of the railway cars by the Canadian Wheat Board is essential because the sales, marketing and transportation of grain are inextricably linked and cannot be separated. We believe that control must remain with the Canadian Wheat Board and will not tolerate any sell-out to the contributors from Canadian Pacific Limited and this unholy alliance between the Conservatives and Liberals to get rid of the Crow rate. That has always been agreed to and accepted by the Tory Party here, if not in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy listening to the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) talk about those steps he intends to take. At the same time, however, his Party has moved an amendment, after our amendment which would keep the Crow for three years, which in effect demolishes the Crow rate immediately. Their amendment moves the rate from 2.5 per cent to 3 per cent. I find that hard to believe.

Members will have noticed that the Member for Regina West did not really debate the motions at hand. He talked at great length about other issues because the motions which he moved are not very strong, and when one does not have a strong case, one does not debate it. I can understand why. The authority of the Canadian Wheat Board to allocate cars existed for some time. It has had control of the placement of cars in the Prairies.

When we came to Government in 1979 everyone in the industry recognized that the system was not efficient and there was not an orderly movement of grain from the delivery point to the ports. The solution was obvious since it was used years ago, during the war, when it was essential to get food to the ports. It was decided that a neutral arbitrator should be in place, someone who could decide where the responsibility for decisions should lie in a neutral way.

That was the reason for establishing a co-ordinator and at that time a task force went across the nation, particularly in the Prairies where it was essential to get the information and to gather the facts. Most in the industry expressed the view that a co-ordinator should be put in place and that among other responsibilities he should act as a neutral arbitrator to help resolve problems that often lingered in that area at that time.

When that recommendation was made, the co-ordinator was not established to allocate cars only to the pools on the Prairies because they are not the only organization that has the producers' interest at heart. There is the United Grain Growers, which is also a co-operative, as well as Pioneer Grain Company, Parish and Heinbecker and Cargill. There are many other producer companies. For instance, there is the terminal that was built at Weyburn by producers who had difficulty getting cars, even though they built one of the most modern facilities on the Prairies, to deliver the farmer's product to the market.

Another fact which was made clear was that while the Canadian Wheat Board had the producers' interest at heart, it was basically in a conflict of interest with itself in regard to the allocation of cars. Obviously, its job was to sell grain in the export market and therefore it had a desire to get as much of that grain to the port as possible using the number of cars it had in the system. Therefore, rather than allocating cars as well to a very important domestic producing and processing industry, it would want to put cars into the export market. This is where the conflict arose. No one in the Wheat Board could make the arbitrary or neutral decision.

That is why the co-ordinator became so important in 1979. I think the co-ordinator is important today because a decision must be made about the use of cars in the system for delivery into the domestic market and the export market. While it might not be efficient to have a surplus of cars, there would be no difficult decisions to make because the Wheat Board could have control over the cars for the export market if there were more than needed. But that has never been the case. It is a very expensive storage program if we have too many cars in the system. It would be far better, given the number of cars that are necessary in the system, to use them in the most efficient manner. One day a greater turnaround means a

greater number of bushels over a year that can be delivered to port, I have just forgotten the figure.

● (2240)

I can understand why the Hon. Member for Regina West did not debate his two motions too strongly. I do not believe there are very many people on the Prairies who would agree with his motions. The co-ordinator has operated very well in the past. The new Bill suggests that that institution remain, that it be given the powers to see that cars are allocated in an efficient manner and that efficiency continues to operate in the system.

I conclude by saying it is no wonder the Hon. Member who just spoke tried to tie into the Conservative Party, because when you look at the motion the NDP just moved, that Party is trying to get Members who are now debating off their motion and on to other areas. We will not forget very quickly the motion that the NDP moved by unanimous consent to destroy the Crow.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to enter into this debate and to know that the people who are watching, or who read the proceedings later will know that the comments made by the Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) are, like most of what the Tories have been putting on the record, just a lot of hot air.

The two amendments which have been proposed by my colleague from Regina are very important, particularly for constituencies such as mine or for elevator systems. The most modern and largest grain elevator being built in Canada, one of the largest in the world, is in Prince Rupert. As most Members know, it is by far majority controlled by the Saskatchewan and Alberta Wheat Pools. I know the position of those two pools. They do not like Bill C-155. They have managed one way or another to take some of the Tories to task for the flim-flam position they are taking. I am sure they will take them to task for the same flim-flam that they are putting up about this proposal tonight to try and get some press and try to get the message out that the NDP are planning to break the Crow. Any farmer or producer on the Prairies who reads our amendments, who reads any of our speeches or who speaks to any of us, knows that the one thing we stand for fundamentally in terms of the overall legislation is no change to the Crow. The Tories are in favour of change. None of them dispute it. They are in favour of five times Crow. They should be standing up in the House and saying that rather than doing what they are doing, which is trying to use smoke, mirrors, rhetoric and falsifying various pieces of information which they bring forward in the House about what their position really is. I think they should really tell the truth, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) just said that Members of the Tory Party falsified information. I challenge him to document that. I dare him. I doubt that he could at all make the claim—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not making a point of order. He will shortly be recognized for purposes of debate. The Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton).

Mr. Fulton: That is right, Mr. Speaker. When I say the Tories have been using false information in the House, people know it is true. The Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) is trying to deny that through the back door.

The two amendments that are before the House are very important in terms of the allocation of grain cars. I think it is important that perhaps some Members on the Government side explain why they will vote against them. I think Canadians have some right to know where Members of the governing Party are coming from in voting against all of these amendments that will come before the House tomorrow.

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) has come up with various proposals, again trying to use his own smoke and mirrors in western Canada by saying he is proposing some kind of a safety net. One part of a safety net which the Government could support and which the Tory Party could support is contained in these two amendments. Let me take a moment to go through both of them. As anyone can tell when they read them, they dovetail. They intend to achieve the same purpose.

The first amendment, Motion No. 55, is to give control over railroad grain cars and the allocation of them to the Canadian Wheat Board. We know that the Liberal and Tory tag team are attempting to take away historic control over grain car allocation from the Wheat Board to provide it either to the Minister or to the Administrator, so that the private grain trade can get more cars and the entire nature of grain movement and grain transportation in Canada can be shifted more quickly into the hands of a few people out to make a quick buck rather than give it to people interested in the producers. They do not think about the enormous value grain production and its export has for Canada and our balance of trade.

There are a number of argument for control. The chief of these is that the Canadian Wheat Board, for reasons given by my colleagues on many former amendments, including myself, in terms of the facilitation of sales, the knowledge of the location of grade of grains and the protection of the block system, should have these cars under its control.

Motion No. 56 flows directly from that. This amendment would remove the ability to transfer the administration and control or the ownership of those grain cars presently owned by the Wheat Board to the Minister of Transport. I would be interested to hear from these two Parties who claim to be the great front runners for free enterprise in Canada. For example, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) knows a little bit about cars, used cars in particular but cars in general. Would he like his own personal car transferred to the Minister of Transport so that the Minister could drive around and use it? The Hon. Member for Vegreville pays the insurance, pays for the purchase of the car, pays for the new tires, greasing and any motor work that has to be done. But who actually uses the car? The Minister of Transport.

The producers in Canada are not naive about some of the deals being made by the Liberals and Conservatives in the interests of the private grain trade, the Cargills, the Otto Langs and certain people in the Winnipeg commodity exchange and so on who want to make more money for themselves. They consider themselves to be entrepreneurs out of the grain business. They want to get that money for themselves. Those cars the producers have paid for one way or the other, whether through a process of not getting as much payment per bushel or per tonne for their grain for a few years while buying grain cars. Now those hopper cars are all over the country. But what the Minister of Transport, the Liberals, along with their Tory friends are saying now is "That is fine. Those cars have been paid for".

These two Parties claim to stand for property rights. They have the audacity and the pomposity to stand in this House and say that, and then go across the country and say they stand for property rights. Those two Parties have brought in almost every expropriationary power in Canada. In my own Province of British Columbia the 48 major expropriation powers that are there were brought in by the Tories, the Liberals and the new coalition called the Socreds. In this case, those farmers, whether in Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia or Manitoba, who have paid for those cars are now being told that the use made of those cars, where those cars are going to be, their availability and so on, will be determined outside of their control, outside of the control of the Canadian Wheat Board. That is expropriation. That is blatant rip-off of something that someone has earned the money for, paid for and now is being denied the right of use.

I do not wonder any more why Liberals and Tories do not get up to speak. What they want to do is create illusions outside the House of Commons about what they are really doing. It is difficult in a forum such as this to get a message out. We in here can see. We listen to the debates. We watch the Minister of Transport go and sit with the Hon. Member for Vegreville. They chat nicely and titter, titter, titter. Then the Hon. Member for Vegreville goes to the Minister of Transport and they make various proposals to help each other. I think producers in the West are waking up pretty damn quickly as they see no Liberal Member speaking and they see Tory Members telling stories that are total fabrication, that all of a sudden the NDP has today decided to completely change its position.

An Hon. Member: It has. Read the amendment.

Mr. Fulton: What a lot of rubbish! I hear someone say "Read the amendment". I know exactly what is in that amendment.

Mr. McKnight: Explain. You don't understand it.

Mr. Fulton: I know what the purpose of it is. The Members are saying explain. We will have plenty of time to explain in this House. You can stand up and use your little tricks to say: "Well, now the NDP has changed its position".

• (2250)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member realizes his remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. Fulton: I am always glad to address my comments through the Chair. However, I want to return to the key point in Motion No. 56. I want to hear the Hon. Member for Vegreville and the Minister of Transport put on the record their position so that Canadian producers can sit down at home and read it. Then they will discover why the man who claims he wants to be Minister of Transport and the man who claims he is the Minister of Transport would not support those cars for which the producers have already paid staying under their control through the Canadian Wheat Board. I think they have a right to know that the Tories and Liberals think that the Administrator is just a kind fellow who happens to be putting all the cars out for Cargill and moving the grain down to the United States with Canadian-owned cars that were paid for by the sweat off the brow of Canadian families working on the Prairies and that these two groups consider themselves to be free enterprisers who can make another special deal for CPR.

In conclusion, I would like to refer to a quote of Sir Clifford Sifton when the Crow rate was agreed on by the CPR and the Government of Canada made various statements about it. Mr. Sifton, who was party to the negotiations that established the 1897 Crow rate agreements, aid in 1929:

> I remember when as a young Minister in Laurier's Cabinet, Van Horne and Shaughnessy said a line into the Kootenay mining district would not be considered for 15 years. Also I remember that within six weeks the same two gentlemen came into my office and said they had to build this line and wanted a large bonus for doing it, that the CPR was on the verge of bankruptcy. We gave them this bonus against the public sentiment of two-thirds of the people of Canada. They built the line and the Kootenay mining development—

Of course, this was the nucleus of Cominco:

> —saved the CPR and saved a good many other things in Canada.

This is quite a different debate. The producers and people who are knowledgeable about the debate in western Canada are opposed to what the Liberal/Tory coalition is doing. I wish the Minister of Transport and the Hon. Member who thinks he should be the Minister of Transport would listen and tell Canadians why they do not support Motion No. 56.

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) as spoken. I have never heard so many lonesome neurons in all my life. What we heard was a bombast of words which meant nothing.

We are dealing with Motions Nos. 55 and 56. Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party are saying that the Canadian Wheat Board must be preserved. Those who believe in good would quickly have to agree, including Canadian farmers. The fact is that their warrant and premise does not lead to the proper conclusion. This has nothing to do with the strength of the Canadian Wheat Board. In fact, the Canadian Wheat Board has come to the realization that when the transportation and allocation of cars is in the hands of another agency, much of the flak against the Canadian Wheat Board is removed and

it is left to its proper and just role, the sale of grain in the international marketplace.

What did the Hon. Member for Skeena try to make us believe? He said, "I no longer wonder why the Tories do not speak". We had some 66 committee meetings across the Prairies. All told, there were 86 Members days for the entire New Democratic Party caucus. All 31 of its Members showed up for a total of 86 Member days. Two of our Members were there for 138 days. The Hon. Member for Skeena places himself on a high pedestal. He claims that he is knowledgeable about grain transportation. He is the great wheat farmer from Skeena! The great wheat farmer from British Columbia never showed up for a single committee meeting, according to the minutes of the Standing Committee on Transport.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. For the sake of the record, I would like to inform the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) that I am the environment and northern development critic, not the transport critic.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to know that he is the critic of something for his caucus. The point is that he hallucinated here, trying to make the claim that he no longer wonders why the Tories do not speak. Two of our Members were present for a total of 138 Member days, whereas the entire NDP caucus present for only a total of 86 Member days Their record in terms of what they do in the House is simply unbelievable.

I would like to return to Motions Nos. 55 and 56. The NDP position that the Wheat Pool should have control of the grain cars is interesting. Also it is interesting to note that 2,000 of those cars are owned by the Canadian Wheat Board and 12,000 are owned by the provincial Governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Members of the NDP would like us to believe that the situation is such that somehow they need to protect the control of the Canadian Wheat Board. Canadian farmers have found that when they have a transport agency to which they can go with transportation difficulties, they have been able to pinpoint and resolve their problems faster than when they go to the Canadian Wheat Board. The Canadian Wheat Board was comprised of people who were busy carrying out Canadian Wheat Board activities. They were involved in selling and international negotiations, and they were frustrated part of their day by looking after the car situation. Farmers believe that there was more efficiency in the measure brought forward by the Conservative Government in recent history when the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) was the Minister of Transport. From that time to the present we have seen a more efficient movement of grain in terms of the availability of cars.

NDP Members would like to steal away the successes we have accomplished and return to a system with an agency that principally works with the sale and marketing of grain rather than getting back to the nuts and bolts of fixing up the railways and getting the cars in place. Anyone who deals with the Canadian Wheat Board today will tell us that its credibility was enhanced when it did not have to take the brunt of looking after the organization of cars. I notice Mr. Speaker is nodding; I appreciate your approval of that argument. Hon. Members of the NDP are always taking the position that if we try to establish another agency for the movement of grain, we diminish the power of the Canadian Wheat Board. I appreciate the fact you understand, Mr. Speaker, that by taking away the heat from the Wheat Board, we enhance its credibility in the eyes of the farmers.

Turning to the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse), my goodness, he is a great Member because he attended 45 days of meetings. The Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) attended 17 meeting days. That is the end of the Party's list. Two of them had an incredible record! The next highest is six meeting days, the highest of the next three NDP Members on the list. Let me read the first seven Members of our Party—60 days, 63 days, 62 days, 66 days, 54 days, 28 days and 25 days. The NDP would like the whole country to believe that somehow they travelled all across the country listening to farmers defend their views. Now they are defending the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mrs. Mitchell: I made four speeches.

• (2300)

Mr. Malone: The Hon. Member says she gave four speeches, one right after the other that day. She is here now speaking on one of the most important issues ever to affect western Canada and saying, "I gave four speeches on that one day; I want all the credibility you can give me because I was there fighting for my country, four speeches that afternoon". They make a mockery out of that. The truth is that what we want in this country is an efficient transportation system. It is not a case of trying to salute whether or not it is the Wheat Board that is the great Magna Carta of the universe. It is not a case of trying to pick out some agency. It is a case of trying to put together a system that works. If the Wheat Board can handle its principal job of sales, if an agency can handle the principal job of allocating the cars and if we do not have to have a mismash in the farmer's mind concerning who does what and who hawls out the other for not fulfilling his responsibilities, that makes more sense.

Because the New Democratic Party politically recognizes that farmers appreciate the Wheat Board, it thinks that everything it has done in the past must be preserved, irrespective of some improvements we might make for the future. Because it uses that simple form of argument to find that which is labelled "good", then anything associated with it it calls good and tries to say it is on the side of the farmers. That Party is simply wrong. There is nothing to prove that better than the speech of the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton). What an interesting speech. What a loathsome speech. It said and meant nothing. It had nothing to do with transportation. He said we falsified our data and could not give any evidence of it. The best evidence we can give as to their credibility is the fact that, all told, they gave 86 Member days to the committee and two of our Members gave 138 days.

I see, Mr. Speaker, you are grabbing the arms of your chair, either in suspense, because you want me to go on, or because you want to tell me that my time is up. As I presume it is the latter, I will resume after the NDP has put up some of its speakers.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks on the motions before us tonight. There are two basic proposals here. Motion No. 56, which is second in the way it is presented here, proposes to delete a clause of the Bill which outlines the powers of the Minister respecting the operation of railway cars. It would delete subclause 33(3) which reads:

Notwithstanding anything in this or any other Act of Parliament, the Governor in Council may, by regulation, transfer the administration and control of any railway cars held by the Canadian Wheat Board on behalf of the Government of Canada from the Board to the Minister.

That is what the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) is proposing to delete in this motion. He is proposing to add to the Bill something which would have the effect of amending Subclause 33(1). It would drop the portion that now requires the Minister to take control of the supply of rolling stock and to ensure the adequate supply of rolling stock. He rewords that to say that the administration and control of any railway cars so acquired for the purpose of moving grain, and I quote:

—and the Minister shall take every reasonable initiative to ensure that adequate supply of rolling stock will be provided for the efficient, reliable and effective movement of grain.

It goes on further to say:

The Minister may enter into agreements with the owners or lessees of railway cars and the Wheat Board shall administer control of railway cars acquired or leased by the Board or by the Minister on behalf of Her Majesty, and the Canadian Wheat Board may in respect of railway cars under its administration and control enter into agreements with railway companies respecting the operation of the railway cars.

These changes are consistent with the changes we have been trying to bring to the Bill. We have been trying to stop the change to the rates which erode the bargaining power and the spending power of Canadian farmers. We have also been attempting to stop the erosion of the Canadian Wheat Board, which shows up in several instances in this Bill. This is a case in point.

The Canadian Wheat Board has, as part of its duties, the job of allocating the cars to various points where the correct grades of grain are located. It uses the block system of shipping. Basically what happens is that the Wheat Board determines what grain is needed one month hence at which ports. It sets out a scheme of determining from the railroads how many cars are available in that period of time. Each week it takes the allocation of cars that the railways have available to the Board and sends them out so many hundreds of cars per block. Within the block, the elevator companies that have gathered the grain have orders from the Board for the various kinds and grades of grain.

They look at their stocks around the block and get their percentage of cars based on the amount of business they have done over the past year. They allocate their percentage of the cars to those elevator points that have the correct grade and kind of grain so that that grain gets delivered at the appropriate time to the ship. It is a system that works very well. It is crucial to that system that the Board have some control of what happens to the cars.

In 1977-78 there was great difficulty getting any cars to move grain. At that point in time the Board determined to start purchasing cars with producer's money. Some 2,000 such cars were purchased. In addition, some of the Provinces were persuaded to make arrangements to add to the car fleet as well. Also, the federal Government was sprung for a little more money and it supplied a few more cars. It is an interesting statistical exercise. If you wish to take the increase to the hopper car fleet from that time and look at the increased amount of grain that is shipped, it works out almost in exact proportion.

We have been able to set a new record for exporting and shipping grain this year, almost exclusively because of our ability to have more cars made available. The fact that we increased the fleet provided most of that necessary extra capacity. There was perceived to be a political problem in 1979 as to how the allocation of cars was made. The Conservative Government of that day thought that the Wheat Board was not being entirely fair. It was listening to some of the private grain traders who had received a few years before the right to market feed grains through the open market rather than have the Wheat Board supply the domestic markets, as had been the case for many years before. The power of the Wheat Board was broken down further with the domestic feed grains policy.

● (2310)

Some people who were new in the open marketing of feed grains were charging that the Wheat Board was not fair to them and they were not getting their amount of cars in order to move grain. In fact, the Board was taking great care to make certain that volumes of grain in storage at all the pertinent places were kept at a high level. They were monitoring the volumes that the private trade did have in storage and they were allowing those volumes to remain in storage at a considerably higher proportion to sales than what the Board itself considers efficient within its organization. They were allowing far more storage to take place under the private system than had been imposed upon producers and the Board by the former Transport Minister, Otto Lang, who had carried on what had been begun by the current Member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Hamilton). He had begun the deterioration of the Wheat Board by permitting feed mills to buy their supplies from outside the Board.

It is not because we are paranoid that we are concerned about the further erosion of the Board. Farmers, Members and residents of western Canada have seen the deterioration of the Wheat Board with policies brought in by the Progressive Conservatives and expanded and carried even further by a Liberal Government. We see some of the proposals in this Bill, particularly Clause 33 that has the effect of further eroding the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board. We would stop that

erosion with the movement and inclusion of these two motions by taking away some powers that the Bill proposes to give to the Minister and giving back some powers to the Wheat Board.

One of the major necessities of completing a sale is being able to assure your customer that you can in fact deliver the grain. A major part of being able to assure that delivery is to be able to have as much control as possible over the mechanism that provides that delivery, in this case hopper cars. If the Wheat Board has control and management of the hopper cars, it has a very vital trump card to play when negotiating with the railways for delivery service because it has control of the cars. All the railways have to do then is to supply the locomotive power. There is no complaint about lack of—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Weatherhead): Order. Is the House ready for the question? The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight).

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate. I do not know whether it is the late hour but I could understand the misconceptions of the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) regarding Bill C-155. I know he was handed a prepared text and he went on about the ownership of the cars purchased by the producers, people who own Canadian Wheat Board permit books. The Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse), who attended several meetings, went on in the same vein about cars owned by the producers.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, I said "controlled by the Wheat Board".

Mr. McKnight: I would like to draw to the attention of both those Members who spoke that for all the good intentions of the Canadian Wheat Board to purchase the cars, the holders of the Canadian Wheat Board permit books did pay for those cars. But the legal ruling is that we do not own them. They belong to the Government of Canada. They belong to the Crown. The Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre has a Canadian Wheat Board permit book and he should know. When the Hon. Member for Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle (Mr. Lefebvre) in committee was asked the question, did the Canadian Wheat Board as a separate entity own those cars, he answered, no, the Canadian Wheat Board is for all purposes an agency of the Government of Canada, so in fact the Board by law purchases those cars on behalf of the Government of Canada. It owns it because it is the legal entity that can own property. Mr. Speaker, those cars are owned by the Government of Canada. They are not owned by the producers or by the Canadian Wheat Board.

When you look at the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), you see it is the same amendment that he put forward in committee which was ruled out of order and the same amendment that the Hon. Member said would not affect the allocation of cars. I probably made a mistake in drafting this because this section does not pertain to the allocation of cars. The Hon. Member for Regina West put forward the same amendment here that was found in order. When you look at the Bill it shows that it has absolutely nothing to do with the allocation of cars.

The Hon. Member for Skeena could well have talked to some of his colleagues who attended some committee meetings and he may have been brought more up to date. We look at Motion No. 56 put forward by the Hon. Member for Regina West. This motion has absolutely nothing to do with allocation, and what he wants to do is to take away from the Minister the authority, by regulation, to transfer, administer and control any railway cars held by the Canadian Wheat Board on behalf of the Government of Canada.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if we follow this through we will find out that the Minister is in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I just want to help the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight). The control of the Canadian Wheat Board is under the Secretary of State in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board who is in the other place. All we want to do is to keep these grain cars under the control and administration of the Wheat Board. We are not talking about administration.

Mr. McKnight: That should be taken as given, but I think you will find, if you read the word "responsibilities", that the Secretary of State for the Canadian Wheat Board is an assistant to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy).

Mr. Benjamin: That is their problem.

Mr. McKnight: The Minister has an assistant. I am not too sure how much assistance that Minister in the other place would give any Minister of the Crown, but that is not the problem that we have on this side. But the Minister is in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. The Minister being in charge of the Wheat Board he would, in turn, have control of all the cars that are under the control of the Canadian Wheat Board. The Canadian Wheat Board is an agency of the Crown and that Minister is responsible. So we have here one motion by the Hon. Member that wants to remove any responsibility by regulation, transfer, administration and control of any railway cars held by the Canadian Wheat Board out of the hands of the Minister, but then he wants them left in the hands of the Minister because that Minister is responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board.

• (2320)

I find it difficult to decide what these amendments will do for grain producers in western Canada. How can we have an amendment that does not recognize that the Canadian Wheat Board, therefore the Government, owns the cars even though the producers may feel that they pay for them? A lot of people questioned the Canadian Wheat Board when those cars were purchased. Those people were condemned as being against the Wheat Board. The Board is strong enough in western Canada and has the respect of farmers there so it can withstand criticism. Although it is well managed in most cases, it is not

without fault. The Board does not deny that there was some problem with the purchase, but it did it out of necessity.

One amendment would take powers away from the Minister and then transfer them back to the Canadian Wheat Board and the other deals with the control of cars that are already owned by the Government.

I hope that the NDP will debate these motions quickly. They must have motions that they feel are more important than these. I think we should be able to do something to enhance the Bill. The Minister is here, he is interested in the debate and we should be able to persuade the Government to take a closer look at amendments put forward this afternoon.

Mrs. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak on these amendments although I confess I am not an expert on the Crowsnest Pass freight rates. The Bill has been a tremendous education to us all and we see what it means to be a Canadian. At first I think many of us felt that the Bill had particular significance only to farmers on the Prairies and to the whole agricultural economy there.

As critic for this Party on the status of women, last night I spoke to farm women and I was interested to hear their concerns about the Bill. Often farm women maintain a home, work on the farm in partnership with the family and are forced to go to work in the community in order to bring in more money. The increase in the freight rates will make it even more difficult for them and their families to manage.

These amendments have a particular significance for British Columbians, particularly for the Port of Vancouver.

Motions No. 55 and No. 56 are concerned with the role of railway cars. I do not think the Minister has made it clear why the Liberals want to change the authority for control and distribution of the railway cars. I am not aware of any reason for concentrating power in the Minister or why the Canadian Wheat Board would not have control. I can only conclude that, as usual, the Liberals are more interested in centralized bureaucratic control than in having it closer to the producers. One wonders whether they want to give more control over to the railways as well.

One could ask whether there is a dispute between the Minister in the other place and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) in the House. Whatever the motivation, the Minister offered no explanation.

The NDP has a very clear and distinct reason for disagreeing with Motion No. 55 and for proposing Motion No. 56. We want the Canadian Wheat Board to be more powerful, and to be able to coordinate the transportation of grain through the system to the point of export, which in my riding is the Port of Vancouver. This means that they must be able to call out whichever type of grain is needed at a particular time, whether it be wheat, barley, oats, etc.

Regarding Motion No. 55, it simply says that the grain cars to which the Canadian Wheat Board now has title should be transferred in title to the Minister of Transport at his pleasure. These cars were purchased from the pool account maintained by the Wheat Board. That means they were purchased from the farmers' money. The amount of money distributed to farmers from the sale of their grain was reduced by the amount that it cost to buy these cars. To simply transfer the ownership of these cars to the Government without any recognition of this fact or the payment of any compensation would be, at the very least, an injustice. It really constitutes a special tax by the state on farmers. All the hoary traditions of British democracy, such as it is, militate against that sort of thing.

It could be pointed out that the question of Government spending on grain cars was itself a controvertial issue and spending by the Wheat Board for this purpose even more so. The argument, at the time, was why should others assume the burden of this capital cost that properly belongs to the railroad. However, the producers, knowing the job had to be done and faced with the intransigence of the railroads, made the investment. This, of course, was good for the country. Should they now be penalized for that? Should they be double-taxed? I believe that view was presented in committee.

I should like now to refer to a letter issued by a very famous statesman, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

An Hon. Member: What?

Mrs. Mitchell: He appears to be an expert on this whole question. This Member has a valuable ability to produce a constant flow of information. I wish Members to my right could get on his mailing list.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I already subscribe to the *National Enquirer* and all the joke books.

Mrs. Mitchell: In a letter to constituents he wrote:

> Greetings: I just reviewed some of the earlier letters that I sent to you, and I see that this October 4th I promised to explain, "next letter," the reason why it is so important to maintain the Wheat Board's control over the allocation of grain cars. The pressure of events here caused it to slip my mind.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That was my reaction.

● (2330)

Mrs. Mitchell: Remembering the pressure of the event on that particular day I cannot help but smile a little, Mr. Speaker. I will continue:

> —it is very important that the Wheat Board retain control of the allocation of grain cars. As Justice Hall pointed out, the concentration of knowledge in the offices of the Wheat Board makes for a very efficient system of moving our grain to export position.
>
> This Bill would tamper with that and would do our country no good.

So said the Hon. Member for Regina West. As I understand this whole issue, Mr. Speaker, having the control of grain cars under the authority of the Wheat Board—and we are talking about control, not ownership—would make for a much more efficient system of moving grain to export as it is needed than we have had in the past. In the port of Vancouver, for example, one of the big concerns which we constantly have is that we look out at the English Bay and we see 10, sometimes 20 ships sitting there, moored in the outer harbour, from all

over the Pacific rim. Of course, we know that the demurrage cost of keeping these ships moored while waiting for their cargo to be loaded, in this case, particular types of grain, is very costly. An unfortunate myth also is that people tend to blame the longshoremen for the fact that these ships are waiting in the port. As I understand it, very often it is the fact that there has not been an efficient grain transportation system for that particular type of grain which a particular ship wants for a particular country at a particular time. It is not there when that ship comes into port. As my hon. colleague says it can get worse if the system is not improved.

The whole marketing of the grain as I understand it, requires control over transportation. The movement of grain must be co-ordinated by the chief marketing agency, which is the Canadian Wheat Board. Therefore, the Wheat Board should allocate the cars according to the type of grain which is needed at a particular time for export; in this case, as I mentioned, the port of Vancouver. Cars must be delivered to coincide with shipping requests.

I recently visited the port of Vancouver in relation to this Bill. Many of the port officials, as well as the waterfront unions, were very concerned that the motion which the Conservatives brought in would make it very difficult for the port of Vancouver to maintain exports through the port. Many of these were going to be transferred to Seattle. I saw the whole process of moving grain from the grain cars through the wheat elevators to the ships. It is a very complicated system, indeed. I can appreciate as a lay person, Mr. Speaker, that it is extremely important that we improve the co-ordination of this whole system. As pointed out by my hon. colleagues, certainly with much more expertise than I, the best way to do this is through the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to her has expired. She may continue only with unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There does not appear to be unanimous consent.

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, at this moment we are discussing Motions Nos. 55 and 56, both of which have been proposed by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). These motions have to do with a very important part of the whole Bill, as are all of the motions from my hon. colleague. In general, I would say that the whole debate from the very beginning until now has been that the New Democratic Party has insisted on continuing to try to protect the income of the prairie farmer and at the same time protect the control of the Canadian Wheat Board. Motion No. 55, to begin with, has been inserted into Clause 33 so that the clause would no longer read as it now stands but would read as follows:

Western Grain Transportation Act

The Minister may, on behalf of Her Majesty, acquire or lease railway cars for the purpose of moving grain and administer and control any railway cars so acquired or leased—

The amendment to be included is:

—for the purpose of moving grain—

And continuing:

—and the Minister shall take every reasonable initiative to ensure that an adequate supply of rolling stock will be provided for the efficient, reliable and effective movement of grain.

Those of us who grew up in the Prairies would naturally know that the movement of grain is extremely important. It is the very heart and life of the farming economy of the Prairies. Those of us who grew up in Prairie towns will know that the whole system of movement has improved a great deal over the last 25 or 30 years by a technology which has been brought in in the use of grain cars. These cars have been basically designed by the farmers themselves, by the railway companies and by the engineers. The original grain cars which were used to carry produce on the railroads, and which had originally been planned to carry all kinds of materials of any shape whatsoever, were the old square boxcars which had side doors. I can remember well as a young person at home when one or two cars would come into the local siding. The elevator operator would bring out a kind of special pry that they had for moving the car back and forth a few feet without the use of an engine. The next thing which would be necessary is that they would have to put inside the car door a wall which was made out of slab material. The grain had originally been shovelled in by the farmers. Later it would be piped in out of an elevator. However, the whole formation of the car was not made for the carrying of grain. It was a very inconvenient way of carrying grain. When it finally arrived at the port or elevator where it was to be dumped, the workers had to break that whole wall down which was holding the grain in the cars, and the lumber was just wasted. The Wheat Board bought the new steel cars which are now commonly seen carrying grain across the Prairies, although they are owned by the Government of Canada, as has been pointed out very clearly in the debate. The efficiency of putting grain from a prairie elevator into a car, moving it to the port and dumping it quickly, has been greatly improved with a new design. That is extremely important. It has been a great step forward. The particular amendment which we are talking about ensures that this control would remain with the Wheat Board which saw that it would have to have the proper kind of rolling stock to move the grain. My friend and colleague, the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight), has indicated that Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party were unnecessarily concerned about this and that we were wrong in the fact that we were saying that the Wheat Board owned the cars. Unfortunately, my friend was misinformed about our position because that is not true. We understand that the cars are owned by the Government of Canada. However, the important thing about the amendment is that the Canadian Wheat Board shall administer and control the use of the cars. That is where the very heart of the argument is.

The Canadian Wheat Board is the organization which has been set up by prairie farmers to be an agency which will protect, guide and direct the sale of grain from the moment it is collected at a certain point and shipped to the port at the time when it will be available to sell to a certain part of the world which needs that grain at that particular time. It is a long, complicated, intricate problem which has to be solved if the economy of western Canada is to continue to grow. That is why our amendment, Motion No. 55, which will be spoken about now, insists upon the fact that the Canadian Wheat Board shall administer and control the railroad cars, whether they be leased or owned.

● (2340)

I appreciate the fact that the former Minister of Transport would have liked to have had that power in his hands. That Minister of Transport and I were actually engaged in an election together and I know him quite well. The present Minister of Transport will, I believe, unfortunately meet the same fate as the Minister of Transport of whom I have spoken, the one I had the privilege to run against during an election. Probably one of the Hon. Members in the front row, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn), or the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) who plans to be the next Minister of Transport if that happens to be the fate of the country, will meet the same fate. On the Prairies, it is a very difficult and dangerous job to be the Minister of Transport and move the grain that makes the economy of that part of the world operate.

Again, I would say very clearly and specifically that the reason the Hon. Member for Regina West has proposed Motion No. 5 is that it clearly indicates that the Minister will not be taking over the control but that the control will be administered by the Canadian Wheat Board as it is now, so that we can be certain that those cars are in the right place at the right time because the people who want to move the grain at that particular time to the markets are calling for it.

Motion No. 56, also proposed by the Hon. Member for Regina West, is intended for the purpose of protecting the administration and the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board. The reason again, very simply put, is that this is the key to the whole system. The key to the system is who is in charge of the cars when they are needed and where they will be going with the product that is needed at port at that particular time.

I would just like to go on record, Mr. Speaker, along with my Party, as asking the Government and my colleagues on the Conservative side to support us in Motion No. 55 and Motion No. 56. We would like to make the point clearly and precisely that we want the control of cars to remain with the Wheat Board and not be transferred into the hands of the Minister. That transfer would create a whole new infrastructure of power and a whole new bureaucracy necessary to administer and control the system. As far as we are concerned, it would upset a system that is working properly at this time and should not be interfered with.

There will be plenty of problems down the road with this new Bill that is being pushed through the House. There will be plenty of difficulties, plenty of questions and plenty of regulations to be looked at without tampering with one that is so necessary and so much at the core of the matter as is the control of the transportation system and the cars. That control should remain with the Wheat Board. So, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for being allowed the opportunity to address this subject.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my friend from Saskatchewan spoke this evening about the movement of grain. Mr. Speaker, the movement of grain is the core for our Canadian Prairies. It is very important to the life of people in Western Canada. The Member for Saskatoon-East (Mr. Ogle) spoke from experience and he spoke with a passion for the West; he knows Western Canada and we should listen to what he said.

Motion No. 55 is an amendment aimed at making a Bill more like the kind of legislation we are in favour of. We in the New Democratic Party are opposed to any changes in the Crow rate because that would mark the end of farmers in Western Canada. My colleagues from Manitoba and Saskatchewan have told me that farmers can not afford the new rate. Now I realize that Quebecers understand the need to preserve a culture. That is the problem here. We must preserve and conserve the culture of Western Canada.

I want to ask one question. Is it right for an anglophone Government to change the culture and life of the Province of Quebec without representation from Quebec? Here, the same thing is happening. A Government in Eastern Canada is proposing to change the culture of the West without any support from the people of Western Canada. I say it is not right. This evening, we of the New Democratic Party are proposing amendments. On this Bill, the Progressive Conservative Party on my right is not taking a strong position, no more than it has on any other issues in the House. It has no position at all on the Crow. We in the New Democratic Party said that the Crow must not change if we are to preserve the culture of Western Canada. And although I may not be very articulate in French, I must speak a few words of French to explain to Quebecers why this is so important to us in Western Canada. We hope that this amendment will help farmers in Western Canada. In it we are proposing that present system for moving grain, remain unchanged.

[*English*]

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I tried to say as best I can in French that this in fact is a Government of the East without representation from the West that is making a fundamental change in the culture of the west. I do acknowledge that there is one Member over there who is from the West. I have a great deal of trouble understanding why in fact

the Government is doing this without a great deal of representation and support from western groups.

Mr. Malone: No support.

Mr. Waddell: No support as far as I can see. As the Hon. Member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle), who knows the Prairies much better than do I and much better than do a lot of Government Members, so eloquently put it, Motion No. 55 is simply a motion that would see that control of these cars and the movement of the cars remain with the Canadian Wheat Board so that cars can be in the right place at the right time for the movement of that grain. I think this amendment makes sense and I invite the Government to adopt it.

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to enter into the debate on the motions that are now before us. These are motions which were introduced by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), Motions Nos. 55 and 56. The essential intent of these amendments is to preserve the position of the Canadian Wheat Board. As we stated earlier, many provisions in Bill C-155 attack the main tenets of western Canadian agriculture. We believe that it is an attack on the statutory Crow rate, obviously, and an attack on the Wheat Pools as well as the Canadian Wheat Board.

● (2350)

We have previously argued that the role of the Administrator and the Senior Grain Advisory Committee should not infringe on the job which the Wheat Board has been doing so well. The role of the Canadian Wheat Board has evolved from a lot of thought and consideration and experience which has gone into it. This bill, and particularly Clause 33, represents a further erosion of the powers and responsibility of the Canadian Wheat Board. That responsibility which is being transferred to the Senior Administrator is in essence under the control of the Minister and his Department.

I have stood here and pointed out on other occasions that the Department of Transport does not have a marvelous record and has made some major blunders in the past. I have cited such recent examples as the airports at Mirabel and Pickering as being major billion dollar estates made by the people in the Department of Transport.

We in Saskatchewan feel very unsure about giving more power to the Department of Transport over our lives in Saskatchewan. We simply do not trust the Department and certainly do not see any need for the functions of the Wheat Board to be transferred to the Administrator and, in essence, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy).

The Wheat Board has done a tremendous job in serving western agriculture. It does this job without much money from the public purse. The Wheat Board exists entirely on what the producers pay into it. This means that when the Wheat Board sends a delegation to China, for instance, to negotiate a new grain agreement, they are not being paid by the Canadian taxpayer but by the farmers of western Canada. The Canadian Wheat Board has done extremely well selling grain and moving it without a cost to the Canadian taxpayer, yet this clause of the Bill shows that the Government is adamant about interfering in an area in which it has no competency at all.

I am somewhat surprised by the lack of position which some of my Conservative friends have taken today. That lack of position is quite different from the position they took in the committee. In fact, when I read the committee records, I discovered that what they said on that occasion is quite different from what they have been saying in the House. To be sure, they have not said very much about this particular amendment. After reading the minutes of the committee I was struck by the fact that the Conservatives were quite surprised that those hopper cars which were bought by the producers were not in fact owned by them but by the Canadian Government.

Let me quote as follows from the minutes of the committee hearing held on September 13, 1983, at page 132 : 58:

MR. MCKNIGHT: Mr. Chairman, is the assumption of about 150,000 grain producers in western Canada, that they own the cars because they paid for them, in fact a fallacy? Is that what you are saying?

MR. D. LEFEBVRE: To the best of our knowledge, that is right.

MR. MCKNIGHT: I think there are going to be a lot of people terribly disturbed about what you have just said, Mr. Lefebvre. I happen to be one of them, because I helped pay for them. So did Mr. Gustafson; so did Mr. Mayer; so did Mr. Althouse.

Later on Mr. Mayer says:

I guess, Mr. Chairman, that totally makes us a socialist country. Everything the Government has is its. I mean, everything we have is the Government's, and by the grace of the Government us poor peasants are allowed to keep whatever we can keep.

First, the Conservatives in this committee were very surprised to learn that the producers in fact did not own these cars that they had paid for. Second, they were quite outraged at this. In fact, the last quote I will read into the record is of the Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) who said:

MR. MAZANKOWSKI: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support this amendment.

That was the amendment introduced by my colleague from Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) that would have prevented the Government from taking over those cars which the producer had bought. He went on to say:

I just wonder what would have to occur since the cars are now owned by the Government of Canada. You would have to do some title switching here to ensure that they were not transferrable. Could you, Mr. Kroeger, or Mr. Lefebvre outline what steps would have to be taken to achieve the spirit of Mr. Benjamin's amendment?

MR. D. LEFEBVRE: I think the words he is suggesting, except those 2,000 or the railway cars purchased with that money, would keep it with the Wheat Board—

In other words, the Hon. Member for Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle (Mr. Lefebvre) was saying that the amendment of the Member for Regina West would keep those cars in the control of the Wheat Board. Therefore, they would be in the control of the producers themselves.

That was the position taken by the Conservatives in the committee. I wonder what has happened since then? We have seen a lot of switches by our friends on the right.

Mr. Benjamin: More switches than the railways have.

Mr. de Jong: Indeed, I think he is quite right. On the one hand, the Conservatives in the committee were outraged. They wanted to change the situation and ensure that the title would not be switched to the Minister of Transport. However, from what we understand today, and interpret their remarks to be, they are quite prepared to see the title of these cars being transferred to the Minister of Transport. I am surprised that those Members, particularly the ones from Saskatchewan who should be protecting the role of the Canadian Wheat Board together with us, are quite willing to see the Canadian Wheat Board's role being diminished. If that is their position and the deal which they had to make in their own caucus at least to get the unified front, they should have the courage to stand in the House and be honest with us and to say exactly what their position is in terms of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

Mr. Gurbin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think it is appropriate that tonight, just prior to twelve o'clock, the House recognized, along with other Canadians, that while we have been sitting for 13 hours now we are just coming to the end of Halloween day, which many Canadians have observed. I think the Chair might find some sympathy in the House if we agree to seek unanimous consent to waive notice to have pumpkins included in the preferential rates under the Crowsnest Pass Agreement.

[*Editor's Note: For continuation of proceedings see Part II.*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 31, 1983

The House continued its sitting.

● (0000)

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member who just spoke has shown that the Tories are in for tricks and treats. They have brought us into these extended hours because they want to show sincere concern for the producers of western Canada but at the same time, when we are only partially through all of the motions and amendments, we see a Member from the Conservative Party rising in the House asking that we close down debate on this very important issue for the people who represent constituencies in the West.

I intend being heard this evening, until we get through all of these motions, about the very serious nature of this Bill and the effect it can have on grain producers in the communities of western Canada. It shows that over the years the Liberals and the Tories have been exactly the same. One can look at the $50,000 a year contribution they each get from Canadian Pacific. It shows over many years, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals and Tories are exactly the same whether you look at the $50,000 a year contribution which they each get from Canadian Pacific or whether we look back to the times of earlier elections, in the early 1800s.

I want to quote for the record from "A Record of the Conservative Administration 1878—1882" in preparation for an upcoming election campaign. Reference is made in the *Toronto Telegram* as follows:

> It is all very well for the chief organ of the Reform party to appeal to former friends to come to the rescue of the party now, and save it from annihilation.

This is the case here today. The quote continues:

> But in many quarters the appeal will not be met with a ready response. The organ has been abusing these people for years, and can hardly expect them to swallow all its abuse and meekly turn round and do its bidding. After the rout of September, 1878,—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair questions the relevance of the Hon. Member's quotation to the specific amendment before the House.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, it may not have been when you were very alert in the House this evening. I am speaking at twelve o'clock in the evening. I am quoting from a document which has a lot of relevance to the issue we are debating this evening. I think you should listen very closely. You can look at the "blues" tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, the Chair is listening very closely indeed and having even greater difficulty in determining the relevance. Can the Hon. Member demonstrate how this question is relevant to the debate?

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I can hardly see how you can interrupt me during a quotation in a debate in this House before I have finished the quote.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Will the Hon. Member please resume his seat. The Chair has an obligation in presiding over the House to call to the attention of Hon. Members the rule of relevance. It is perfectly in order for the Chair to call to the attention of Hon. Members the rule of relevance. It is perfectly in order for the Chair to do this and it has done for a number of Members this evening as the Chair does now for the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish). Will he please indicate the relevance of his quotation to the particular amendments before the House?

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, the relevance is that I am quoting from a book entitled "Facts for the Electors A Record of the Conservative Administration 1878-1882." Many of the facts in this booklet concern the program of the Conservative Party and its condemnation of the Liberal Opposition at that time. The facts that are contained in here had to do with the building of the rail system in Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not discussing the two specific amendments before the House. If the Hon. Member persists in being irrelevant, the Chair will have no alternative but to recognize another Hon. Member.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On behalf of the good electorate of The Battlefords-Meadow Lake, to which my riding is twinned, I would like to support very much your call for decorum, your call for order, your call for relevancy tonight. We feel in The Battlefords-Meadow Lake it is the least we can expect in this House.

An Hon. Member: You were speaking for the only Liberal in The Battlefords-Meadow Lake.

Mr. Benjamin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has invited the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake to indicate the relevance of the matters he is quoting to Motions Nos. 55 and 56, which are currently before the House at report stage of this Bill. Will the Hon. Member please indicate the relevance to these amendments?

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I hope this is not coming out of my ten minutes allotted time to debate this very important motion. But the relevancy and the bottom line of it is that

people in Canada and the rail companies bought boxcars even back in the regime of 1878 to 1882, as they do now. Back in those days at least the rail companies purchased the cars to transport the commodities throughout the country, whereas now the rail companies do not buy the cars any more. I am sure you are aware of that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is making an historical point. The amendments before us are very specific, amendments Nos. 55 and 56. If the Hon. Member has not read the amendments before the House, the Chair is quite prepared to bring them to his attention to assist him in focusing his argument. But in fairness to the House, the Hon. Member is under some obligation to demonstrate how what happened a century or so ago is relevant to this specific amendment proposed by his Party at this point.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, the rail lines in Canada came into existence during this time. It was the era preceding the setting of the statutory rate which we are reviewing in this House now, a rate we view as our historic right. I do not see how you can—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is making general comments and is not dealing with specific amendments. The rule of the House is very clear. Hon. Members at report stage are invited to speak specifically to the amendments before the House. The Hon. Member refuses to do so. If the Hon. Member will not deal with the amendments, the Chair will have no alternative but to recognize another Hon. Member.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, it is a question of control over the rolling stock, over the boxcars and the hopper cars that should be under the control of the Canadian Wheat Board and are not now. I do not know how much more relevant I can be than to quote from a document which was the forerunner to the setting of the historic freight rate which the farmers, the producers in western Canada have appreciated for a long period of time and view as their right. Thus I referred to the document. I will not continue the quotation. I will accept your ruling. I also state that there are facts in that document from which I would like to quote that are relevant to this debate on Bill C-155. I would say with all due respect to you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not need to be told what the amendments are.

I represent an agricultural riding, where agriculture is the number one industry. The amendments we are debating here are both put forward by the New Democratic Party. The reason we put them forward is that the railway companies no longer buy boxcars or hopper cars. In fact, I am not sure which rail company it is, but the last time either the CNR or the CPR bought boxcars was in the early 1950s. The other company has not bought boxcars since the late 1940s, prior to this Member being born. It is no wonder that we are concerned that these amendments must be put in place. Who has bought the boxcars recently?

Mr. Benjamin: Hopper cars.

Mr. Anguish: Who has bought the cars for the movement of grain in western Canada? My colleague has just brought to my attention it is not boxcars but hopper cars. Of course, I know that. But hopper cars are fairly new on the scene, Mr. Speaker. We did not have hopper cars in 1951. But who bought those hopper cars?

First, the federal Government bought some hopper cars, not the rail companies in Canada. It sure was not the Conservatives under an administration of theirs that forced the railway companies to meet their obligations, nor under the Liberals. Both of those Parties have been negligent; a curse on both their houses. The taxpayers of Canada purchased those hopper cars. More hopper cars were purchased. The Government of Saskatchewan purchased some hopper cars. The Government of Alberta purchased some hopper cars because it knew the vital interests that farmers played in the economies of those Provinces. They bought those hopper cars so the producers could move their grain to markets, to ports, because the rail companies failed to meet their obligations.

There is a third group which has purchased hopper cars in recent years. This is the real thrust of our amendment. The people who have purchased those hopper cars are the producers themselves through the Canadian Wheat Board. The Canadian Wheat Board purchased the cars because they thought that if the producers at least purchased their own cars, the rail companies would have a great deal more obligation to haul the grain out to markets where it could be sold. But it has not seemed to work that way.

The Conservatives did not do anything when they were in power to ensure that the grain would move better. The Liberals have not done anything to ensure that grain will move better now that they are in government. Even if the two of them together formed a coalition tomorrow, which they should because they are the same Party, I doubt whether the two minds coming together could move the grain any better than it moves at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

The thrust of our amendment, Motions Nos. 55 and 56 to Bill C-155, first is to give control over railroad grain cars and the allocation of them to the Canadian Wheat Board. If they have the responsibility to deliver that grain to the ports, as the farmers really do because they produce it and the Wheat Board orders it, they must also have the authority to make sure that those cars are in place when the farmers need them to move their grain to where it should be located, or to its final destination.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair hesitates to interrupt the Hon. Member. He was allowed three and a half minutes extra for the interruptions and he has had a fair allocation of time. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, we now have Motions Nos. 55 and 56, proposed by the Member for Regina-West (Mr. Benjamin), and these two motions are very important to us in Western Canada because according to

Bill C-155 and Clause 33, the federal Government, by regulation, has given considerable powers to the Administrator over the future of this Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in Clause 33, sub-clauses (4) and (5), it is said, and I quote:

Where the Administrator administers and controls any railway cars at the direction of the Minister, the Administrator may enter into agreements with the railway companies respecting the operation of the railway cars, subject to any agreements respecting such operation that have been entered into by the Minister.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said in this debate that it was very important to Western Canada to have, with the Canadian Wheat Board, the power to organize the grain transportation system in Western Canada, to organize transportation systems because this will be a very important factor. And last summer, more specifically in September, Mr. Jarvis, Chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board, appeared before the Special Committee dealing with this legislation and made the following statement, and I quote: "The Canadian Wheat Board, like any other sales organization, must control shipment of its own product in order to ensure performance. For these reasons the board has always held the view that overall control of the system, as it is developed in co-ordination with the total of the grain industry, should be administered by the board."

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Mr. Jarvis, as Chairman of the Canadian Wheat Board, must see that the administration and control over the grain transportation system rest with the Canadian Wheat Board.

But if we have a bill as well as a section such as Section 33, there is not much difference, for the Administrator must exercice many powers over the allocation of railway cars.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Canada has given the CPR a lot of money since 1881.

I have here some very important figures taken from the CP Rail and CN annual reports showing that we gave CP Rail direct subsidies totalling $13.5 million in 1982 dollars. For example, in 1960, we provided a direct subsidy of $12.9 million; in 1961, a subsidy of $32.3 million. Mr. Speaker, this is the reason why the government should have more powers over CP Rail, because for many years now, we have been most generous for railway companies.

I remember quite well that during the election campaign, CP Rail gave huge amounts not only to the Liberal Party but also to the Progressive Conservative Party. The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) who is here tonight has surely received a lot of money from CP Rail for his campaign. I am sure that his federal party received a lot of money. However, it is a good investment for CP Rail, Mr. Speaker, because the company received $31.6 million from the federal government in 1963 and $31.9 million in 1964. In 1965, $37.8 million from the Canadian Government; in 1967, $52.2 million from the Canadian Government. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked because the money we have given to the railways came from the pockets of my constituents, farmers, workers, small business employees and what not.

And it goes on and on. In 1968, $38.7 million were paid to CP Rail. In 1970, $27.8 million were paid to CP Rail. In 1971, still under a Liberal Government: $32.0 million; in 1972, $35.5 million; in 1973, $54.9 million; in 1974, $61.1 million; in 1975, $93 million; in 1976, $84.6 million. But from 1977 on, we went over the $100 million mark: $112.8 million went to CP Rail in this country.

Mr. Speaker, this is quite a big handout. We have been playing Santa Claus for a long time to CP Rail. This is why CP Rail must have this change to the Crow rate. In 1978, another very large increase, we once again went over the $100 million mark to $129.1 million. In 1979, $186 million were paid in grants to CP Rail. That was under a Progressive Conservative Government, not a Liberal one, headed by the Honourable Joe Clark as Prime Minister, and the same thing happened again, a huge grant was awarded to CP Rail. Perhaps it comes to the same thing.

But three years ago, in 1980, we spent $200 million, a massive grant of $221.6 million, and in 1981, $232.7 million.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt you now understand why CP Rail is very supportive of the Liberal Government in this country, because they will change the Crow rate. This is good for CP Rail. It has been getting a lot of money coming from the taxpayers in your constituency of Ottawa West, in my constituency of Yorkton-Melville, in Vancouver-Kingsway and from everywhere else in this land of ours.

That is why I have decided, or rather we in the New Democratic Party have decided to fight every inch of the way against the Government of Mr. Trudeau and the Progressive Conservative Party to stop the movement aimed at doing away with the Crow rate. Mr. Speaker, that is why I hope that the Progressive Conservative Members and the Liberal Members will join us and support Motions Nos. 55 and 56 in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

I should like to point out another thing, namely that the Canadian Wheat Board is very important for the producer in Western Canada. It is very important to have an organization like that, a collective organization for Western farmers similar to a union for workers, or a medical association for physicians, or an association for lawyers. It is very important for the farmers. I remember quite well when I was a little boy and my grandfather spoke about the time here in Canada when we had a wheat board and only the Winnipeg Exchange, the Chicago Exchange, the Richardson Grain Exchange and others where the price of grain, the price of wheat and the price of other commodities were set by a few capitalists throughout the world.

• (0015)

[*English*]

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a serious point of order if I could have about two minutes. It has been over two hours since we commenced the debate on Motions Nos. 55 and 56. That means that we are using one hour per amendment. There are 174 amendments on the Order Paper, of which we have considered 56. That leaves 118 amendments remaining. If we divide 24 hours into 118 motions, it comes to five full days. In other words, we will require ten full days to complete the debate. I suggest we are not being fair to Canadians when we spend all this time on one or two amendments. Surely Hon. Members can get to the point in a reasonable amount of time so that we can cover all amendments. If we do not accomplish that, the New Democratic Party will be just as guilty as was the Liberal Party in bringing in time allocation, because it is stopping us from debating some very important motions.

Mr. Waddell: A point of order.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I think the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) made an excellent point. However, why did his party waste a whole day preventing debate on Bill C-155 by presenting petitions which could have been tabled?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Hon. Members are not making points of order.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). I sympathize with him. We are not moving swiftly through the amendments, but they are very controversial matters. Adequate time has to be taken to deal with them. I am hopeful that by tomorrow, Wednesday or Thursday we will have reached the amendment in which he is particularly interested, but in the meantime he has to show some patience.

Mr. Waddell: I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has heard a number of interventions which were not really points of order. If the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) really has a point of order, the Chair will hear it.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the last point of Order so that Your Honour can rule on it. It seems to me—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has ruled that no one has really raised a point of order. The Chair has listened patiently to Hon. Members, but it is convinced that no points of order were raised. If the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway has a point of order, the Chair will hear it.

The Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant).

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, you did not say that with any great deal of enthusiasm.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is a little late in the day. The Chair does its best. The Hon. Member has been recognized.

Mr. Sargeant: I am well aware of that. I will do my best as well. I welcome the opportunity to speak once again on a group of amendments to this very important piece of legislation before the House of Commons.

Mr. Taylor: You don't have to tell us ten more times; you have already done it 20 times now.

Mr. Sargeant: I especially thank Hon. Members of the Conservative Party for providing me with an opportunity to rise at 12.30 in the morning of November 1 and debate this piece of legislation. I point out, however, to the Hon. Member from dinosaur that we in the New Democratic Party are not especially greedy. If they want to take their turn at debating the legislation—

Mr. Taylor: We do not want an opportunity to say the same thing over and over.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has recognized the Hon. Member for the purpose of debate on Motions Nos. 55 and 56. I draw the attention of Hon. Members to the fact that this is report stage and that debate should be strictly relevant to the motions before the House.

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, if you could keep this gaggle of geese over here quiet, I could deal with the amendments before the House.

Mr. Forrestall: Get your hands out of your pockets and stand up straight when you speak to the Chair.

Mr. Sargeant: We are debating Motions Nos. 55 and 56 which have been moved by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). Motion No. 55 reads in part:

> That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 33 by striking out lines 11 to 43 at page 16 and substituting the following therefor;
>
> "for the purpose of moving grain and the Minister shall take every reasonable initiative to ensure that an adequate supply of rolling stock will be provided for the efficient, reliable and effective movement of grain.

It is time the Government got around to requiring the railways, or indeed some agency in the country, to live up to the mandate of moving grain for the benefit of producers and farmers.

I am not an expert on farm issues. I did not grow up on a farm. The town in which I grew up and still live in is not really a farming community. There are some farmers in the surrounding area, but its main source of income was for many years a Canadian Air Force base and a large fishing industry. I did not grow up with farming in my blood as have some of my friends in the House. However, I represent a constituency with a good number of farmers. In fact, some parts of it have a number of grain farmers, many of whom are concerned about this piece of legislation. One thing I learned before getting into politics and realizing where events were taking me and that I would have to apprise myself of the concerns of the Selkirk-Interlake constituency was that for many years the railways in

this country had been allowed effectively to break the law. As was poined out in debate earlier by the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish), the railways have not bought any new rolling stock since the late forties or early fifties. Under Article 262 of the Railway Act, they are required to provide adequate rolling stock. They are required to provide boxcars, engines, etc. to be able to move grain effectively to the ports of this country. They have not done that for many years.

• (0030)

For the last 15 or 20 years, the Government of Canada has been buying hopper cars. In recent years, farmers have been buying them through their pools. In more recent years, we have seen the Governments of Saskatchewan and Alberta buying rolling stock because the railways refused to do it.

I listened to the radio show "Morningside" this morning. A professor from the University of Manitoba was talking with Peter Gzowski about the Crow issue. He put it very well, to my mind. He said that the railways had in effect been on strike. For a number of years they simply refused to live up to their obligations and to honour their contract to move grain to port. We are finally, in this piece of legislation, calling on the Minister to take every reasonable initiative to ensure that an adequate supply of rolling stock will be provided. This has been the law for these many years.

The amendment carries on to say that the Canadian Wheat Board shall administer and control any rail cars acquired or leased by the Board. Over the last few days when we have been debating these amendments most Members of this Party have pointed out that it is absolutely essential for the Canadian Wheat Board to have control of the entire grain handling system. It simply does not make any sense not to have this control. We debated earlier an amendment about the powers that will be given to the Administrator of the grain transportation authority. At that time Members in this corner of the House expressed their amazement and puzzlement at why the Government would want to take power away from the Wheat Board or why it would want to put yet another regulatory step in the whole process of moving grain.

After all, is it not the Wheat Board that is familiar with the system? Is it not the Wheat Board that makes the sales, knows where the grain is needed, when it is needed at such and such a point and where it is located when it comes into the elevators? Is it not the Wheat Board that is familiar with the grades and what grade is needed where, at which port and at what time?

Why do we want to break down a system that has been working very well in this country for years? There is no denying that the Wheat Board played a very important and major role in western Canada. Why do we want to break it down?

In Motion No. 56, we talked about removing the ability to transfer the administration and control from the Wheat Board to the Minister of Transport. This provision of the Bill causes a great deal of concern. For years farmers have learned to look at various Ministers of Transport with less than complete trust. They have seen Ministers of Transport who have diminished the authority and effect of the Canadian Wheat Board. Many years ago we had a Minister in the Diefenbaker Conservative Government who took domestic feed grains away from the Wheat Board. This process was continued until a former Liberal Minister of Transport, to whom the Hon. Member for Saskatoon East (Mr. Ogle) earlier referred and had the great pleasure of defeating in 1979, diminished the power of the Wheat Board and its effect on the Prairies.

We heard from the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) who for a period of time was Minister of Transport. He is now a great defender of the Crow rate. In the few months that he was in power, he started to put into process the very moves we are now going through. He started to put steps into place that would have led to the scrapping on the Crowsnest Pass freight rates, probably much earlier than we are dealing with them today.

The Minister of Transport before this Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) when visiting western Canada promised he would not move on the Crowsnest Pass freight rates until such time as there was a consensus on the Prairies. The committee found out this summer when it travelled across the Prairies that there is anything but consensus on how the changes should be made.

The successive Ministers have all betrayed the trust of farmers. Now we want to move the control and administration of grain cars away from the Wheat Board, the body that farmers have learned to trust over the half century that it has been in existence, and move it into the office of the Minister of Transport. I do not want to cast any aspersions on the present or any future occupant of that office, but farmers with good cause—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Sargeant: I have an absolutely brilliant speech to carry on, if the House will agree.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has already been given an extension beyond the ten minutes normally permitted.

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak to Motions Nos. 55 and 56 to amend Clause 33. Railroaders call this hour of the night the graveyard shift. That is exactly what it is. I am pleased to be here to speak to this amendment to the Bill because it goes to the very root of what this legislation is about.

The original Crow's Nest Agreement stated that the railways would supply the equipment, cars and rolling stock for the handling of grain. That was not done. Throughout the years, the railways kept getting out and getting the Government more involved in putting in the money. The Government has put literally hundreds of millions of dollars into rolling stock. It has now started leasing it out. The railways have gone to the Government asking it to release those cars from the Wheat Board and the pools which are leasing to it and have

this looked after by the Minister. What a set up! We have the Minister dancing to the tune of the railways, using the taxpayers' money to build equipment and lease it. The Government now has the gall, when it is going to change the Crowsnest Agreement, to say it should be taken away from the Wheat Board and other groups which lease it and put under the control of the Minister.

We in the New Democratic Party know exactly what is going on. While the Conservatives sit here and take their $50,000 in donations a year from Canadian Pacific and the Liberals take theirs, they are allowing these kinds of things to take place. They have had 14 speakers this evening and we have had 21, yet their House Leader calls them the Official Opposition.

I want to go on with what is happening with this railway equipment. I worked for the railways for over 35 years and I know how the system works. I know how they had the Canadian taxpayers build new cars to supply their demands which they would not live up to. They also had literally hundreds of millions of dollars to upgrade their own equipment, and this was done in a shabby way, not really having done what was supposed to be done to meet the needs. The Wheat Pools and the Government of Canada had to come into the system and start building the cars in order that the demands could be met.

In my riding of Kootenay East-Revelstoke, CP Rail signed an agreement with a Japanese company for the sale of coal. How quickly they obtained their equipment and rolling stock and got ready to meet that demand because it suited their needs and their profits! We in this Party realize there is more to Canada than just shipping coal and lumber. Grain is a very important part of our economy, and the purpose of this Bill is to ensure that the administration of these cars will come under the Wheat Board.

If it ever gets to the point where the Minister handles it and administers it, what is to stop the railways from leaving the cars on sidings for weeks on end and then coming back to the Government and saying that they need more cars? I guess the Government of Canada will have to build more cars. When is this going to stop?

If we are speaking about legislation that is going to have some impact on the shipment of grains in Canada, then we must have the group involved in the sale of wheat and the production of grain and other commodities onstream and able to administer. They must have the authority to carry out their plans to meet their needs at very specific times.

The Conservative Party sits there with its one hundred and some Members, and only 14 of its Members showed concern for the farmers. Early in 1982 I was a Member of the Transport Committee which travelled across Canada. We heard the concerns of many of the farmers with regard to the allocation of cars. The former Progressive Conservative Minister of Transport, the Hon. Member for Vegreville, was there. He openly bragged about the cars and the equipment that he had made available for grain transportation during his administration. His administration lasted exactly nine months, but he talked about all the boxcars that he had built and the equipment that he had upgraded in order to meet the needs of the grain farmer. It takes a lot longer than nine months to carry out that kind of program, build that equipment and get the various groups involved. The ones who took the initiative were not in the Conservative Party. It was the grain growers, the Wheat Board and the Wheat Pools. They realized what had to be done and took the initiative to ensure that it was done. Therefore, for them to try to take that kind of credit is shameful.

For us to be discussing the leasing of this equipment which will be taken away from the control of the Wheat Board and put into the hands of the Minister is absolutely ludicrous. We on this side know that these amendments will not have a chance to be properly discussed, let alone voted on by the Liberals. They have told us there will not be any more amendments passed. These amendments are not going to pass because the Liberals have already made their sweetheart deal with the railway systems in Canada. We have to be able to speak about this. For that reason I am pleased we have had some extra hours so that we could speak on each one of these clauses and about these amendments. It is important to get it on the record to show exactly who is fighting for the Canadian farmers and the Canadian people. If we do not do that and allow this kind of legislation to go through we will find the prairie farmers going bankrupt five to seven years in the future, and we will see the Government of that day coming to the House looking for help for the farmers. After giving it all to the railways the Government will return five years from now to say that it needs help for the farmers. The taxpayers of Canada will have to provide the extra money to help the farmers. We will see the old see-saw back and forth between the railroads and the Wheat Board.

● (0045)

This is very serious legislation. No Member should say that we should not be debating it. The amendments go to the very root of what is being discussed in the House. Each of these amendments is very important to our Party and we will make sure that everyone in the country knows exactly what is happening.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Would the Hon. Member allow a question?

Mr. Parker: I would be happy to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has a minute and a half for the question. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn).

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Before asking the question I should say that I was quite impressed by the enthusiasm with which the Hon. Member addressed this issue and I welcome him to the debate which has taken place. In view of the fact that he has strenuously put forward his personal position with respect to this legislation, and has done so with force and effect in the debate on this occasion, and in view of his great interest in this legislation, would he explain why he attended none of the

hearings of the Transport Committee when we spent the whole summer considering this legislation, or is it that he just wants to come in the middle of the night to make a speech and then go back to bed?

Mr. Deans: That was very, very clever.

Mr. Parker: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I have no intention of going back to bed. I also want to answer his question. The fact of the matter is that I travelled with the Transport Committee across Canada in 1982 for over two and one-half weeks going to such places as Regina—

Mr. McKnight: Not 1982.

Mr. Parker: I said in 1982. We went to such places as Regina, Winnipeg, Edmonton, Vancouver and Prince Rupert. That is where I spent my summer of 1982.

I want to say that I had full confidence in our Members that sat on that committee and I have been briefed on everything that took place.

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking part in this debate on Motion No. 55 and Motion No. 56.

Mr. Deans: That is quite obvious.

Mr. Flis: But since the Hon. Member did take part in this debate specifically on these two amendements, I would like to take a few minutes to draw to the attention of the House what the committee heard when it was in British Columbia.

There was a group of mayors who appeared before the committee. One mayor, Mr. Colgur, had this to say and I would like to quote him. The Chairman said:

Yes, I think it is fair that you should have an opportunity to respond, Mayor Colgur.

MAYOR COLGUR: Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary, because the member of the committee has distorted the question and the comment I made.

What I said, Mr. Chairman, is that our Member of Parliament, Sid Parker, has not fully represented our position. He has been—he has had representation made to him by all of the Mayors and Councils that you see sitting before you from the southeast today. He has chosen to present in the House, on the other hand, petitions on behalf of two or three farming groups—

Mr. Anguish: A point of order.

Mr. Flis:

—in the Province of Saskatchewan—

Mr. Anguish: A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member resume his seat. The Chair was about to call the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary to the rule of relevance. Again, the Chair is having difficulty relating the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary's remarks to amendments No. 55 and No. 56 which are before the House.

Mr. Waddell: On a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member first allow the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to respond to the charge of being irrelevant which the Chair has made.

Mr. Flis: I think it is very relevant, Mr. Speaker, because it is important what constituents have to say on this Bill, and specifically Motion No. 55 and Motion No. 56.

Mr. Parker: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Flis: The mayor went on to say—

Mr. Parker: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Flis:

He has chosen to present in the House—

Mr. Anguish: A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Hon. Member will be a little more polite, he will be recognized. The Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish).

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I have been very patient and have tried to be as polite as I can with you this evening.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member resume his seat, please. I am quite prepared to recognize the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) on a point of order.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a similar point of order. I believe there is a parliamentary rule which says that we cannot question the right of a Member to represent his riding. I think this is not only irrelevant but it questions the fact of the Member representing the views of his constituents. That is unparliamentary and out of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is quoting a document. The Chair is trying to understand how the document relates to the debate. That is the first problem. If Hon. Members will just bear with the Chair, it will try to resolve that.

If relevance is not established, the same rules will apply to the Parliamentary Secretary as they will to any other Member of the House.

Mr. Parker: A point of order.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, all I am doing is quoting from the minutes of the committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member says that he is quoting from what?

Mr. Parker: A point of order.

Mr. Flis: From the minutes of the Transport Committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is quoting from the minutes of the Committee on Transport. The Hon. Member

for Kootenay East-Revelstoke (Mr. Parker) says a point of order.

Mr. Parker: Mr. Speaker, the Member has quoted my name when reading, and that is my point of order. I suggest he should have recognized me as the Member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This has always been a difficult problem in the House when a committee report or document of the House is quoted in which a specific reference is made by name. The Chair is not prepared to recognize that as a point of order at this time. It is a grey area that creates problems for the Chair.

At this point the Chair would like to hear the rest of the statement of the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Flis), bearing in mind the admonition that his comments must be relevant to Motions No. 55 and No. 56.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I am quoting from page 117:176 of the minutes of the Transport Committee. We spent all summer on this Bill. This is a direct quote from the minutes of the committee, and this mayor went on to say:

He has chosen to present in the House, on the other hand, petitions on behalf of two or three farming groups in the Province of Saskatchewan, rather than represent the position of his constituents.

Mr. Deans: A point of order.

Mr. Flis:

That is our concern, Mr. Chairman. We are therefore not at all assured by our member's representation—

Mr. Deans: A point of order.

Mr. Flis:

—that our view will be heard—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Some Hon. Members: A point of order.

Mr. Deans: A point of order.

Mr. Flis:

—and that, Mr. Chairman, is why we are here today.

Meaning the mayors of B.C.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deans: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Deans: I certainly do, Mr. Speaker. You asked the Member to indicate the relevance of the minutes that he was quoting to the particular amendment we have before us. I now challenge the Member to indicate whether or not the mayor was specifically referring to the allocation of coal cars during that particular intervention. If he did not and if he was not, then I demand that the Member withdraw what he has said.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is not making any point other than that which the Chair has made. The Chair is trying carefully to follow the remarks of the Parliamentary Secretary in terms of relevance. The Chair can only do this if Hon. Members will at least give the Chair the opportunity of listening, just as Hon. Members extend to Members of the group at the far end the opportunity of speaking so that we can come to some understanding as to whether or not they are relevant.

There appears to be some reluctance to hear the Parliamentary Secretary. The Chair would like to hear a little more on the matter raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain about relevance.

Mr. Waddell: Let him put it on the record.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member from British Columbia was representing the views of British Columbians on this Bill and on any amendments or motions that pertain to any attempt to change this Bill or improve it.

Mr. Deans: He was not.

Mr. Flis: How relevant can you get? We heard the Hon. Member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke (Mr. Parker) posing to represent the views of Canadians in British Columbia on this Bill and on all of the amendments that were discussed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Do these relate to Motion No. 55 and Motion No. 56?

Mr. Flis: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am just remarking on the comments made by the Hon. Member on Motion No. 55 and Motion No. 56.

Mr. Deans: That is not true.

Mr. Flis: I am commenting on what he said. I will leave the minutes since this seems to have hit a soft spot.

Mr. Deans: No, it hasn't.

Mr. Flis: I will go on to quote a headline from letters to the editor in *The Daily Townsman* of Friday, June 10. It is under the heading—

Mr. Waddell: A point of order. He is out of order.

Mr. Anguish: A point of order.

Mr. Parker: A point of order.

Mr. Flis: It is under the heading "Parker's position on Crow Reflects outdated thought".

Mr. Waddell: Order.

Mr. Anguish: A point of order.

Mr. Deans: A point of order.

Mr. Flis: This is the problem with the position of the NDP.

Mr. Deans: A point of order.

Mr. Flis: Their whole position—

Mr. Deans: Are you deaf?

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Flis: —reflects outdated thought. There are other mayors. There is the union of British Columbia Municipalities—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Flis: They made a resolution.

Mr. Deans: A point of order.

Mr. Flis: That resolution reads as follows—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has listened—

Mr. Deans: A point of order.

Mr. Anguish: One way for the Liberals; one way for the rest.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will Hon. Member please be seated.

Mr. Deans: I am not sitting down. You cannot sit there and ignore us. Who the hell do you think you are? Take your seat. You cannot allow this kind of garbage. Who do you think you are, Francis.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please be seated?

Mr. Deans: No. I have been on my feet for two minutes asking for a point of order and you have damned well refused to listen. You sit down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please be seated.

Mr. Deans: I bloody well will not sit down. Who do you think you are? You cannot allow this garbage to take place. You may think you are God up there but you are not.

Mr. Anguish: Withdraw, Speaker.

Mr. Deans: I rose on a point of order and by God I will be heard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) be seated.

Mr. Deans: I will be heard on this point of order. Don't pussyfoot around.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please be seated.

Mr. Deans: I will be heard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain please be seated?

Mr. Deans: No. I have been attempting to gain the floor on a point of order and you ignored me intentionally.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain please be seated.

Mr. Deans: No. I have been rising on a point of order. I will be recognized.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain please be seated?

Mr. Anguish: He has a right.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Deans, I have to name you for disregarding the authority of the Chair.

Mr. Deans: Well, you bloody well go right ahead. But you are going to have a problem. You cannot ignore me when I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I invite the Hon. Member to withdraw from this place.

Mr. Deans: No.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to parliamentary practice, I move, seconded by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy):

That the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) be expelled from the House for the remainder of this sitting.

● (0100)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the Members.

● (0130)

And the bells having been rung:

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am sure you will be aware that Citation 25(2) of Beauchesne's

Fifth Edition indicates that prior to the House making its judgment I am entitled to make a statement. I wish to exercise that right now, with the approval of the Chair, of course.

I regret the episode which occurred this evening. I regret it most profoundly. I have been a Member of the legislature of the Province of Ontario and a Member of Parliament for a total of almost 17 years. Never in my time as a Member representing the people of Hamilton have I been expelled from either of the two Chambers.

I rose on a point of order. It is my understanding from reading the rules that a Member is entitled so to do. Also it is my understanding from reading the rules that it is the requirement of the Chair to recognize a Member rising on a point of order. That did not happen. I want to apologize to you in advance for what occurred, but I believed at the time—and I still believe—it was within my right to request the floor on a point of order, and I was not given the floor according to the rules of Parliament.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) is apologizing and taking this opportunity to explain himself. However, I do feel that if we are to comply with the rules of parliamentary procedure, we have no other choice but to proceed with a vote, because the explanation he has just furnished, in accordance with paragraph 25.2 of Beauchesne, indicates clearly that this must be done before I can present my motion. Paragraph (3) reads as follows and I quote:

If the Member satisfies the House by an apology, no further action is necessary. If the Member's statement is insufficient, it is the duty of the Government House Leader to present a motion proposing a suitable penalty.

It would therefore seem that these explanations should have been supplied immediately after the Hon. Member was named by the Speaker.

Therefore, I think that it is a noble gesture on his part to provide an explanation and to apologize. However, from a procedural standpoint, I think that, regrettably, we have no other alternative but to proceed with the vote.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Pinard) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 373*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Axworthy	Campbell (Cardigan)	Epp
Bachand	Clark (Brandon-Souris)	Ethier
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)	Cook	Evans
Bloomfield	Côté (Mrs.)	Ferguson
Bockstael	Cousineau	Flis
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)	Dubois	Forrestall
		Friesen
		Gurbin
Gustafson	Malépart	Pinard
Hargrave	Malone	Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Hnatyshyn	Maltais	Savard
Hopkins	Massé	Schellenberger
Huntington	Masters	Schroder
King	Mayer	Siddon
Landers	Mazankowski	Taylor
Laniel	McKnight	Tousignant
Lapointe (Beauce)	Neil	Turner
Leduc	Nielsen	Weatherhead—53.
Mackasey	Olivier	
	Peterson	

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse	Manly	Nystrom
Anguish	Miller	Parker
Benjamin	Mitchell (Mrs.)	Sargeant
Hovdebo	Murphy	Waddell—13.
Kristiansen		

● (0145)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. I have to direct the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) to withdraw in compliance with the order that the House has just made.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

And Mr. Deans having withdrawn:

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise on the same point of order as the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). I want you to consider four different citations, if you will be so kind as to do so, from Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. They are Citations 233(1), 233(2), 235, 237 and 239(1). I would like to take one moment to elaborate. If you look at Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, you will find that Citation 233(1) reads:

Points of order are questions raised with the view of calling attention to any departure from the Standing Orders or the customary modes of proceeding in debate or in the conduct of legislative business and may be raised at virtually any time by any Member, whether he has previously spoken or not.

(2) A question of order concerns the interpretation to be put upon the rules of procedure and is a matter for the Speaker or, in a committee, for the Chairman to determine.

I think the person has to be heard before determination can be made. Second, I refer to the Chair to Citation 235 of Beauchesne. I quote part of the citation:

Any Member is entitled, even bound, to bring to the Speaker's immediate notice any instance of what he considers a breach of order. He may interrupt and lay the point in question precisely before the Speaker. He should do so as soon as he perceives an irregularity in the proceedings which are engaging the attention of the House.

In rapid conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer Citation 237 of Beauchesne's. I quote:

A point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. The Hon. Member was recognized for the purpose of debate. He is raising a point of order. The Chair would ask the Hon. Member if his point of order relates to the proceedings that have just been completed in this House.

Mr. Nystrom: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If it does not, then the Hon. Member certainly has permission to proceed. The Chair is having difficulty grasping just what is the purpose of the Hon. Member's point of order. Which point of order is he making?

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on the same point of order as the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). I refer you to two citations of Beauchesne's.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not permitted to reflect on a decision of the House or a decision of the Chair. Is that what the Hon. Member is doing at this time? He appears to be reflecting on a decision of the Chair and a decision of the House. That is not in order. I will hear the Hon. Member out.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Only one point of order can be entertained at a time. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) is being heard on a point of order. The Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) must realize that he cannot interrupt on another point of order. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville cannot raise the same matter which the House has just decided.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I refer you, then, to Citation 239(1) of Beauchesne's which reads:

The Speaker decides questions of order only when they actually arise and not in anticipation.

I suggest, with great deference, that you cannot anticipate—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Hon. Member is reflecting on a decision of the Chair—The Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) has made an intervention? I hope I did not hear it right.

Mr. Benjamin: I was not on my feet.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) must realize that he cannot reflect upon a decision of the Chair. He was recognized for the purpose of debate. He made reference to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans)—

An Hon. Member: Oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All right, the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary had the floor. He was making a speech before he was interrupted by the proceedings which took place in the House in the last hour or so. I am now trying to make the same point of order that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) wanted to make but was unable to make. I want to make sure that I can make that point of order and that is why I am quoting citations of Beauchesne for your consideration. Citation 239 states that one cannot anticipate what I am going to say.

To get back to the argument I was making, Citation 237 reads:

A point of order against procedure must be raised promptly and before the question has passed to a stage at which the objection would be out of place.

I think that these four citations to which I have referred you, and with some research and a bit more time I could surely give you more citations and more precedents, should convince you as to why I should be recognized at this time for a point of order. My point of order and the point of order of the Hon. Member from Hamilton Mountain, if he were recognized, was going to concern the speech that the Parliamentary Secretary was in the process of making. He was making a speech in this House on Motions Nos. 55 and 56. What the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain wanted to do was to make a point of order under the citations of Beauchesne—the Standing Orders of our rule book—suggesting that the speech he was making was not relevant to the motions before the House. Since he was not allowed to make the argument, I want at this time to make the argument that the remarks that he was making were not relevant.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, the Chair was attempting to establish relevance. The Chair had called the attention of the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the question of relevance, as the *Hansard* record will show, and the Chair was doing its very best to determine relevance. The problem the Chair had was the constant interruptions and, therefore, the Chair could not hear what the Parlaimentary Secretary was saying.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question or relevance has been raised many times in the debate regarding statements by Member of the Party to which the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville belongs. The Chair in every case listened, and listened attentively, with regard to relevance. In the case of the Parliamentary Secretary, the Chair had the greatest difficulty. At a point which the Chair considered absolutely crucial in the argument, it was almost physically impossible for the Chair to hear.

Therefore, with the greatest respect to the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville, the Chair is quite prepared to rule on a question of relevance of any speech. It is not an easy matter to rule on relevance. It is not easy at all. But the Chair was certainly raising the point and had cautioned the Parliamentary Secretary more than once about the rule of relevance. If the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville is making the point that the Chair should have called the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary to the matter of relevance, the Chair will readily agree that it was considering that but had great difficulty hearing the Hon. Member for that purpose.

Mr. Nystrom: My whole point, Mr. Speaker, is that I wanted to be heard on a point of order a few minutes ago, but because of proceedings that I thought might happen because of certain precedents that were set, I wanted to make sure that I quoted four citations from Beauchesne's to point out that I

have a right to rise on a point of order. Under Citations 233, 237, 239 and 235 of Beauchesne, I am bound to do that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Certainly the Hon. Member has a right and an obligation to raise points of order. That is conceded. The problem the Chair has to recognize is that when many Members are on their feet at one time, all claiming points of order, and another Hon. Member is making a speech wherein the question of relevance has been raised by the Chair, the Chair has to make a decision. In this case the decision was to hear further statements of the Parliamentary Secretary before calling on another Hon. Member on the grounds that the speech of the Parliamentary Secretary was out of order.

The decision in this case was to hear further statements of the Parliamentary Secretary before calling on another Hon. Member on the grounds that the Parliamentary Secretary's speech was out of order. The Chair was in the process of doing that when Hon. Members, a number of them, were on their feet screaming, "Point of order". It is physically impossible for more than one Hon. Member to be recognized at any one moment in time. The Chair could not recognize six Members at once on a point of order.

Mr. Benjamin: Nobody asked you to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There were six Members of the Hon. Member's Party on their feet at once.

Mr. Anguish: There were not.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: They were all screaming "Point of order".

Mr. Anguish: There was one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure that the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) will do me the courtesy of checking with the transcript which is provided by *Hansard* for the House and he will recognize the fact after the event. From where the Chair observed the proceedings, there were a number of Members seeking to be recognized on a point of order all at once. It is physically impossible to recognize everybody at once.

The Chair made a decision to attempt to hear further statements from the Parliamentary Secretary before calling relevance again. The Chair had already cautioned the Parliamentary Secretary on a speech that appeared to be irrelevant to the Chair, and I was in the process of making a determination.

Now, if the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) has anything else to add to the record, the Chair would be pleased to hear him. But there is no dispute about the need for relevance in this House.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Speaker. I would also like to thank him for saying that a Member has an obligation to raise a point of order. I am very glad to hear that. That was what I was trying to do. You allowed me to do that and I thank you for that. I am glad that no dangerous precedents have been set tonight and I am glad we can get back to the Bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are Hon. Members about to raise points of order at this moment?

Some Hon. Members: Debate.

Mr. Anguish: Are you a mind reader?

An Hon. Member: Button your lip for once.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my wife called me this evening and said that she had just seen the Air Farce on television in which they used as their theme the House of Commons debating the Crow rate. She said that they did a very good job and it was exactly what she sees in the House every day. That is what our public thinks of us. That is a very unbiased opinion by my wife.

In any event, I am very glad to rise to speak to these two amendments. The reason for these amendments is the fact that sales and transportation are inextricably linked and therefore it is very important that the Wheat Board have the kind of authority over the movement and placing of cars that it has had in the past and should continue to have. Because it is necessary to protect the block system, it is necessary for the Wheat Board to be able to call out the kind of grain it needs when it is needed. It is very necessary for the Wheat Board to act in a proper way and have the authority to act. Therefore, it is necessary to have these two amendments pass which will make the difference in this Bill.

● (0200)

Besides that, we in this Party want to stop the erosion of the Crow which the Official Opposition and the Government are attempting to bring about, or are in the process of doing. They have not quit attempting to do it. They went through this farce of going out West listening to the people, but made no changes to the Bill. There is change made to the Bill. They added 86 amendments, but the basic Bill did not change. The effect on the farmer is exactly the same as it was when they went out west. We wasted all that time. We wasted time and dollars to find out, and then did nothing. It is what the bureaucracy decided. This is an individual group of bureaucrats who have governed this Government, who have put the words in the mouth of this Government, into the mouth of the Department of Transport, for the last 20 years. They have continued to do it and are still doing it. The bureaucracy decided what it thought was good.

If you had attended the hearings during the summer, Mr. Speaker, you would have seen exactly how much the Government and, to a great extent, the Official Opposition were guided by the officials who are the bureaucracy. They never made a decision on their own. Every decision was a decision of the bureaucrat who was supposed to be an expert, but an expert who had been trained by this particular administration, hopefully, except that none of these people were there then.

You have to go back probably to the Minister of Agriculture in the Diefenbaker Government to find the basis for the training that was here. He was the Member from Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain, I believe. A Minister of Transport in this present administration, at one time the Member from Saskatoon-Humboldt, has since been rewarded and is now the Vice-President of Pioneer Grain. In the last Conservative administration we had the present critic for the Conservative Party, who was the then Minister for a very short period of time. All of these Ministers either contributed to or took orders from the bureaucracy which has now decided we should no longer have the Crow rate, and in the process they decided the Wheat Board should be denigrated as much as possible.

During successive administrations we have had a feed grain policy which reduced the effectiveness of the Wheat Board. We have had an open market system established which has reduced the effectiveness of the Wheat Board. We have had a Grain Transportation Co-ordinator who reduced the effectiveness of the Wheat Board.

It has been very interesting this evening to listen to Members who have spoken. Unfortunately, I cannot criticize Members on the Government side because they have not spoken. I can criticize others, and I do not think you could rule me irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, because you never ruled any of these fellows irrelevant. Earlier, the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) spoke of the bureaucracy, the bureaucracy that is going to be established. I would like to point out to the Hon. Member for Crowfoot that the Alberta Government, a very strong Conservative Government, has more bureaucracy per capita than any of the other western Provinces. Where does the bureaucracy develop?

The Hon. Member for Westaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) said that the best situation we ever had was when we put the Grain Transportation Co-ordinator in place. He forgot to mention the effectiveness of the Grain Transportation Co-ordinator did not really have too much to do with the PC's and, after three years of operation, they went back to the original system which was the Wheat Board operating entirely on its own. The Grain Transportation Co-ordinator is now just somebody there. He takes a little bit of heat but he has nothing to do with the block system and he has nothing to do with the presentation of cars, or the dividing of cars. He is not used. The Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin also forgot to mention the fact that the success of the system depended upon 12,000 cars that were suddenly made available to the Grain Transportation Co-ordinator. He did not mention that after three years the Co-ordinator's ideas all went by the board and we went back to the original system.

The Wheat Board, in its presentation to the Transportation Committee, suggested that although the Grain Transportation Co-ordinator did not get in the road very much, he was really of no value to them. The Wheat Board put up with him and he did take some heat, but as far as the operation of the system was concerned, he was of no value.

I learned a new word tonight from the Hon. Member for Crowfoot who said that there was an "illucination", or was it an hallucination, that the Canadian Wheat Board would have some effect. Again, the Hon. Member for Crowfoot neglected to say there were 12,000 cars in place. That is why anything the Co-ordinator did was going to be better than it was before, but the system there is the system that is working the best now and it has nothing to do with an Administrator being appointed through this Bill, or the Co-ordinator that was appointed by the past administration.

I wonder why the Hon. Member for Parkdale-High Park (Mr. Flis) would put so much trust in a witness rather than in a Member of Parliament. Does the Hon. Member understand the motive of the mayor who made the presentation? He suggested it was relevant. That particular mayor is to be the candidate for the Liberal Party in Cranbrook. In a couple of weeks the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) are going out to crown him—to make him the candidate.

We must look at Motions Nos. 55 and 56 and say that all of these things which are relevant, which these fellows have said are relevant to this, do not really have very much effect.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair hesitates to interrupt the Hon. Member on a matter of relevance, but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue only with unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise this morning to debate what I think is a very important amendment. I think this amendment protects the autonomy of the Canadian Wheat Board and prevents the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) from taking over a very important aspect of rail transportation for the movement of grain. Rising tonight in the House reminds me very much of what my colleagues in the New Democratic Party in British Columbia have been doing over the last couple of months, trying to prevent government by exhaustion and legislation by exhaustion. That is exactly what the Tories and Liberals are putting this House through tonight on a very important Bill which has a great deal of significance for the prairie grain farmers in particular.

We are dealing with legislation which will change the whole rural community in our central Provinces. I can now appreciate just what kind of effort my colleagues in British Columbia have been going through to prevent the coalition Government in British Columbia implementing its revenge package, which includes wresting away the power of local school boards, hospital boards, removal of collective bargaining rights, the right to fair rent, and the right to an adequate human rights commission. We are dealing with legislation here in the same manner, presented in the same manner, without any careful consideration on the part of the Government or the Official Opposition as to what this particular amendment would mean.

The coalition in British Columbia, which was formed in 1975, and which was a Conservative, Liberal and Social Credit coalition, had some very important things to say about rail car upgrading. As Members in this Party will recall, the New Democratic Party in 1974 entered into the production of box cars in a plant in Squamish. That plant was the most modern rail car plant in Canada, in fact in North America. It employed over 300 people. It could produce over a box car a day and had orders for years in advance. The Social Credit Government in one of its first activities, the Conservative-Liberal coalition called Social Credit, decided that it did not want those 300 jobs, that it was government intervention in free enterprise, and I suppose that was their rationale for closing down the plant. We still have no rail boxcar plant in British Columbia. We have no opportunity to have one because all the equipment in the original plant was sold because of some philosophical aversion to government involvement.

The Bill before us and the amendment which the New Democratic Party is moving would see some of the Power of the Minister taken away and put back into the hands of the Canadian Wheat Board where it rightfully belongs. Motion No. 55 replacing Clause 33 would do the following. It reads:

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 33 by striking out lines 11 to 43 at page 16 and substituting the following therefor:

"for the purpose of moving grain and the Minister shall take every reasonable initiative to ensure that an adequate supply of rolling stock will be provided for the efficient, reliable and effective movement of grain.

That is an admirable attempt. The Motion continues as follows:

(2) The Minister may enter into agreements with the owners or lessees of railway cars.

(3) The Canadian Wheat Board shall administer and control any railway cars acquired or leased by the Board or by the Minister on behalf of Her Majesty.

(4) The Canadian Wheat Board may, in respect of railway cars under its administration and control, enter into agreements with the railway companies respecting the operation of the railway cars."

It seems that the Canadian Wheat Board, which is responsible to the producers of grain, should have the responsibility of determining what boxcars, grain cars, are available for the transportation of grain, and should be responsible for acquiring or leasing appropriate cars, taking that responsibility away from the Minister of Transport who has other responsibilities toward the Canadian wheat industry. If this does not happen, I can see the possibility of the Minister of Transport taking the same narrow attitude toward government involvement in the production of railway cars as the Socred-Liberal coalition in British Columbia in 1975-1976.

● (0215)

It should really be up to the Canadian Wheat Board to determine who should purchase those cars and from where they should be purchased. That it not happening. It did not happen in British Columbia. I suspect the same attitudes would exist at the federal level, whether it be a Liberal or a Conservative Government in the next couple of years, that is, before the New Democratic Party rightfully assumes its position as the Government of Canada some time in the near future.

If the Liberal-Conservative coalition continues to approach the grain industry and farmers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba in the manner it has, certainly it will lose a great deal of support. Because of its inability to enunciate clearly its real position on the Crow to the people in the Prairies or in British Columbia, it will lose a great deal of support in British Columbia. No one understands what is its position. No one will find out what is its position, by the looks of the debate in the House tonight. Neither the Liberals nor the Conservatives want to participate in the debate on these very important amendments.

Mr. Malone: Do you still wonder why you are at 16 per cent?

Mr. Miller: We will see the Tories at 16 per cent again.

Mr. Malone: It will be 116 per cent.

Mr. Miller: That is wishful thinking on the part of the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) who finds himself having slipped seven points in the poll last month. Four months like that and they will be in their rightful position, and the race will be on for government at that time.

The people of British Columbia want to know what is the Tory position. Hon. Members of the Conservative Party want to have it both ways. They want to pretend to grain producers that they are in favour of a three-year delay in changes to the Crow. At the same time they want to see massive subsidies going to CP and CN. By the looks of it, they want to see the British Columbia coal lands remaining in the hands of the federal Government. That is not an adequate position for the people of British Columbia who, at the moment, are in the throes of fighting a very repressive Government which is basically comprised of Liberals and Conservatives. Their Government is attacking not only the civil rights of the entire population, but at the moment it is putting the entire province into economic trouble as a result of a possible strike in the public sector within the next 40 minutes. That Government does not respect the views of the community.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): The Chair would very much appreciate it if the Hon. Member for Nanaimo-Alberni (Mr. Miller) could restrict his remarks to those which are relevant to the important debate at hand.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I think the type of Government representing the people is very relevant. I was just making the point that the Government will take control of the acquisition and leasing of rail cars as a result of this Bill. The Government does not respect the view of farmers who are saying that the Canadian Wheat Board should control the distribution of cars. Therefore I think my remarks are very relevant. Hon. Members must appreciate the intent of the Bill. It will take control over the acquisition and leasing of rail cars. We have seen the Government in British Columbia take over the control of a rail car plant, a plant which could have provided boxcars for the

shipment of lumber and other commodities to eastern Canada and back to western Canada. In conclusion, let me indicate that the Bill before us is important. Also it is important that the Canadian Wheat Board maintain control over the distribution of cars.

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue debate on the amendments which have been put forward by the New Democratic Party. The intent of the amendments before us at this time is to protect the integrity of the wheat shipping system in Canada. We are concernend that there is only one group within Canada that has the expertise and the knowledge to look after the allocation of grain cars. We believe that that group is the Canadian Wheat Board. More than any other group it has an understanding of the grade of grain and a knowledge of the location of various grains, as well as some knowledge of the different ways of facilitating sales.

With that in mind, we do not understand how the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), whether it be this Minister or any other Minister, can be the one who makes adequate decisions with regard to the allocation of rolling stock. Many grain cars are already owned by the Canadian Wheat Board. They have been paid for by the farmers of Canada. This means that the Act, in its present form, would confiscate the property of producers. It is very important to remember that fact.

These cars, the allocation of which would be taken away from the Canadian Wheat Board, were purchased by farmers by reason of the fact that they received less for the grain they sold in the past. At present the Government is participating in a form of expropriation. One of my concerns is that the Bill gives the Minister of Transport another role in addition to the ones that he already holds in the shipment of grain. It will really increase the number of different levels of people within the bureaucracy.

I mentioned earlier in the debate on a previous amendment that one of the problems faced in western Canada was that VIA had a contract with CN and CP. This creates a problem because we have one Crown corporation, VIA, looking after passenger travel, and another corporation, with its private enterprise like CP, or its public enterprise like CN, having control over the rolling stock, train schedules, et cetera. For that matter, earlier today I pointed out that even the master agreement between CN, CP and VIA was something about which we have no real knowledge. For example, CN can say that its costs are at a certain level for the movement of cars and charge VIA proportionately. In other words, VIA has no right to know why it is being charged so much, or whether or not it should really be paying those rates.

I can see the same problem existing if we have a system wherein the Canadian Wheat Board has a certain level of responsibility and there is someone in the Minister's office—we all know that it will not be the Minister—or someone working with the Government who will have a special office and will also make decisions that may be quite different from those of the Wheat Board. There should be a centralized control of the shipment of grain within the country.

I have argued before in the House that one of the problems at the present time is that there is no interchange agreement between CN and CP.

I would like to refer to the Port of Churchill, if I may. Grain in the northeastern part of Saskatchewan is closest to the Port of Churchill. However, because CP does not have tracks going to Churchill and CN does, the grain crosses the CN line and goes to Thunder Bay, many more miles away. However, at the present time there is no interchange agreement. Therefore, CP controls that grain, even though it would be much better for farmers if they could go to the nearest port. For that matter, only once in history has CP given up its right to take grain over its own tracks.

My concern is that the system will continue to be a hodgepodge. Instead of giving one person or one agency responsibility for the transportation and sale of grain, which I believe should be the Canadian Wheat Board, the Government will add another level of inadequate decision making.

We face a similar problem in many different areas. The Government just wants to create another group to share the blame, and not really share the burden. It will create more of a problem without solving the problems which are already faced. We cannot really accept that. For those reasons I urge the House to vote in favour of the amendments of the New Democratic Party because we are trying to ensure that we have an efficient and comprehensive transportation system in Canada for the exportation of grain.

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak in the wee hours of the morning, especially following Hallowe'en. This night of the year seems particularly appropriate to the shenanigans which have taken place in the House of Commons over the last few hours.

Before getting into the meat of my remarks on Motions Nos. 55 and 56, I would like to deal with the scenario which developed when the Conservatives came to the door of the New Democratic Party yelling, "Trick or treat". We did not feel it was appropriate to move to their last minute, out of order amendments, and therefore we denied them that permission. At that time we did not think that their under-performance in defence of the people of western Canada and the farmers of the prairie Provinces really warranted a treat, so we said, "trick", and they did. With their usual lack of imagination, the trick to which they resorted was basically the old one of overturning the outhouse. Unfortunately, as they tipped it over, they fell into the hole. Now they are desperately groping around, trying to climb their way back out of the hole they created.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): Order, please. I believe we are talking about rolling stock, not that other type of utility.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member who has the floor just made a mistake. He said

that we tipped over the outhouse; he meant to say that we tipped over the "Althouse".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): Do I understand that the Hon. Member is naming another Member of the House?

Mr. Malone: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Peterson): We will have no more of that tonight in this House.

Mr. Kristiansen: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that you treated the Hon. Member's intervention with the dignity it so obviously deserved. It was really a pleasure to hear that. Whether they want to roll in it or climb out of the hole, that is up to them. Hon. Members of the Conservative Party have done a very effective job so far of digging themselves into a hole, especially on this issue. I will wait with some interest to see how they manage to rise from it.

Mr. Taylor: We do not have it all over our face, anyway.

Mr. Kristiansen: It is surprising, because they certainly spend a lot of time trying to stand on their heads. However they manage it, it is up to them.

I will return to Motions Nos. 55 and 56 because I know Mr. Speaker wants me to be relevant. Of course Motion No. 55 stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). The intent of this Motion is to give control over the allocation of railroad grain cars to the Canadian Wheat Board. For the reasons of facilitation of sales, knowledge of the location and grade of grains, protection of the block system, et cetera, the Canadian Wheat Board should have these cars under its control. We think the purpose of this amendment is rather self-evident. Some of the ground referring to it has been covered in previous discussions.

Motion No. 56 also stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West. The intent of this amendment would be to remove the ability to transfer the administration and control of grain cars owned by the Canadian Wheat Board to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy). If we transfer the administration and control of these cars, effectively we are transferring the ownership of the cars. It is our contention that the Canadian Wheat Board should have control over the shipment of grain and the allocation of cars. Therefore, these cars should remain under the control of the Board.

• (0230)

These cars were paid for out of the producers' pool fund. In other words, grain producers received a smaller payment for the grain sold on their behalf by the Canadian Wheat Board because some of the revenues derived from the sale of their grain went to the purchase of these cars. To transfer administrative control of these cars from the Canadian Wheat Board to the Minister of Transport is effectively to expropriate them from the producers without compensation or, viewed in another way, to levy a discriminatory tax on producers that has not received the approval of Parliament.

Our friends on the Government side and in the Conservative Party might want to ask themselves whether they want to set a precedent whereby the Minister can expropriate or levy taxes through regulation. Today I would ask, if it is the Canadian Wheat Board that is having its cars effectively expropriated without any compensation, and expropriated by regulation and not by any deliberate act of Parliament, then who is next on the hit list? There are hundreds of cars owned by forest product companies across Canada which they have had to purchase because the railways were not doing their job. Will they be next at some point? Will it be the cars owned by B.C. Rail? Who is next on the list?

What kind of precedent are we establishing by allowing the Government, through this legislation, to expropriate without compensation, and to expropriate without legislation because it is all to be done by a regulatory process? You have to wonder if the new Liberal and Conservative slogan is that extremism in the pursuit of avarice is no vice. How far are they going to go in this kind of grab over what the farmers of western Canada have paid for, such as cars? They have indirectly paid for them. To be sure, they have been paid for by their labours over years and years. It should have been argued before.

That case has been made not only by members of this Party, but by many other Hon. Members over the past number of years, that it was the Government of Canada and the railways that should have purchased these cars in the first place. Because of the failure of Governments and the failure of the railways in this country, whether it has been cars of the Canadian Wheat Board or forest product companies or whoever, that has not happened. Now we are going to make some kind of illegitimate power grab to seize something that we have not paid for, and to seize something for which we are not even providing any legislative framework. We are allowing a bunch of bureaucrats to seize by regulation something that does not belong to them.

We in this Party believe that that kind of action is wrong. It is illegitimate. Even though it is the day after Hallowe'en—I think it is called All Saints Day—I suspect that this kind of trickery and chicanery will not be forgiven. As sure as last night was Hallowe'en, the great pumpkin will indeed rise from the pumpkin patch and wreak his vengeance on Members to our right and on Members across the way as well.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I expect a little bit of enthusiasm from my colleagues. Certainly we have not seen much enthusiasm from the Tories this evening. It is rather ironic that they should call for an all-night sitting and yet, on important amendments, they have been silent. This reminds me very much of their blood brothers in British Columbia, the B.C. Social Credit Party, who called for an all-night sitting of the Legislature. They rammed through legislation without even bothering to speak on it. Their leader can only make such speeches before the television cameras rather than appearing in the legislative assembly to defend his legislation.

It is important to note that, as a result of that hasty ill-considered legislation in British Columbia, in approximately

25 minutes from now the employees of the Government of British Columbia will be declaring their contempt for that whole process and going on strike because the legislation was rammed through with no consideration for the real economic or social interests of the people of British Columbia. I believe there is a direct analogy between that kind of legislation that we have seen in British Columbia and Bill C-155, which is really a sham in terms of trying to deal with the problems of the people of western Canada.

I would like to speak in support of Motions Nos. 55 and 56 which were moved by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). Before I begin, I wish to quote a couple of lines from one of the great American poems of the fifties, written by Alan Ginsberg. It is entitled "How". It begins with the lines:

Boxcars, boxcars, boxcars,
I have seen the best minds of my generation destroyed.

Perhaps Ginsberg was a bit prophetic of the Crow debate. I do not know whether it is destroying any minds or not.

This Crow debate is certainly having an adverse effect on the economy of western Canada. The Tories have asked for an all-night sitting, but where are they tonight?

Mr. Mazankowski: I rise on a point of order. One of the reasons the Tory Party asked for an all-night debate was to have the opportunity to debate some of the more important and substantive amendments that have been offered by our Party.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not making a point of order.

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, what the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) is indicating with his spurious point of order, which was an intervention, is that the Tories have no regard for the Canadian Wheat Board. That is basically what these two amendments are about. They seek basically—

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The fact is that this Party has a lot of respect for the Canadian Wheat Board, but we are not going to engage in a game of smear and fear.

Mr. Manly: You have it smeared all over you right now.

Mr. Mazankowski: You are smeared from head to toe. You do not know the difference between a Wheat Board and a Fish Board.

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate a bit of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair appeals to Hon. Members. Bearing in mind the hour, perhaps they should refrain from exaggerated eloquence and speak to the motion before the House.

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with you that we want to try to restrain ourselves and not give way to vile passions.

Motion No. 55 seeks to give the Canadian Wheat Board control over railway cars for the purpose of moving grain. This is where control belongs rather than being transferred to the Minister.

Mr. Malone: Why?

Mr. Manly: The Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) asks why. I think he will recognize the expertise of the Canadian Wheat Board. They know the grain growing potential in the different regions in the Prairies. They know the specific needs of their customers. They know how the different qualities of grain can be brought together to meet the needs of their customers. Therefore, they should have the opportunity and the responsibility to control and administer the railway cars for the sale of grain.

The Hon. Member for Crowfoot feels that this whole thing is irrelevant. That simply indicates that they do not understand the basic purpose of these amendments. I fail to understand why the Conservatives do not wish to support the Wheat Board instead of seeking greater control in the hands of the Minister.

Motion No. 56 would eliminate Subclause 33(3) which reads:

Notwithstanding anything in this or any other Act of Parliament, the Governor in Council may, by regulation, transfer the administration and control of any railway cars held by the Canadian Wheat Board on behalf of the Government of Canada from that Board to the Minister.

I am sure Members are aware that these cars that are presently held by the Canadian Wheat Board were purchased with money that was held back from farmers at the time that they sold their grain. In effect, these cars belong to the farmers. They are being administered and controlled by the Canadian Wheat Board. Our Party asks what justification there is for this power going to the Minister. Why should it not continue to be administered by the Canadian Wheat Board on behalf of the farmers when it is the farmers and producers of the grain who paid the costs of those cars?

This transfer is a form of robbery. It is a special taxation being imposed on the farmers. If the Hon. Member for Crowfoot feels that this kind of robbery in the name of efficiency is okay, and if that is the philosophy of the Conservative Party, I just hope the Canadian people understand what they are really saying, that robbery in the name of efficiency is no vice.

The cost of these cars should have been borne by the railways initially, yet we find that the railways are always crying poor. They always have their hand out. It is a rather surprising fact that the railways in Canada, after all these years, always seem to be losing money and are always asking for more. Yet the people who own the railways seem to be getting more and more rich while the railways are crying poor. The fact is that the railways have a responsibility to purchase those cars. They did not meet their responsibility. The Hon. Member for Crowfoot and the producers on the Prairies

recognize that it is important that, in order to move the grain, they have a system by which they purchase cars. Now the Government wants to take them over. We believe that the power and the control over those cars should continue to rest with the Canadian Wheat Board where it belongs.

Our Party would like to see this entire Bill defeated. We make no secret about that. The Government seems determined to forge ahead with it, regardless of opposition. Earlier the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) promised there would be no change in the Crow rate unless there was some clear consensus about this on the Prairies. There has been no consensus. In fact the developing consensus is that Bill C-155 is completely unsatisfactory to the people of western Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but the time allocated to him has expired.

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly to the two motions, and to point out that we in this Party, and there are several of us who hold Canadian Wheat Board permit books, do not need lectures from that great wheat grower from Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly) with his phony, trumped up sincerity about the Canadian Wheat Board. I suspect he does not have a clue what the Canadian Wheat Board is all about. If he had followed the proceedings of the committee, he would have understood that even the Pools were basically in favour of some of the things he is talking about. The point is that a lot of the things that have been referred to by Members of the New Democratic Party had nothing to do with the amendment.

I wish to quote from the Grain Transportation Agency Administrator brief to the committee, as follows:

> The Pools accept the formal establishment of a Grain Transportation Agency Administrator with co-ordinating functions and powers.

Nobody is talking about taking anything away from the Canadian Wheat Board. We understand the importance of the Canadian Wheat Board. We understand what it does, what it has done in the past, and what this does. If the Hon. Member had followed the committee proceedings he would have understood what happened. Even the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), who at least was in the committee as the "Lone Ranger" of the NDP, understood what was happening.

● (0245)

I do not think the Member even attended a committee meeting. All of a sudden he is an expert.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Malone: He just woke up.

Mr. Anguish: I do not appreciate the Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) saying I just woke up. I have been awake for several hours, trying to participate in the debate which the Tories initiated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not making a point of order. If he has one, will he please make it?

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is, with all due respect, that you have ruled on the terms of relevancy many times this evening. I would like you tell me anything that was in the present speaker's contribution to this debate that was relevant to the debate itself. There was no relevancy there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is the impression of the Chair that the most recent remarks of the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) were strictly relevant to the amendment. I am sure the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish)—

Mr. Anguish: You were on edge.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member for the Battlefords-Meadow Lake like to be quiet for just a moment? In the view of the Chair, the most recent remarks of the Hon. Member are strictly relevant to the amendment, and I invite him to continue.

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I will not prolong the debate for any length of time. I think we want to get to the next motion which stands in the name of the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight). However, I simply wanted to point out that our record at the committee does not bear out any allegations made by the NDP about this Party's attitude at the committee with respect to the Canadian Wheat Board. In fact, it was the Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger), who was very modest in his speech, who was part of the special task force—along with the Hon. Member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta) and the Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster—responsible for setting up the Grain Transportation Agency in the first place. Its record speaks for itself because since the time when the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) was Minister of Transport, Canadian farmers have enjoyed records every year and are increasing the amounts of grain for export.

In closing, let me repeat how nonsensical the NDP has been in terms of this amendment. I do not believe that the Conservative Party can be faulted for anything it has done with respect to the Wheat Board. In fact, we recognize its value, and many of us have dealt with it. I have had a Wheat Board permit book since I was 18, which is close to 30 years. We on this side know the value of the Wheat Board, and I suggest the House would be better off spending its time trying to help the individual producers move more grain for export, earn more dollars, and meet their commitments to their bankers and others so they may stay in business on an ongoing basis. I believe that would be much more useful, rather than engaging in that phony sincerity like the Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands, the great weed grower, not wheat grower, and the trumped up sincerity he tries to bring to this issue in terms of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall I dispense?

Some Hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Motion No. 55?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the Motion please say yea?

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11), the recorded division on the proposed Motion stands deferred.

The next question is on Motion 56. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the Motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Section (11) of Standing Order 79, the recorded division on the proposed Motion stands deferred.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, could you tell us what amendment we are going to discuss next.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now be discussing Motion No. 58. Shall I dispense?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster) moved:

Motion No. 58

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 43 at page 16 the following:

Western Grain Transportation Act

"ACCOMMODATION FOR GRAIN TRAFFIC

34.(1) The Company shall,

(*a*) furnish, at the place of starting, and at the junction of the railway with other railways, and at all stopping places established for such purpose, adequate and suitable accommodation for the receiving and loading of grain offered for carriage upon the railway;

(*b*) furnish adequate and suitable accommodation for the carrying, unloading and delivering of grain;

(*c*) without delay, and with due care and diligence, receive, carry and deliver all such grain;

(*d*) furnish and use all proper appliances, accommodation and means necessary for receiving, loading, carrying, unloading and delivering such grain; and

(*e*) furnish such other service incidental to transportation as is customary or usual in connection with the business of a railway company, as may be ordered by the Commission.

(2) Such adequate and suitable accommodation shall include reasonable facilities for the junction of private sidings or private branch railways with any railway belonging to or worked by the company, and reasonable facilities for receiving, forwarding and delivering grain upon and from those sidings or private branch railways, together with the placing of cars and moving them upon and from such private sidings and private branch railways.

(3) If in any case such accommodation is not, in the opinion of the Commission, furnished by the company, the Commission may order the company to furnish the same within such time or during such period as the Commission deems expedient, having regard to all proper interests; or may prohibit or limit the use, either generally or upon any specified railway or part thereof, of any engines, locomotives, cars, rolling stock, apparatus, machinery, or devices, or any class or kind thereof, not equipped as required by this Act, or by any orders or regulations of the Commission made within its jurisdiction under the provisions of this Act.

(4) Such grain shall be taken, carried to and from, and delivered at the places aforesaid on the due payment of the toll lawfully imposed by this Act.

(5) For the purposes of this section the Commission may order that specific works be constructed or carried out, or that property be acquired, or that cars, motive power or other equipment be allotted, distributed, used or moved as specified by the Commission, or that any specified steps, systems or methods be taken or followed by any particular company or companies, or by railway companies generally, and the Commission may in any such order specify the maximum charges that may be made by the company or companies in respect of any matter so ordered by the Commission.

(6) Every person aggrieved by any neglect or refusal of the company to comply with the requirements of this section has, subject to this Act, an action therefor against the company, from which action the company is not relieved by any notice, condition or declaration, if the damage arises from any negligence or omission of the company or of its servant.

(7) The Commission may make regulations, applying generally or to any particular railway or any portion thereof, or may make an order in any case where it sees fit, imposing charges for default or delay by any company in furnishing accommodation, appliances, or means as aforesaid, or in receiving, loading, carrying, unloading or delivering grain, and may enforce payment of such charges by companies to any person injuriously affected by the default or delay; and any amount so received by any person shall be deducted from the damages recoverable or recovered by such person for the default or delay; and the Commission may, by order or regulation, determine what circumstances shall exempt any company from payment of any such charges.

(8) The railway companies shall afford to the carriage of grain a level of accommodation equal to that afforded to the carriage of other traffic and failure to provide such a level shall be remedied by such orders as the Commission deems appropriate in the circumstances.

(9)(*a*) Where the Administrator is of the opinion that reciprocal and other arrangements between railway companies are required to facilitate the efficient, adequate and reliable movement of grain on behalf of, and in the interests of grain producers, the Administrator shall apply to the Commission for such order or orders as may be required to achieve the necessary reciprocal and other arrangements between railway companies, and the Commission may

make an order granting in whole or in part the Application of the Administrator.

(*b*) If the special circumstances of any case so require, the Commission may exercise any of the powers given to it by Sections 59 and 71 of the National Transportation Act and may thereby make an interim ex parte order or orders.

(*c*) Any railway company or person directly affected by an interim ex parte order made pursuant to paragraph 9(*b*) may at any time within ten days after becoming aware of such order, apply to the Commission to vary, amend or rescind such order and the Commission shall thereupon, on such notice to other parties interested as it may in its discretion think desirable, hear such application, and either amend, alter or rescind such order, or dismiss the application, as may seem to it just and right.

(*d*) Any interim order made pursuant to paragraph 9(*b*) shall apply for a period not to exceed one hundred and eighty days but any such order may, within the said period, be converted by the Commission to a permanent order.

(*e*) If railway companies affected by any order requiring them to provide reciprocal and other arrangements are unable to agree as to compensation each should receive or pay, the Commission may, by order, fix the amount of such compensation but in no instance shall such compensation exceed the variable costs associated with the provision of such reciprocal and other arrangements.

(10)(*a*) For the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, on behalf of any grain shipper or group of grain shippers, commence any proceedings before the Commission or the Courts to secure any of the remedies herein provided.

(*b*) Where any remedy, against a railway company, other than the remedies provided herein, is available to shippers pursuant to this Act, the Railway Act, or the National Transportation Act, the Administrator is deemed to be a shipper and he may pursue such a remedy or remedies and any remedy or remedies he obtains, shall to the fullest possible degree, apply to all grain shippers."

and by renumbering the subsequent Clauses accordingly.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise after a considerable time to speak in this debate. It is now 3 a.m. and, while that is not actually important, if Members of the NDP had been a little slower in their haste and had knowledge of Motion No. 58, I think they would have recognized that Motion No. 58 fulfils many of the wishes that they seem to have in pieces, parts, and jibs and jibes, in their motions preceeding Motion No. 58.

This motion is basically accommodation for grain traffic. Part of it has been taken directly from the National Transportation Act, Section No. 262.

Mr. Benjamin: We knew that.

Mr. McKnight: I am glad that the Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) knows that. I have heard him speak quite often about that Section of the National Transportation Act. I presume that he would be in full support of this motion. As a matter of fact, he has launched cases using that Section of the National Transportation Act, although I hestitate to ask who his counsel was because I understand that he was not successful in those cases.

Basically, this motion, if accepted, will force the railroads to carry grain. If the railroads are going to receive the benefit of the taxpayers' dollars and the producers of grain will have to continue to pay increased costs for the shipment of grain, when it comes time to vote on this motion we hope it will be part of the Bill because it will leave absolutely no doubt in the mind of anyone reading this legislation in the future. It will not give the railroads the opportunity to say that they are not being adequately compensated for the movement of grain, which is the argument they have made in the past to prevent being forced under Section 262 to move grain.

Our amendment states that the railroads must furnish adequate and suitable accommodation for carrying, unloading, and delivering the grain. This would be of assistance along with Section 2 for the protection of private sidings and private branch lines of any railway belonging to or worked by the company. What that would do would facilitate the use and the maintenance of sidings and facilities that have been abandoned by railroads when abandonment has been allowed by the Canadian Transport Commission. It would maintain those sidings. It would force the railroads to provide the facilities that would allow producers to use producer cars, to establish their own elevator system, or their own private railway line.

● (0300)

Any time there is any talk at present under the existing legislation of producers getting together and forming their own railroad and running a right-of-way it appears the railway companies refuse to co-operate. This amendment would force the railroads to co-operate.

The other protection we see in this piece of legislation is that it would rely on the Canadian Transport Commission. I know there are some Members in the New Democratic Party, I have heard them, not all of them, but some of them, who speak of the inability of the Canadian Transport Commission to meet the needs of producers in western Canada. I would like to say that those of us on this side of the House put a great deal of faith in the Canadian Transport Commission. In fact we put more faith in the Commissioners established in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, when it comes to the abandonment and protection of branch lines and the movement of grain in our area than we do in the whole of the Canadian Transport Commission, I am sure.

As you come along and look at the Bill, under this Section the Commission may order that specific works be constructed or carried out, or that property be acquired, or that cars, mode of power or other equipment, be allotted. That would force railroads to repair branch lines that are in disrepair, and to repair bridges that may not be adequate, to provide rolling stock when it is in short supply, and to provide cars when they are in short supply. There would be no excuse for railroads to say they do not have enough diesel power, because this amendment would cause them to purchase that power. Then we move into other segments of the Bill. In Motion No. 58, I quote sub-paragraph (8) which reads:

The railway companies shall afford to the carriage of grain a level of accommodation equal to that afforded to the carriage of other traffic—

That simply says that the railroads would not be able to differentiate as they have in the past, and probably under this Bill will in the future, between the movement of grain and of those other commodities sharing the same lines.

Again, the Commission would be able to force the railways to carry grain and take appropriate action under the circum-

stances as the Commission sees fit. In sub-paragraph (9) it mentions the Administrator. We know that some Members of the Committee believed the Administrator was given too much power. We had an earlier amendment to this Bill which would cause the railroads to enter into reciprocal agreements if it were in the best interests of the grain producers. In sub-paragraph (9)(a) it states:

Where the Administrator is of the opinion that reciprocal and other arrangements between railway companies are required to facilitate the efficient, adequate and reliable movement of grain on behalf of, and in the interests of grain producers, the Administrator shall apply to the Commission for such order or orders as may be required—

When we brought in that amendment by itself earlier on it was supported strongly by Members of the New Democratic Party, and I am sure was even supported by some Members of the Government Party, because the reciprocal arrangements are so important to producers to move their grain. We have heard the bleating and the cries about Churchill. This is something that would facilitate and require the railroads to enter into agreements that would be in the best interests of the producers.

There is also a part in this amendment dealing with the need for the Commission to act quickly. There are times when the movement of grain is delayed and, if the railways refuse to co-operate or refuse to enter into discussions, the delay can cause the producers of that grain a considerable loss of income. It is very simply put in this Motion. It reads:

9(*b*) If the special circumstances of any case so require, the Commission may exercise any of the powers given to it by Sections 59 and 71 of the National Transportation Act and may thereby make an interim ex parte order or orders.

That simply means the Commission can go ahead without having the railroads present, without any of those parties being present, and make an order to remedy whatever circumstance they may need to remedy.

The other thing we do is fairly civil. I think the railroads are treated in the right way, the appropriate manner.

In sub-paragraph 9(*c*) the motion reads:

Any railway company or person directly affected by an interim ex parte order made pursuant to paragraph 9(*b*) may at any time within ten days after becoming aware of such order, apply to the Commission to vary, amend or rescind such order and the Commission shall thereupon, on such notice to other parties interested as it may in its discretion think desirable, hear such application—

It does not say they have to, but it says they may. That is only fair.

I come down to another fair and reasonable portion of this motion. It reads in sub-paragraph 9(*d*):

Any interim order made pursuant to paragraph 9(*b*) shall apply for a period not to exceed one hundred and eighty days—

That is only reasonable. We would not want it to continue forever in that period of limbo. It goes on to read:

—but any such order may, within the said period, be converted by the Commission to a permanent order.

We think that is consistent with the desires of the producers of grain in western Canada, the people who require the service of the railroads.

I had a friend who reviewed this. He felt that sub-paragraphs 9(a), (b), (c) and (d) would, in his opinion, cause corporate convulsions in the boardrooms of Canadian Pacific and Canadian National. I think that is probably the intent. There is not any reason they should be denied the right to worry about what would happen if they did not perform. The producers have to worry about what happens to them if the railroads do not perform. Therefore, we think we have found a way in this to satisfy all parties.

When you come to the close of the last paragraph which is found in sub-paragraph 10(a), it is a change from Section 262 of the Railway Act, and it reads:

(10)(*a*) —the Administrator may, on behalf of any grain shipper or group of grain shippers, commence any proceedings before the Commission or the Courts to secure any of the remedies herein provided.

(*b*) Where any remedy, against a railway company, other than the remedies provided herein, is available to shippers pursuant to this Act, the Railway Act, or the National Transportation Act, the Administrator is deemed to be a shipper—

In closing, I would like to read the definition of shipper that we sought and had accepted in Bill C-155. A shipper means any person, partnership, corporation or organization that enters into a contract with a railway company for the movement of grain.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, may I say I think the Hon. Member mentioned there were a couple of clauses that would cause consternation in the boardrooms of Canadian Pacific Railway. The last time the Conservatives caused consternation in the broadrooms of Canadian Pacific Railway, I think the only time, was when it was revealed that Sir John A. Macdonald was taking money from Canadian Pacific in the Pacific scandal in the last century. The Conservatives are still taking money from the Canadian Pacific Railway. They are not about to upset the apple cart.

This amendment is a piece of fluff. That is what it is. It is a piece of fluff. It, in many ways, exposes the Conservatives' approach to the Crowsnest Pass rate and to Bill C-155. When you cut through all the verbiage, it does nothing to the Bill. In fact it changes nothing in terms of the existing legislation.

The provisions contained within this Conservative amendment on the responsibility of the railroads to provide service are already covered under the National Transportation Act. The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) admitted that in his speech. It is already covered under that Act. The amendment shows up the Conservatives' approach to this legislation. It is all form and has no substance.

Faced with an aroused electorate—and perhaps we should explain this to some of the Liberal Members across the way so they know what is happening here tonight—on the Prairies that is adamantly against changing the Crow rates, the Conservatives have a position that is essentially the same as the Liberals when you really get down to it, and the Tories are reduced to moving amendments of this nature. It is all fluff and no substance. Because they have nothing to say, they end up saying basically nothing at all. Instead of addressing them-

selves to the critically important areas dealt with in Bill C-155, the Conservatives have chosen to deal with the window dressing with this amendment. That is what they mean when they talk about their responsible approach to the legislation. In fact, the irresponsibility of their approach is shown when you look at this amendment.

The responsible approach, I submit, is shown by the New Democratic Party which has stood firm, united, and consistent for the interests of their constituents and for the country as a whole. Its stand is basically change in the Crow rate—three-year option, no flim-flam as in this amendment. The thrust of all our amendments has been basically to eliminate changes to the Crow rate.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that serious people should not focus on the irrelevant. People who have something to hide often do. We should not be diverted by this rather trivial Tory amendment. Whether you vote for it or not is really fairly irrelevant. We should get it over and get on to some of the more important NDP amendments which deal with the real guts of this issue, namely, how we are going to preserve the culture, the historic rights in Confederation of the western farmer, and how we really are going to bring the railways, including the CPR, in tow and force them to upgrade rail lines while keeping the viability of the prairie farmer through the existing Crow rate.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, we have certainly heard from the joker from Vancouver-Kingsway. What a joke. It was hilarious to listen to that exposé. It is an embarrassment to his colleagues, and it is an embarrassment for anyone to be sitting in this House listening to the comments just advanced by the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway. He is suggesting that everything that needs to be contained in this Bill to protect the farmers and the grain producers is contained in Section 262 of the National Transportation Act. I think everyone knows that Section 262 of the Act has not been adequate and sufficient to date. It is certainly not improved with the passage of this Bill.

If the Member can show me in any one instance where the Act signifies the interest of the grain producer, or even mentions the word grain, then perhaps I would at least partially share some of comments he has made. But for him to suggest that this amendment is trivial, that it is nothing but fluff and has no substance, clearly shows up the lack of knowledge which this Member has about this Bill, or the lack of his knowledge about the history that producers and groups have experienced when dealing with Section 262.

● (0315)

Perhaps it all goes to show that this particular Hon. Member was handed a speech prepared by his researchers. He read it into the record. His knowledge would have certainly been served far better if he had engaged and participated in some of the committee meetings during the course of last summer. I know that the Hon. Member appeared before the committee hearing in Vancouver. He stayed for a short period of time, made an intervention, and left. That was the sum and substance of his interest in Bill C-155, yet he rose tonight and promenaded as the great defender and great saviour of western Canadian grain producers.

I compliment the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) on his comprehensive and thorough amendment. Yes, it was patterned after Section 262, but it is strengthened in many areas and is tailored specifically to grain. That is the important part, and that is the point which the rookie from Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) overlooked. Furthermore, it is consistent with our commitment to improve the Bill in terms of its relationship with producers.

The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster just handed me a quotation from which I would like to read. At page 93 of the committee proceedings, No. 132, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) is quoted as saying:

> Mr. Chairman, as one who has had two bitter experiences in trying to get the CTC to act under Section 262, in the case of several farmers who tried to act under the provisions of Section 262, those farmers were turned down because they were not called a shipper. The courts turned them down because they were not classified as a shipper. It was a board grain.

We certainly addressed that matter in the course of the committee proceedings by defining a shipper. He went on to say:

> Now, if the GTA is not a shipper, he can complain all he likes to the CTC and he can go to court: he is not a shipper, he is out of court. I tried it with grain cars, I tried it with livestock cars, and all the CTC did was respond to me, after the railroads and I went back and forth two or three times each, that the railroads were making a reasonable effort to provide suitable accommodation for traffic offered under Section 262.

In the words of the Hon. Member for Regina West, Section 262 is not adequate. The Hon. Member for Regina West, the "Lone Ranger" who sat through the committee proceedings, has a fair knowledge of the contents of the Bill and of transportation in general. Certainly we may disagree on a number of approaches to transportation, but I would never suggest for a minute that the Hon. Member does not understand transportation. However, I would suggest that the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway should spend some time with the Hon. Member for Regina West and learn a little about transportation. Then he could contribute in a much more positive manner to this debate.

As I indicated, this particular comprehensive motion goes a long way toward strengthening the accountability of the railroads in terms of what they will be called upon and expected to do in the area of providing service. Quite frankly, it charges the railway, under a legal obligation, to provide adequate service and adequate accommodation to move grain. As I said earlier, the motion is designed to incorporate grain and to incorporate grain producers.

In dealing with this Bill, and from the various exchanges which have taken place, we know that the railways are indeed obtaining a sweetheart deal. They will be receiving well over $1 billion per year for the movement of grain. During the course of committee proceedings the impression was left with us that the railways did not think that that amount was enough. As a matter of fact they are still complaining, notwithstanding the fact that the Government has been very

generous in terms of the funds which will be provided for the movement of grain, and very harsh in terms of the additional freight rate increases which will be imposed upon farmers.

Therefore, it is very important that Subparagraph (8) be looked at very carefully. It goes a long way toward spelling out clearly the following:

The railway companies shall afford to the carriage of grain a level of accommodation equal to that afforded to the carriage of other traffic and failure to provide such a level shall be remedied by such orders as the Commission deems appropriate in the circumstances.

The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway called that fluff. One of the reasons that is important is because we know that the apportionment of contribution to constant costs in this particular Bill is calculated at a figure of 20 per cent.

I have a document in my hand which I am sure all Hon. Members received from CN. It outlines some of the pros and cons of this particular piece of legislation. It made the point that the contribution to constant costs is not sufficient and that, in its presentation to Snavely, it made a case for a contribution to constant costs of 35.3 per cent of volume and line related variable costs. Also the document dealt with the cost of money.

We know that that particular figure was calculated at 20 per cent for the last crop year and that it is 18.5 per cent for this year. That component is taken into consideration in determining the cost of moving grain. They left that at 18 per cent, whereas CN and CP are arguing for 30 per cent. Snavely set it at 25.43 per cent. I urge Hon. Members to look very seriously at subclauses (7), (8), (9) and (10) because they go a long way towards strengthening the kind of legal obligation which should be imposed upon railways to discharge their responsibilities in the interests of moving grain efficiently, reliably, effectively, and in the interests of producers.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to allow the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) to continue his remarks. This is a major motion on the Order Paper. I am sure the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) would be willing to allow the Hon. Member to continue his remarks. I would suggest that the Chair should seek unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) wish to have the consent of the House to continue his remarks?

Mr. Mazankowski: I would be very happy to continue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have the unanimous consent of the House to continue?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, this provides me with an opportunity to elaborate further on the subclauses to which I referred earlier. I have already dealt with subclause (8). Now I would like to deal with subclause (9)(a) which significantly points out the incorporation of the Administrator in terms of holding the railways accountable and providing a legal obligation for them to discharge their responsibilities and to provide adequate accommodation for traffic.

Subclause (9)(a) reads:

Where the Administrator is of the opinion that reciprocal and other arrangements between railway companies are required to facilitate the efficient, adequate and reliable movement of grain on behalf of, and in the interests of grain producers, the Administrator shall apply to the Commission for such order or orders as may be required to achieve the necessary reciprocal and other arrangements—

Earlier we had some discussion on a motion wherein we moved an amendment to obligate the railways to enter into reciprocal arrangements, if necessary, and in the best interests of producers. Here we have a repeat of that same provision, and here again the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway calls it fluff. I am startled and flabbergasted that he would make such inappropriate comments on a motion which was advanced in a comprehensive manner by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster. This particular motion goes to the very heart of performance objectives and the assurance that the necessary service will be provided.

Throughout the course of committee hearings and, indeed, throughout the debate on this Bill in the House of Commons, we heard from producer groups and organizations, particularly as we travelled throughout the country, and in the letters we received, that there were not adequate service and performance guarantees. While there are provisions contained in the Bill in terms of awards, sanctions, and what not, in terms of the individual shipper who is being aggrieved or is not provided with a service which he deems appropriate, enabling devices which would allow him to seek redress were certainly not provided in this piece of legislation. This particular amendment goes a long way toward answering that particular problem.

Turning to subclause 10(a), it gets into the real meat of the particular motion. It provides a means by which a senior Government officer may, on behalf of a grain shipper or shippers, lead the way toward the recovery of some sort of remedy for a shipper or group of shippers. When we look at the cost of litigation, I think this is a very important component for producers. I am sure the Hon. Member for Regina West could tell us about the costs of litigation. It is extremely expensive, and it is a very difficult burden to bear for small operators.

Mr. Benjamin: Oh!

Mr. Mazankowski: If the Hon. Member for Regina West wants to speak, I will yield the floor to him. I wish he would stop his mumbling, bumbling, bickering and snickering. These guys are just like a bunch of chickens. They yap, yap, and yap. There is a bunch of chickens at one end of the Party and there is a bunch of fox terriers at the other. It is the most rude group I have ever seen in a debating forum.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was simply supporting the Hon. Member for Vegreville. I was

agreeing with him about court costs. I would like an opportunity to indicate how we managed to collect some. I was supporting what he was saying. I do not know what he is complaining about.

Mr. Mazankowski: In any event, subclause 10(a) would provide a very major benefit to shippers and, indeed, to farmers. I will read it into the record:

> For the purposes of this section, the Administrator may, on behalf of any grain shipper or group of grain shippers, commence any proceedings before the Commission or the Courts to secure any of the remedies herein provided.
>
> (*b*) Where any remedy, against a railway company, other than the remedies provided herein, is available to shippers pursuant to this Act, the Railway Act, or the National Transportation Act, the Administrator is deemed to be a shipper and he may pursue such a remedy or remedies and any remedy or remedies he obtains, shall to the fullest possible degree, apply to all grain shippers.

Our friends in the New Democratic Party have criticized and ridiculed the role of the Administrator. I would suspect, in the course of addressing this particular motion, they would saddle up very closely to the Administrator because here again the Administrator can act on behalf of grain shippers and provide a valuable service.

● (0330)

I would hope that in the course of this debate we might hear from the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy). He is a fair person. He recognizes that there is a very heavy obligation imposed upon the taxpayers of Canada, indeed upon the farmers, to pay for the service that we hope will be discharged by the railways.

He will recognize, as we have recognized throughout the course of our hearings and the course of this debate, that the producers want the assurance that they will have service and performance delivery. They want assurance that their grain will move on time, that there will be the right grain at the right time, at the right place at the right time, that they will be freed from heavy demurrage charges and losses of grain sales. If in the event that this does not occur, there should be some recourse by the producer. In this case the Administrator can act on behalf of the producer.

The Government will probably say that it covered this particular provision by including the provisions of Section 262. As has been pointed out previously, certainly by the legal counsel to the committee, in terms of the movement of grain Section 262 is not very effective. We have heard from the Member for Regina West and other Members who have sought recourse against the railways under the provisions of Section 262. It simply has not been an effective vehicle.

As we enter the final stages of this debate I hope that the Minister of Transport will have a serious look at this particular provision. If there is some wording that might be changed, I am sure that could be accommodated with unanimous consent. I genuinely commend Motion No. 58 to the Minister for consideration. I ask him to consider it seriously. I believe it would alleviate a lot of fears and suspicions that may very well rise in the minds of the producers. I am sure it is paramount in the minds of the producers because of the bad experiences they have had. Hopefully the Minister, or his Parliamentary Secretary, will enter into this debate. They have had some opportunity to consider this particular provision. I hope they will reconsider it and look at it in a positive light. It will certainly go a long way toward improving this Bill, incorporating a provision that would apply specifically to grain, grain shippers, and producers. It could be a major benefit to them in future years.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that we have reached this major motion of the Conservative Party. I say to my hon. friend and colleague from Vegreville that he transposes in Motion No. 58 what is already in the National Transportation Act and the Railway Act. I am sure my hon. friend will agree, from bitter opposition as a Member of the Opposition, and as the Minister of Transport trying to straighten out all that had been going on in past years, that whether through the Canadian Transport Commission or the Courts, we have never succeeded in getting the provisions of those Acts enforced.

I have carefully read through Motion No. 58 moved by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) who, I hope, will speak more on this. What is incorporated in this amendment is the same motherhood stuff we have had since the MacPherson Commission of 1965-66. Members of Parliament of that day, and maybe my friend from Dartmouth-Halifax East will remember because he was here before I was—

Mr. Forrestall: And don't you forget it.

Mr. Benjamin: Members of Parliament of that day thought that the new National Transportation Act, which came about as a result of the MacPherson Royal Commission, would solve the problems which the Hon. Member for Vegreville has mentioned. We have been trying to do this for 25 or 26 years. I made two or three submissions to the Canadian Transport Commission under the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act to try to get enforced some of the very things that are in this amendment.

What did the CTC tell us? They thought the railroads were living up to a reasonable expectation. It did not matter that the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave) could not get enough stock cars. That did not matter. It did not matter that potato growers in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island could not get enough railway cars to ship their products. What do we get here? We get an amendment supported by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). We can vote for it. It is motherhood. There are no teeth in it. This is the kind of legislation that Liberal Governments have introduced.

If the Hon. Member for Vegreville, who in his visions of grandeur is going to be Minister of Transport, is going to put the same damn thing in the legislation concerning the Crowsnest Pass rate that is already in the National Transportation Act and the Railway Act, that is why my colleague from Vancouver-Kingsway said that it is fluff. I say it is window dressing.

If the Hon. Member for Vegreville means business, he will have his colleagues move some subamendments in order to put some teeth in this amendment. All he wants to do is repeat what is already in the legislation. I do not know if he has any experience trying to have the present legislation enforced. If you try with this amendment, you will be no better off than you are under the legislation already in place.

I have here a couple of pages from the National Transportation Act. I invite you, Mr. Speaker, to read it. Then read through the amendment which is two pages long, written by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster. It is amazing how much of the wording is similar, identical to, or fits in with what is already in the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act.

There is nobody in this House who will complain about the objectives of the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster. We will not complain about that. His objectives are beautiful. We agree with those objectives. When are the Tory Party members going to put their actions where their mouths are? When are they going to put, in this kind of amendment, how they can compel the railways to live up to the law? No Government, Liberal or Tory, since the National Transportation Act, the Railway Act, or even the old legislation under Telegraphs, Canals and Railroads, has ever been able to enforce the law. If the Government had the political will and the popular support, and any Government has the popular support to enforce the present law, we would not need this amendment which is supported by the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Mr. Mazankowski: I wonder if the Hon. Member would permit a question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) accept a question?

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to entertain a question from my hon. friend. I assume from that that you will allow a minute and a half extra for my speaking time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will need the unanimous consent of the House to extend the Hon. Member's time.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, since the Hon. Member for Regina West finds so much fault with Motion No. 58, is he satisfied with the provision that has been incorporated in this Bill by the Government, which really states that the provision of Section 262 of the Railway Act shall apply? I take it, since he has found fault with this and found it inadequate, that he finds the provisions of 34(4) acceptable. Is that correct? Would I be correct in assuming that?

Mr. Benjamin: Is the Hon. Member talking about Motion No. 58?

Mr. Mazankowski: Clause 34.

Mr. Benjamin: In response to the Hon. Member's question, maybe he has been involved with Section 262 as well as myself. I have certainly been involved with Section 262 before the Canadian Transport Commission on at least two, or maybe three, other issues. We lost every time. I am objecting to a repetition. He has put, in different words, what is already in the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act. Every time a group of farmers, shippers or consignees tried to get protection under the present legislation, they were defeated. Where does Motion No. 58 make any damn difference from what is already in place?

The Hon. Member for Vegreville should get a couple of his colleagues to move some subamendments to put teeth into this so that it becomes something more than, and different from, what is in the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act. Under Section 26 the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat is perfectly aware of a case that we took to the CTC about livestock cars. Even though we proved that the railways were destroying and scrapping their equipment, the CTC said that it thought the railways were making a real effort. Instead of 1,100 stock cars, we got 500.

We went to the CTC under Section 262, which the Hon. Member for Vegreville just mentioned. There were numerous submissions, letters, and phone calls. The CTC said that its interpretation of Section 262 of the Act was the same as what is in the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville. It said that the railroads were making a reasonable effort. However, the time is long overdue. We should give the railroads two choices in the provision of service to shippers, either compulsory or "they have to".

● (0345)

I know that this will appeal to the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor). Let us visualize his version of a fully private enterprise, free, and open market government in this country, where all the railroads were privately owned but would not provide suitable accommodation, which is in the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville. Would the Hon. Member for Bow River make it compulsory? Would he interfere?

When will the Tory Party make up its mind? A public, common utility that everyone must use directly and indirectly is the railway. It is the same as a sewer line and water line, and at the moment our rail lines are like sewer lines. However, everyone must use them. It is not possible to reconcile a public utility under an amendment such as the one supported by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. It has not worked the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act. He is simply duplicating them without putting much teeth into it. This indicates to me that, should the Hon. Member ever become the Minister of Transport again—and I wish him well— if he is going to incorporate legislation which has nothing more to it than this amendment, then he will lose. He will lose just like five of his predecessors have lost. I remind the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) about a previous Minister of Transport who said to him and me behind the curtain in this House that someone should tell the railroads that they are not running this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired. Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, by dealing with this motion introduced by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) we have finally arrived at an amendment which deals with some of the very serious concerns of the producers and shippers of grain. It is interesting to note in connection with the term "accommodation for grain traffic", that the last two speakers for the NDP, the Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) and the Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), went to great lengths to point out how frivolous this amendment is, in their opinion.

However, I would suggest that finally in this debate, at ten minutes to four, we have arrived at some substance. The Hon. Member for Regina West has been talking about what is wrong with this Bill, but it was he and his Party who did not support a grains co-ordinator when, in fact, the grains co-ordinator was trying to bring together that which was not being carried out by the railroads.

I wish to point out some clauses in the motion which are specifically important. They deal with the loading of grains, and the receiving of grains. We have producer cars on the Prairies. This means that a primary producer can order a car and load it at a siding where the railroads service the cars, deliver them and make accommodation available for the producer to do the same. I suggest that this is an area which could be improved, that is, splitting a producer car. While this is not addressed in this motion, it is certainly an area of concern and the Minister should consider this matter at some point when enhancing the position of producers loading cars on a siding. This is quite permissible and happens quite often in various areas where the producers do not load through the elevator or a grain company but choose to order cars on their own.

This Bill deals with this situation, but the NDP consider this frivolous, instead of being concerned with the situation that faces the producers. Of course this is due to the fact that many NDP Members are not permit holders or farmers and do not really understand the intricate workings of the grain system and the problems faced by the producers, the shippers, and those who load cars. In this case I am talking about cars that are spotted as producer cars.

Another area which I do not believe has been dealt with concerns Clause 34(4) which states:

> Such grain shall be taken, carried to and from, and delivered at the places aforesaid on the due payment of the toll lawfully imposed by this Act.

Under our freeze provision, this would mean that the statutory Crow rate would remain in place at least until 1986. Of course the Hon. Member for Regina West did not deal with that specifically, but circumvented our freeze position. That, of course, is most important to the farmers and producers because it would guarantee a freight rate until some sanity could prevail on the Government side. I make that comment to the Government with respect to the ability of the producer to pay. I began to speak about this issue earlier this evening, that this ability would be upheld by this Clause 34(4) and our freeze provision. I think it is most important to consider the ability of the producer to pay.

I already indicated this evening that the House should understand the position of the Progressive Conservative Party in regard to this Bill. We are in favour of the development and the work proceeding. We do not like to hear the Government saying that we want to stop jobs or stop development. That is not true. Our contention is simply over the ability to pay. We are saying that the Government of Canada should accept the responsibility of paying the railroads for the enhancement and for the upgrading that the producers do not have the ability to pay for at this time of falling world prices and an increase in freight rates.

The Canadian producers are facing a very difficult situation when one considers the competition they meet as a result of subsidies that are paid in other countries around the world. These countries include the United States, the European Common Market countries, and Argentina, where the freight is completely paid for, and Australia where the grain growing areas are close to open waters. These situations are taken into account in Clause 34(4). Of course our provisions would also include the freeze which would open the door for the primary producer to achieve what I believe is possible for Canada.

Mr. Benjamin: That is my speech.

Mr. Gustafson: The Hon. Member for Regina West says that that is his speech. A new Canada could emerge.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask the advice of the Chair. Is there any way that another Member of the House of Commons can sue a colleague for plagiarism? He is making my speech over again.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not making a point of order. I call to the attention of the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson) that his time has expired. Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few short comments on Motion No. 58. I am sure you would sympathize with me when I say that it is certainly one of the longest motions we have seen in this debate during the last few weeks, because you had to read it earlier this morning.

I would certainly support the motion. I would assume that most Members on the Opposition side would do so. I predict that all Members on the Opposition side would support the motion. The Government could also support it. My research on this motion tells me that almost everything that is said in here comes under either the Railway Act or the National Transpor-

tation Act. Maybe the Hon. Member feels that a number of these provisions should be repeated. If that is so, being such a good friend, I think we will support it. However, it is probably not an important amendment in terms of making any new points.

However, the Hon. Member covers and reinforces a number of points that are important in terms of transportation. That is why we have the National Transportation Act and the Railway Act.

This motion outlines a number of things the company should do, including ensuring an adequate and suitable accommodation for receiving and loading of grain, in terms of loading grain onto the railways. That is important. There are many examples in my riding over the years where we have had problems in terms of adequate facilities for loading grain onto the railway cars. But that is already covered in the National Transportation Act. I think the provision is strong enough to be enforced in that Act, even after the Liberal Government has abolished the Crow as it is determined to do.

This amendment simply reintroduces something that is in the National Transportation Act. It states that the company shall furnish adequate and suitable accommodation for the carrying, unloading, and delivering of grain. It says that this must be done without delay, with due care and diligence.

Almost all of the points made in this amendment already exist in the National Transportation Act or the Railway Act. The Conservatives are attempting to incorporate references to the Administrator and the new Senior Grain Transportation Committee. As I have said, for that reason I believe it is probably wiser to support Motion No. 58 and it would be to oppose it.

Mr. Mazankowski: No, vote against it.

Mr. Nystrom: I have been invited to vote against it. I find that a very strange way to lobby on behalf of farmers. You put a lot of work into something and you have some researchers—

• (0400)

Mr. Mazankowski: Isn't that awful? Do not support it.

Mr. Nystrom: I am the only one so far who has been complimenting what you put before the House. I am trying to be nice and generous. I am sure the Member who moved the motion, the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight), would not react that way. He has a bit of grace and a bit of respect and decency. I am sure he appreciates a little bit of extra support for this motion that is before the House. I am surprised at the attitude of the Hon. Member for Vegreville. Maybe it is because of the wee hour of the morning. If it is, maybe he should go and get a bit of sleep.

Mr. Mazankowski: It is because of your claptrap.

Mr. Nystrom: Well, there is an expert on claptrap, if I ever saw one, sitting across the way.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would ask Hon. Members to remember the decorum of the House even though the hour is late. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom).

An Hon. Member: Let the Hon. Member himself go back to sleep.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn), if he wants to speak, can get the floor a little bit later on.

A number of the things I mentioned are very important. I suppose the reason they are is that they were reiterated by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster and he wants to make sure they are covered, because the retention of the Crow is very important to our having a good transportation system in this country.

The Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson) was making a few points earlier that a number of us have made before, that other countries around the world do subsidize their grain producers. The Argentinians subsidize freight rates. The Australian producers are all very close to sea ports. There are massive subsidies in the European Common Market. We are all aware of that. You could spend a long time putting on the record the subsidies that are paid by the European Common Market.

I had a chance, with the Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mr. Thomson), and the Minister of Trade, to go last November to the GATT meeting in Geneva. It was a real eye-opener for the three of us and the officials accompanying us to see and hear the kinds of arguments going on between the Europeans and the Americans about subsidies, and to learn about the kinds of support which other countries were giving their grain producers. I would like to suggest to you that the support offered by our Crow rate in return is not an exaggeration in any way whatever. The Crow rate gives us an opportunity to be competitive with other countries around the world. Their subsidies are massive indeed. I remind you that their producers are a lot closer to a sea port than ours.

I do not know whether you, Mr. Speaker, coming from the Toronto area might not be aware that the farmers of Canada, particularly those in the Province of Saskatchewan, are farther away from a sea port than any other farmers in the world. That is why it is so important the transportation system be efficient and that it be there at the cheapest possible rate per bushel, or per tonne, for our farmers so we can be competitive with farmers around the world. Since we have to go farther than the others, it is important that we keep the Crow.

The Americans have the Mississippi and the Missouri River systems. The Europeans are close to the sea. The Argentinians are close to the sea. The Australians and the New Zealeanders are close to the sea. We have a long way to get to a deep water port. It is therefore important that we have a very efficient transportation system. It is an important reason why the Wheat Board must remain the sole authority in terms of organization of the system and in terms of allocating the box

cars, in terms of making sure that the system runs on behalf of the farmers of this land.

Motion No. 58 is a reference to a whole series of things. It talks about the Commission and the regulations that can be made and can be applied. You can go on and on and on. I refer to the many different items in detail that are repeated here in the motion that is before the House. As I said before, many of these things, not all, are referred to in the Railway Act or the National Transportation Act. I suppose that is why the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), learned lawyer that he is, said this amendment is really a piece of fluff. I guess he means by that it is fluff because it is padded and is a repetition of something that is already in the statutes of the land. I guess that is also why he said in many ways it exposes the Conservatives' attitude toward the Crow. They are trying to have it both ways. They are trying to make believe they are actually fighting for the Crow, but they are not really doing much to protect it.

When you cut through all the verbiage in this amendment, you find that it does not really change anything in terms of existing legislation. I think, because my Conservative friends come from the Prairies and have put forth in a small way the arguments of the farmers, I will certainly will be voting for and in favour of Motion No. 58. I see you are being very polite, Mr. Speaker, and signalling that my time is up. Rather than make you stand up at this hour of the morning and call me to order, I will sit down.

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of things I want to say. First, I want to deal with a few of the interventions made by the NDP and to dismiss them as quickly as I can because this is an important amendment and I want to get to the parts of it that are most important. I am pleased to see the Minister is here. I hope, when I have finished speaking, the Minister will be aware of some of our concerns and why this amendment was moved by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight).

When the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) called this amendment fluff, I would like to point out to the House that he managed to attend parts of one afternoon Committee meeting in Vancouver and he made three interventions. The Chairman ruled on one of them that the question put did not have to be answered because it was really a political question. If anyone was fluff in terms of his participation respecting this Bill when it was in committee, it was certainly the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway. Anything he may say may be dismissed as fluff, based on the kind of performance he showed in committee.

With regard to what we just heard from the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), when he said that we want to have it both ways, I would like to ask him or his Party to explain why, on the one hand, they say they are in favour of keeping the Crow and, on the other hand, move an amendment that, in effect, has the purpose of dismissing the Crow. As soon as the NDP agree to a safety net above the level of the Crow, to my mind at least it means the NDP has changed its tune or position. Members of the NDP are the ones who are trying to have it both ways.

That is enough about the NDP except to say, when they stand up and bemoan not having a Liberal Government or a Tory Government that will ever do anything on behalf of the railways, and when we see their performance here tonight and how sad it is, we can understand why the NDP will never be in a position to form a government. If the performance of the Members of the NDP is any indication of what would happen if the NDP were in government, we have to be thankful that the prospect of the NDP forming a government is very, very remote, and slim indeed. That is something we have to be thankful for during this late evening.

Let me speak about the motion. I think the Minister will agree with me that a preferable way to proceed with this Bill would have been to make some of the money available to producers so they could put some efficiency into the system themselves. But that is not the case. Given that fact, and because we deal with a regulated industry—any of us who sat in the committee this summer could not help but realize what a regulated and totally controlled industry it is—surely it becomes incumbent upon the Government to see to it to the best of its ability that the railways that are regulated to perform, do the kinds of things this Bill intends and instructs them to do. That is what this amendment does.

In many respects the railways should not be able to have it both ways. They should not be able to live freely in a regulated society. They should not be able to get money without expecting to have some regulations by which they have to live. In fact, that is what Motion 58 does. The NDP can talk all it wants about its similarity to Section 262 of the Railway Act. There are a lot of similarities, except that what this motion does is to collect parts of the Railway Act and the National Transportation Act that are applicable to grain, and translate them into language that is specifically applicable to grain. I would argue in this respect it should be more effective than Section 262 of the Railway Act. When we have a regulated industry, of which the railways are a part and the Government is a part, surely the railways should expect some regulations to be put in place to see they perform.

Second, when we do have so many regulations, and all the money is going to the railways, I would also suggest that it is incumbent upon us to see that the amount of money that is going to the railways is as lean as possible. What you are going to have is inflationary costs borne by the Government and the producers. That inflationary increase will be based on the initial amount of money with which we start. In many ways that was the fault of the Gilson process.

The people at the Gilson meetings, to my mind, were more concerned than they should have been about some of the things that came about after the agreement. There was not enough concern about the producers initially, and about the Government's share of the money. Everybody was concerned about getting a piece of the pie. The bigger amount of money they could pile on the table and which the Government was going to commit—and we have to give the Government credit

for putting a large amount of money on the table—the more money there was to be shared, everyone thought part of that money was going to go to the producers and, the more you started with, the more would be spread among producers. We know now that is not going to happen. When you start from a position where all of the money goes to the railways, I think it is incumbent upon us to see that the railways perform and to see their bill is as lean as possible.

When you get to a situation in subsequent years, just to make my point, say in the 1986-1987 crop year, when producers are asked to pick up a share of the increase based on the initial amount of money, which is the $651 million, taken roughly—it is not quite exactly that—as their increased cost goes up as time goes on, the phased in contribution to constant costs will be $165.61 million. That figure is the Minister of Transport's figure. At the same time, the producers' payment, if there was no increase in Crow, would amount to almost the same amount. It would amount to $168.2 million.

We are dealing with a lot of money as far as the producer is concerned. I am just talking about the share of the money the railways will get as a result of this Bill, and which is their contribution to constant costs. That will be almost equal to what the producer would be paying in 1986-1987 if there were no increase in the Crow. In fact, that is the Crow rate. That is a lot of money.

Again, when the producer is going to be asked to pick up his share, and the Government, and the taxpayer, then it is incumbent that we write as many regulations into the Bill as possible to see that the railways perform. If they do not perform and we have an inefficient system, and the costs are higher than they should be, and there are not proper regulations to ensure that the railways perform, everyone will lose. Then the producers will pay more because they will be financing an inefficient system, and because the Government is going to be picking up the inflationary costs over 6 per cent in 1985-1986, the Government stands to lose as well. That means the taxpayers lose. Despite the fact that I do not like regulations and I would much sooner see some inefficiencies in the marketplace through paying some of that money to the producer, we feel that because of the Government's position on this, whereby all the money goes to the railways, we need regulations.

To me that makes a certain amount of sense, Mr. Speaker. I do not understand what the problem is. If the Government chooses to pay all the money to the railway, why would not the Government see to it that there are adequate stipulations in the Bill to ensure that the railways perform? We are asking that the CTC do this.

• (0415)

To the best of our knowledge, the CTC is the one neutral body we have in the country. Admittedly it is an agent of Government, but we know that it has acted in the past not necessarily in accord with the Government. The Government has disagreed with the Commission and, on occasion, has had to overrule it, but basically it is an independent body. It has some very good people in the western division in Saskatoon. By the way, we managed to get a definition in the Bill which defines the western division based in Saskatoon. We are not asking that the railways or the Government administer this. We are asking that a well-respected, independent agency of Government administer the amendment contained in Motion No. 58. That makes good sense to me.

I notice the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) is listening to my comments. I appreciate that very much. All the money goes to the railways. There is no room in the Bill, as I see it, for efficiency in the marketplace because some of the money should go to producers. I think the Minister would agree with that. He has indicated as much. He indicated that there will be a review process, immediately upon the Bill being passed, to look at the method of payment. Because of those things and because producers will be forced to pick up part of the increased costs, as time goes on we think that in order to guard producers and taxpayers as much as possible we need many teeth in the Bill to force the railways to perform. Very simply that is what the amendment indicates.

The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) dealt with the guts of the specific subclauses in the motion, as did the Hon. Member who introduced it. I have attempted to outline broadly the initiatives which we say would flow from this amendment and how they would benefit producers, the Government and, therefore, Canadian taxpayers. To my way of thinking it is an eminently reasonable amendment which I hope the Government would look favourably on and support.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, during the course of the debate on this particular amendment I have received several entreaties from Hon. Members opposite to respond and to comment on Motion No. 58. My participation comes at a late hour, as we all know. I suppose I could say that I have taken proper account of nocturnal submissions. However, there are one or two submissions which are very sensitive to the proposals in this motion.

One of the last points of the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) concerned the ability to pay, and that there was a government choice. I remind Hon. Members that that is not totally accurate. If he recalls the various proposals put forward during the committee hearings, he will remember that there was no consensus because major prairie producer groups, the Pools in particular, were prime proponents of payments to the railroads. If Hon. Members opposite are asking us listen to the voices of producers, this is a very clear example of us responding to the voice of some 60 per cent of them in the prairie region, and the Pool organizations, both of which were very adamant.

The Hon. Member made a very important corollary, that with the elimination of the producer payment under the 50/50 system there has to be a somewhat different form of discipline to ensure performance because the market system would no longer have the same application, force or leverage it would otherwise have. We believe that the requirement for the use of Section 262 under the Railway Act was a proper recognition of that need. We felt that the clear obligation arising from it

would provide the performance requirements which were the concern of many of us who appeared before the committee. Of course these requirements have been raised this evening. However, I have taken note of the very strong arguments made by Hon. Members of both opposition Parties.

Perhaps the simple mention of the obligation under Section 262 is in itself insufficient, in particular in relation to precedents which have been set, and perhaps the more extensive or elaborate wording of the amendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) should be and could be a more comprehensive set of criteria which would impose performance obligations upon the railroads. I am prepared to consider that suggestion. However, I would point out that during the course of committee proceedings there were some fairly lively and difficult exchanges between legal counsel as to the implications of accepting the amendment. Counsel for the Department was of the strong opinion that Section 262 was sufficient and that to accept the whole wording of the proposed amendment might create some further legal complications. This raised some question marks.

I want to return to the offer of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). He recognized that there may be need for some re-working of the language of this particular amendment in order to eliminate what might be complications perhaps resulting in contrary decisions being made in relation to the Railway Act, under the Bill. We want to have some degree of harmony and to eliminate contradiction. Of course that takes time. I think all Hon. Members would recognize that we cannot expect legal counsel to be available at 4.22 o'clock in the morning. I know that public servants are very diligent and responsive to the command of their political Ministers, but at this time of the morning it would be too much to expect them to be on call.

An Hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. Axworthy: They are not exactly a 24-hour hamburger service. In order to obtain the sharp, pristine legal judgment we require, we would expect them to have a proper night's sleep, unlike Members of Parliament who, we presume, are able to function, even if they have to attend Cabinet meetings at eight o'clock in the morning.

I will take into account Motion No. 58, but obviously I would like the time to consult with legal counsel. Perhaps at that time I would be in a position to respond to the concerns of Hon. Members of the Opposition or to determine if the complications are too overwhelming to accept. Perhaps some other wording might be accepted, or adapted, which would incorporate the reference to grain requirements throughout the Bill without getting into the contradictory propositions mentioned by legal counsel during the committee hearings. I think Hon. Members opposite would understand my concern as the Minister responsible for the Bill. I cannot require us to come back with further amendments which would not be harmonious with legal principles.

I would be prepared to take a hard look at Motion No. 58, but I would want to be able to give it the kind of assessment it requires. Obviously we would require some time in order to determine the possibilities. Knowing that Hon. Members opposite are anxious for us to proceed with such an examination, I would like to move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Parkdale-High Park (Mr. Flis):

That the House do now adjourn.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 374*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand	Demers	Hopkins
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Dingwall	Hudecki
Axworthy	Dion	Irwin
Bachand	Dionne (Chicoutimi)	Isabelle
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)	Dubois	Joyal
Bégin (Miss)	Duclos	Kaplan
Berger	Dupont	Kelly
Blais	Dupras	Lachance
Bloomfield	Duquet	Lajoie
Bockstael	Erola (Mrs.)	Lalonde
Bossy	Ethier	Lamontagne
Breau	Evans	Landers
Bujold	Ferguson	Lang
Burghardt	Fisher	Laniel
Bussières	Fleming	Lapierre
Caccia	Flis	Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)	Foster	Lapointe (Beauce)
Campbell (LaSalle)	Fox	LeBlanc
Campbell (Cardigan)	Frith	Leduc
Chénier	Garant	Lefebvre
Chrétien	Gauthier	Loiselle
Collenette	Gimaïel	Lumley
Comtois	Gingras	MacBain
Corbin	Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)	MacEachen
Côté (Mrs.)	Gourde (Lévis)	MacGuigan
Cousineau	Gray	Mackasey
Cullen	Harquail	MacLaren
Cyr	Henderson	MacLellan
Dawson	Herbert	Malépart
de Corneille	Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)	Maltais
		Marceau
		Massé

Messrs.

Masters
McRae
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—126.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Broadbent
Cardiff
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Corbett
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis

Messrs.

Jewett (Miss)
Kempling
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—107.

● (1130)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

It being after eleven o'clock a.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at two o'clock p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 11.33 a.m. on Tuesday, November 1, 1983 the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 2, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

• (1405)

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 21

[*English*]

MEDICAL CARE

TRIBUTE TO PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN SAVING LIFE OF OTTAWA YOUTH

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions of sadness, pride, and concern that I address Members of the House today. Sadness stems from the most unfortunate accident involving Steven Gerald Bednas, an Ottawa youth whose legs had to be amputated as a result of a tragic accident last Friday when he was caught in a box shredder. The pride, stems from the effort by doctors, ambulance attendants, firefighters and policemen, whose joint efficient efforts saved the life of this young man.

With such a gallant team effort one is reluctant to impart special recognition to a select few individuals. Unfortunately, the names of all those involved are not yet available. Nevertheless, the heroic humanitarianism and professionalism displayed by Drs. Barry Armstrong and Charles Buckley, of the Canadian Armed Forces, and by Dr. Justin Maloney of the Ottawa General Hospital, deserve recognition for their efforts in saving Steven Bednas' life. Also deserving a great deal of credit is Dr. Armstrong's wife who, upon witnessing the accident, ran to inform her husband and called Dr. Buckley to assist him. What is especially remarkable about the contribution by these doctors is that they were not on duty at the time. They were preparing for a special function that evening. Yet they committed themselves to saving that young man's life without concern for time or legalities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I rise with concern, because evidently some equipment necessary to deal with the crisis was not on hand. Some of the equipment needed had to be brought in from the Ottawa General because it is not carried by ambulances. Dr. Armstrong indicated that if a paramedical system had been in existence the equipment would have been available from the start. Equipment and special training are essential. The example of the need for both in this case was revealed in the training that Dr. Armstrong received at the National Defence Medical Centre, known as the Advanced Trauma Life Saving System.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member, but his allotted time has expired.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

RECOMMENDATION TO CANCEL LIQUOR EXCISE TAX PENDING TASK FORCE REPORT

Mr. Louis Duclos (Montmorency-Orléans): Mr. Speaker, the situation today is very difficult for Canadian distilleries and their employees. The industry is operating at 40 per cent of its production capacity, and the number of jobs has reached its lowest level since 1965. In my own riding, several dozen workers have been laid off in recent months. In the circumstances, the 13.3 per cent increase in the excise tax on liquor which has been in effect since September 1 of this year has increased the hardship for the industry and its employees.

I know this automatic increase merely maintains the ratio between federal excise taxes and the final sale price. I am also aware that the federal Government receives only 31 per cent of the revenue collected by all governments on sales of alcoholic beverages, while 10 years ago, its share was 40 per cent. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, in view of the extent of the problems with which the Canadian distillery industry is faced, I suggest the excise tax increase should be cancelled, pending recommendations by the task force responsible for looking into this matter, which was announced last summer by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde).

Finally, I would like to remind the Government that substantial increases in the tax on liquor may bring about an equally substantial drop in sales, thus reducing the total amount of tax revenue.

* * *

[*English*]

STATUS OF WOMEN

BATTLE FOR EQUALITY

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, this is an especially opportune week for all of us to recognize the progress Canadian women have made toward full equality. But it is also important at this time to recognize that there are victories still to come.

Yesterday a Manitoba lawyer named Isabel Ross Hunt was presented by the Governor General with the Persons Award.

The award was established on the fiftieth anniversary of the recognition in Canadian law that women were persons and, therefore, could become Senators. Since that landmark ruling, women have fought diligently for legal and economic equality. But the battle is not over. For our part, as parliamentarians, we can support the recognition of homemakers in the Canada Pension Plan. We can actively encourage an increase in the role of women in the political process, and we can seek greater representation of women in the Senate.

For her part, Isabel Ross Hunt, who is an authority on family law, has made important inroads with regard to property rights. But the battle for full equality ought not to be fought by women alone. Indeed, those who seek full recognition of women's rights do so knowing that to achieve the goal is to achieve a better Canada.

* * *

[*Translation*]

RAILWAYS

AMENDMENT OF CROWSNEST PASS RATE—INDUSTRIAL REPERCUSSIONS

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, passing Bill C-155 will mean that capital expenditures of $16.5 billion will be made by the railways, and 375,000 person-years of employment will be created. Canadian National plans to spend over $10 billion and Canadian Pacific will be spending $6.5 billion over the next eight years. Most of the money will be used to renew, upgrade and extend railway networks in the West. Thus, the industrial impact will be felt across the country, not only in Western Canada where much of the construction will be done but also in the East, where the steel and equipment is manufactured. The bulk of these expenditures will depend on whether the Bill is passed and on changes in the Crow rate. The railroads have already started their projects, in anticipation of passage of the Bill. Mr. Speaker, in Quebec we intend to spend $308 million over the next four years on upgrading equipment and facilities. CN and CP are expected to spend about $1.4 billion on railway supplies and equipment in the next decade, in the Province of Quebec alone. The Government intends to order 3,840 new hopper cars, most of which will be built in Quebec. Mr. Speaker, this is another good reason why Hon. Members opposite should stop their delaying tactics.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

SOUTH AFRICA—INTERNMENT OF REVEREND SMANGALISO MKHATSHWA

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, today a referendum is taking place in South Africa to see how South Africans will react to a new constitution which will permit three Parliaments in that country. One Parliament will represent the whites, of which there are about 4,300,000; one Parliament will represent the coloured, of which there are about 2,400,000; one Parliament will represent the Indians, of which there are about 750,000; and the blacks, who represent about 18,600,000, will not have a Parliament at all. The referendum is not binding. Nevertheless, it is being voted on only by whites. The executive authority of the constitution still permits the President and the executive to be appointed by a panel comprised of a majority of whites. In general, it is a mockery of democratic life. The blacks, who still provide the labour force, are banished to the homelands. In actual fact they are disposable labour. It is a trick to improve the image of South Africa to the rest of the world.

On top of all this, Reverend Smangaliso Mkhatshwa, a Roman Catholic priest and Secretary General of the Catholic Bishops of South Africa, has been interned. I would like the House of Commons to support this man who is known for his stand on human rights and equality for blacks. We should protest his internment, along with South African Catholic Bishops, and demand that he be removed from detention immediately.

* * *

REMEMBRANCE DAY

PREVENTION OF FUTURE WARS

Mr. Jack Burghardt (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, on November 11, 1983, Canadians across the land will share in Remembrance Day ceremonies. It is of concern to me that November 11 not only continue to be a day of commemoration, and of pride in those who served their country, but a day to reflect upon the present and future course of our great country.

The events of the last few months have escalated global tensions. Not since the 1962 Cuban missile crisis have we been so acutely aware of a possible movement toward war. On Remembrance Day we will honour those who gave their lives in past wars. Perhaps the greatest tribute we could pay to these courageous men and women is to work as parliamentarians toward preventing future wars and the loss of life and property that would result. It is my hope that we will do everything in our power to promote and ensure world peace.

Furthermore, I urge my hon. colleagues to lend their support to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as he embarks next week on a round of talks with world leaders in an effort to reduce global tensions.

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT

GOVERNMENT POLICIES—QUEBEC UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, today, the Parliament of Canada has 64 Liberal Members for Quebec. For nearly 18 years the Liberal Party has been in power, but year after year, Quebecers have been saddled with a high unemployment rate. In my view, neither youth nor the workers of this country or this Province but the Liberal Members of the House are to blame. Their policies on energy, agriculture, industry and tourism have caused a great deal of harm.

Canadian citizens need a federal election, a new, Conservative Government that understands that specific policies are necessary for each region and each Province.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility lies with the Liberal Members and their failure to speak up and take the intitiative with respect to these problems. Voters want and need to make a new choice. After four years it is time for a federal election.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES—CANADIAN MEMBERSHIP URGED

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, throughout the years Canada has permitted its influence and presence in the affairs of the Caribbean and Latin America to recede by failing to join the Organization of American States.

On July 9, 1982, I moved a motion in the House asking for Canadian membership in the Organization of American States, but did not receive unanimous consent. Subsequently the Chairman, the Hon. Member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras), of the Subcommittee on Canada's relations with Latin America, publicly recommended that Canada join the OAS. Indeed, even the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) indicated to the news media his disposition for full Canadian membership in the OAS.

● (1415)

The United States of America is a member of the OAS but is not a member of the OECS, the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States. In my view Canada's possible influence in the Grenada events was severely limited by its stubborn refusal to join, and lack of membership in, the Organization of American States. I therefore call upon the Government to review again its foreign policy with regard to Latin American nations and the Caribbean nations, and undertake to become a full member of the Organization of American States at the earliest opportunity.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

METRIC CONVERSION

COURT DECISION ON LEGALITY OF IMPERIAL AND METRIC MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Domm: —I would like to take this opportunity to address my question to the representative of the tiny group of fanatics or the dinosaurs, namely, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who is not present. In her absence I would direct my question to the Prime Minister. In light of the recent judgment in Toronto that both imperial and metric measurement are legal in Canada today, is it the intention of the Prime Minister to proceed as it is the intention of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who, at 1.30 today, said that the judgment will not stop the Government "from proceeding with its position on mandatory metric"? What is the position of the Government of Canada in light of the decision of the judge in the court in Toronto?

Mr. David Berger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Berger: I thank the Hon. Member for his question. The Minister has had the opportunity to comment upon it and will obviously be saying more, now that she has arrived in the Chamber. However, I would remind the Hon. Member of the purpose behind the Government's position, that to allow both systems could lead to confusion and put the consumer in a weaker position when it comes to verifying price increases, which I understand is a concern of the Hon. Member and his Party. Further, the law and regulations were designed to ensure equity in the marketplace for the consumer and between retailers. I am sure that the Hon. Member supports these objectives.

Mr. Domm: I cannot say that I appreciate the answer representing the tiny group of fanatics in the Government who think that mandatory metric is the only route to go.

INQUIRY WHETHER APPEAL WILL BE LAUNCHED

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I will address my supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, or whomever. Given the fact that Judge William Ross described the methods of your inspectors as draconian, and your actions in enforcing poorly drafted regulations as devoid of any semblance of decency, fairness and natural justice, is it the intention of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to agree with the judge, or to ignore the judge and go through the process of appeal?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Of course, Mr. Speaker, we will follow the law. We have not yet received a written decision. When we do, we will base our appeal on that decision. At the moment, of course, the law prevails and we will not be able to enforce any of those regulations in the Province of Ontario.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

● (1420)

APPLICATION OF LAW

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all the citizens of Canada I ask this question of the Prime Minister. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who represents a tiny group of fanatics, the dinosaurs of this nation, says that in Ontario we are free to use imperial and metric. What does the Prime Minister say is the case as it applies to all of Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I cannot comment on fanatics, but I do know that the dinosaurs are those who refuse to see metric is world-wide in its scope and that Canada has to live in the world if it wants to trade in the world. I also know that the Hon. Member's Party voted in support of the metric system. The metric system was first brought in by Tory Prime Minister John A. Macdonald. So much for the dinosaurs.

I understand that the judgment just came out.

Some Hon. Members: It is just a judgment. It is just a judge.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, it is just a judgment until all appeals have been exhausted, or until a decision has been made not to go to appeal.

An Hon. Member: Walk on water, Pierre.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the Leader of the Opposition and remind him once again that he has talked repeatedly about civility in the House of Commons. I wish he would talk to his own caucus rather than talking to the press.

ENFORCEMENT OF REGULATIONS—APPLICATION OF CHARTER OF RIGHTS

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister a very important question with respect to the Charter of Rights and Judge Ross's very blistering attack on government activities in terms of regulations which infringe on the rights of individual citizens of this country. Will the Prime Minister do the just thing in the spirit of the Charter of Rights, and give direction that, until this matter is resolved, regulations which allow the metric enforcement squad to go in and shut down the livelihood and operations of service station operators in Canada are not to be enforced?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member should remember that the Charter of Rights, which is binding upon all Canadians, is the work of this Government. His Party fought the Charter of Rights for a year, saying that it should only be done after patriation of the Constitution, which really meant it never would have been done because we know the difficulty there was, even before patriation, to get agreement from the Provinces.

Mr. Speaker, there is a Charter of Rights to protect the citizens. The courts are there to enforce the Charter of Rights. As the Minister said, we want to live with the laws and the Charter as they are willed by this Parliament. Let the process go through the courts; then the Government will decide if the law is an infringement of the Charter or not. If the courts decide that the regulations are an infringement of the Charter they will be changed, obviously.

GOVERNMENT POLICY INQUIRY

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. Judge Ross stated in his judgment that this Government regards the Charter of Rights only as a mere declaration. If the Prime Minister has any interest, aside from words and proclamations and declarations, will he take some active steps in terms of policy to prevent the Gestapo-like tactics such as those going on with respect to the metric enforcers and in the Department of National Revenue, to ensure that the spirit of the Charter of Rights, with respect to the rights of individuals vis-à-vis the Government, will be observed?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I suspect the Hon. Member is not quoting the judge correctly. If the judge said that this Government is considering the Charter only a declaration, then the judge does not know what he is talking about. I suspect that he is being misquoted.

Mr. Crosbie: Have you read the judgment?

Mr. Trudeau: I suspect he has been misquoted by the Hon. Member.

* * *

FISHERIES

FEES CHARGED TO BRITISH COLUMBIA GILLNET FISHERMEN

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. At the meeting with gillnet fishermen at Steveston on Monday, Mr. Parkinson, head of the Small Craft Harbours Branch, made only two minuscule cuts in the exorbitant charges being levied on gillnetters, charges which will ruin the majority of them. Will the Minister authorize the branch to hold up the proposed rates for at least a year while consultations take place? Will he, or his deputy, attend the meeting of gillnetters to be held in New Westminster this Friday, and hear the concerns of the gillnet fishermen directly from them?

• (1425)

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, the commitment I can give to the Hon. Member is that I will personally review the whole case and, within a few days, make a final decision.

I should like to give a general outline of the matter so that Hon. Members will understand it. The fees that are charged by the Department for use of the facilities—and we have over 2,400 wharves and berthing facilities in Canada—are about 50 per cent of what the private sector charges for berthing facilities. The fees that fishermen pay for storing equipment with the Department are barely 20 per cent of what the private sector charges for similar facilities.

Our major investment in B.C. means that starting now, and in the years ahead, we will have to increase our expenditures substantially. I will review the case personally but I ask Hon. Members to think about this. If our fees are so high, why is the waiting list of fishermen who want to use the facilities of the Department, so long?

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—REPORTED WELCOME BY CITIZENS

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The Government has, in effect, condemned the landing of Caribbean and American forces on Grenada. My talks with dozens of randomly selected Grenadians last Sunday indicated that, without exception, they welcomed this as the liberation of their island. "We are free", was the most common comment. Will the Minister indicate whether popular support for the landing on that island would change the Government's position to any degree?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to hear that the Hon. Member had a successful visit, and I appreciate the comments he has made. In reply to his specific question about whether new factors have caused the Government to change its position on this particular matter, I have read very carefully the comments made by the Prime Minister and the Minister of State for International Trade and I have seen no developments, even in those comments made by the Hon. Member, that would cause the Government to change the opinion it has already expressed.

REPORTED MASSACRE BY SOLDIERS OF FORMER REGIME

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, on October 21 the Minister of State for External Relations said in the House that after a "decent period of time" the Government would be recognizing Messrs. Austin, Coard and company as the new Government of Grenada. Is the Government aware that, on October 19, coup soldiers massacred between 100 and 200 men, women and children, according to my advice from eyewitnesses of that incident at Fort Rupert? If so, why were the Liberals conditioning Canadian public opinion to accept such a brutal regime so quickly?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member refers to the loss of life at Fort Rupert. I know there has been a loss of life. His estimate of 100 to 200 is much greater than any estimate we have. We have no evidence that the number is greater than 20 or so, but the Hon. Member may have information not available to us. I assure the Hon. Member that he is rather unfair in suggesting that we were attempting to condition public opinion to the acceptance of this kind of activity.

* * *

• (1430)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF MEMBERS OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT OF ITALY, PROFESSOR FUGLIELMO ROEHRSSEN; DR. FRANCESCO SAJA, AND DR. MAURICIO NEVOLA, DIRECTOR OF PROTOCOL

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I call to the attention of the House the presence in our gallery of members of the Constitutional Court of Italy, Professor Fuglielmo Roehrssen; Dr. Francesco Saja, and Dr. Mauricio Nevola, Director of Protocol.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

RESTRUCTURING OF FISHERIES IN QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

Could the Minister inform the House whether his offer to restructure the fisheries industry in Quebec still holds, considering the unwillingness expressed by a number of ship's captains in Newport who want to have their own factory, and could the Minister inform the House whether negotiations are continuing with fishermen in the Gaspé?

An Hon. Member: Good question!

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to inform the House that the federal Government's offer still stands, and I was very pleased to receive the support of the majority of Newport fishermen. However, should a majority of the Newport fishermen change their minds, I would then have to reconsider the federal

Government's offer. If our offer cannot be maintained, all the efforts of the federal Government to prevent Pêcheurs-Unis from going bankrupt will have been for nothing, and not the creditors will lose money but the fishermen themselves who, with the factory workers, have invested over $1,200,000 of their own money in this co-operative, and the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada who represent Canadian taxpayers as well. That is why we made an offer under which fishermen will not have to invest again, and we shall set up a large company in which fishermen, factory workers, unions, creditors and both Governments will be asked to work together. However, I repeat that if Newport changes its mind, I think we will have to reconsider our position, because—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Minister, but his answer is getting longer and longer. Could he perhaps finish his answer?

Mr. De Bané: Very briefly then Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Government's offer is a comprehensive offer to the entire Pêcheurs-Unis movement, and if the Government of Quebec wants to take care of Newport, it is welcome to do so, provided it does the same for all other factories.

* * *

[*English*]

VIA RAIL

CANCELLATION OF TOUR SERVICE TO NORTHERN MANITOBA

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. As he is probably aware, there has been a lot of concern in northern Manitoba about the lack of service or co-operation by VIA Rail with the tourist industry. Churchill Wilderness Encounters cancelled five tours this year. Toronto based Horizon Holiday Tours have expressed absolute frustration in dealing with VIA. Travel Network of California has stopped bringing people to Churchill. Great West Tours of San Francisco have also stopped bringing people in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please ask his question?

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, it is not my fault that there are so many problems at VIA. Will the Minister investigate and see what he can do to improve the marketing practices of VIA, especially from Winnipeg to northern Manitoba?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we are presently doing that.

UNITED NATIONS

NICARAGUAN RESOLUTION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that a Nicaraguan resolution is up for debate in the UN General Assembly today, with a vote anticipated tomorrow, would the Minister indicate to the House the position the Government of Canada intends to take respecting this resolution? In particular, will the Government be voting in support of the resolution and continue its condemnation of the Caribbean countries' and American intervention in Grenada?

Mr. Broadbent: Where do you stand?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, instructions have not yet been delivered to the Canadian delegation on what position they ought to take on this resolution. The situation is changing rather quickly at the General Assembly. There may be amendments, there may be further resolutions, and until the situation is fully clarified it is not the intention of the Government to give specific instructions. But such instructions will be given, and the Canadian delegation will be asked to take a stand on this particular resolution.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—REQUEST FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Chairman of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence has not been seen in the House for questions since last Friday when I asked him if he would arrange through the steering committee—

Mr. Mulroney: There he is.

Mr. Stevens: Good. Mr. Speaker, would the chairman of that committee indicate to the House if he has now made arrangements for an immediate reference to be heard in that committee with respect to the Grenadian affair so that there can be an open discussion in a committee of this House about all facts and activities on Canada's role leading up to and during the intervention in Grenada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised that the Hon. Member should have noticed my absence since last Friday, for I was in the House yesterday, the day before yesterday, and I am here now. I did say quite clearly that I would consider the advisability of convening the steering committee. I might point out to the Hon. Member that I followed the debate earlier today, even though I had other consultations to make, as I had promised, behind the curtains and in private, that I would. I am still

making them, but the Hon. Member will appreciate that he is not the only one I must consult. I paid close attention to the Oral Question Period today, although I was expecting another phone call during my consultations, and I wondered which of the two Members was the Official Opposition critic—the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona or the Hon. Member who has just taken the floor. I have to decide as well with whom I should negotiate. At 4.25 p.m. yesterday, I did receive a letter from the Hon. Member for Edmonton-Strathcona and, because the mail delivery service is sometimes slow, I got in touch with the Hon. Member's office first thing this morning to tell him I had received his letter. I have it here, in fact. I carry all my documents with me. I will continue my consultations, but I am not in a position to tell him whether—

* * *

[*English*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

AUDITOR GENERAL'S RESERVATIONS

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board who will know that the Auditor General has issued a qualified opinion on the 1982-83 Public Accounts. He stated in his opinion that he has four serious reservations about the fairness of the financial statements. In effect he is saying that they are misleading, and I suggest to the President of the Treasury Board that this is a serious matter for the taxpayers-shareholders of Canada. What steps is the Minister taking to encourage his officials to eliminate those reservations?

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, there is a difference of opinion between the Auditor General and our accounting advisers on the approach to the statements. The approach we are following is based on policies set out in a note to the statements, that we are primarily responsible to Parliament and our statements, therefore, have to respond to the legislation passed by Parliament. That is the basis on which the statements are being prepared. But the Comptroller General is already carrying out a study in depth into what the appropriate definition should be of the accounting entity in a way which is intended to address the concerns of the Auditor General. In doing this he is responding to a request of the Public Accounts Committee made last year.

• (1440)

Mr. Lewis: The Auditor General makes the point that it is not just a question of compliance, it is a question of not misleading the Canadian public.

CANADAIR AND DE HAVILLAND LOSSES

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to direct to the same Minister. One of those reservations involves the accumulated losses of Canadair and de Havilland. In Volume III these losses are written off and shown as deficits. In Volume I they are treated as explicit guarantees. Can the Minister tell us how we can go from a loss in one set of financial statements to a guarantee in another, and not mislead the Canadian public?

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that there is no intention to mislead the Canadian public. The statements are developed and reported on the basis of the legislative requirements of Parliament. The statements respond to the necessity of reporting to Parliament. I will be happy to provide further information to my hon. friend on the specific point he has raised. However, I simply want to say that the Comptroller General, at the present time, is carrying out a study designed to address the concerns of the Auditor General. In the meantime, our view is that we have no alternative but to follow the direction of Parliament and report on how the Government is operating on the basis of the laws passed by this Chamber.

* * *

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

FREEZE ON TOLLS IN 1984

Mr. Jack Masters (Thunder Bay-Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Transport. As the Minister knows, many western grain producers have indicated their concern at the possibility of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority raising its tolls for the 1984 season. As this comes under the responsibility of the Minister, would he inform the House of his intentions on this matter which is very important to the farmers and to many others who use our great St. Lawrence Seaway?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Government has been very concerned about trying to limit the various factors of cost which relate to the movement of agricultural goods.

An Hon. Member: How about the Crow?

Mr. Axworthy: I would be pleased to inform the House, if Hon. Members opposite would like to listen, that after consultation with the U.S. Secretary for Transportation, Mrs. Elizabeth Dole, we have come to the conclusion that there will be a total freeze on Seaway tolls for 1984.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

IMMIGRATION

EXERCISE OF MINISTERIAL DISCRETION ON COMPASSIONATE GROUNDS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. As the Minister knows, his immigration guidelines empower him to use his discretion to relieve unusual hardship for a last

remaining relative in the old country who may not be in the immediate family class for immigration, but who, by long association, is dependent on a Canadian family for physical or mental well-being. Since the Minister has announced that he is cutting back on immigration next year by about 15,000 in spite of the clear signs of recovery in unemployment, will the Minister assure this House that he will continue to exercise his discretion on compassionate grounds on behalf of such remaining family members?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I believe I should say, first of all, that the Hon. Member is not technically correct when he says that I will be cutting down. The figures which we have announced are not the targets which will be inevitably reached, but are the estimated entry levels which we expect will take place. We believe that the entry next year will turn out to be about the same as it will prove to be this year, because I expect entry this year will be below what we had originally anticipated.

Of course there is no intention, Mr. Speaker, of changing the practice or the power which does exist to exercise consideration on humanitarian grounds. I am always prepared to examine individual cases which are presented to me by Hon. Members, to see if they are worthy of the exercise of that discretion.

* * *

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

METHOD OF PRESENTATION—AUDITOR GENERAL'S RESERVATIONS

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance my question is directed to the Minister of State for Finance. The Minister will know that the Minister of Finance has presented the Public Accounts of Canada to the Governor General about which the Auditor General has expressed serious reservations. Essentially what the Auditor General has said—and the Minister will appreciate this—is that there has been a netting out of expenses and receipts so that the expenses and receipts of the Government are grossly understated. Will the Minister change the system of reporting in future so that we will have what the Auditor General says is a reasonable, clean statement? We will then not have reservations by Parliament's auditor as to the way the accounts of Canada are presented.

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, each year the Auditor General gives his comments on the Public Accounts to which the Hon. Member opposite has referred. As in previous years, we shall take full account of his proposals with respect to the way in which the Accounts are presented. The fact remains, however, that the presentation of the Public Accounts conformed with past practices and, if there are improvements to be made, as suggested by the Auditor General, we shall take those into account.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF HON. THOMAS WELLS, ONTARIO MINISTER OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to call to the attention of the House the presence in our gallery of the Hon. Thomas Wells, Ontario Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

INDUSTRY

BOMBARDIER TRAIN CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. The Minister is now the proud owner of two slightly used train sets which were repurchased by the Government for some $9 million after Amtrak Corporation in the United States refused to buy the trains from Bombardier MLW under the terms of a lease-purchase agreement. When the Government entered into this contract with the Bombardier Company, to whom did the Government intend to resell the trains if it was called on to buy them? Or was the Government simply rolling the dice, hoping it would never have to perform on the contract?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I thought the Hon. Member was going to rise and ask me some questions with respect to Pratt & Whitney, so that I would have a chance to answer him directly in the House instead of doing this all by himself. With respect—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Minister answer the question please?

Mr. Lumley: With respect to the question concerning the LRC matter, I wasn't around when those decisions were made. I believe I would make the same arrangement tomorrow as whomever made the decision at that time. The fact of the matter is that there was a potential of hundreds of millions of dollars of export business for Canada, as well as thousands of high technology jobs with a future by entering into that contract. It did not work out, Mr. Speaker. However, I concur in the decision to take the risk.

Mr. Wilson: This proves again that there is no foresight, no planning, and no understanding of how the taxpayers' funds are to be looked after. It is another example of government waste.

NON-USE OF TRAINS

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Minister directly if he will explain why he has allowed these trains to sit in the yard by Bombardier's plant since the spring of 1982 when, at the same time the repurchase

occurred, VIA Rail was placing a $100 million order for ten trains at double the price at which the Government has been asked to take these trains back? Why have they been sitting around there rusting and totally unused?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, first of all, we tried to sell those trains to other railroads around the world. We tried to sell those trains to other rail lines in North America. We have had discussions with VIA Rail and those negotiations are still ongoing. However, with respect to the information from the Hon. Member, I just want to remind him, while I have the chance, about Pratt & Whitney—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Lumley: —the cost per job is $2,500, not $100,000. He should get his information straight.

* * *

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

RESTRUCTURING OF DEPARTMENT

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of State for Science and Technology. The Minister's Department has been cut in half, reduced to a head without a body. The Minister has stated that this change is for the better, because the head will have direct access to Cabinet. That remains to be seen. As the Minister knows, Cabinet proceedings are secret. Therefore, can he assure this House that the shake-up at MOSST is not just the way to put government policy on science and technology behind closed doors, in secret, and away from the scrutiny of an informed public?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, there is no shake-up at MOSST. MOSST was restructured to make it more effective in its new role as chief science adviser to the Government, with direct access to Cabinet Ministers, to Cabinet Committees, and to the Prime Minister's Office. This is very much in keeping, I would think, with what we have seen happen in the United States. The role has been made clear. The lines of responsibility, I believe, are now well established. Dr. Berlinguet has assumed his post. I would judge, contrary to what the Hon. Member feels, that this is indeed a major improvement in terms of moving forward with the science and technology policy which I announced in the House last May.

• (1450)

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

EXTENSION OF SERVICE TO NORTHERN NEW BRUNSWICK

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Communications. It concerns the subject of CBC radio which has long been awaited by Canadians living in northern New Brunswick, with respect to facilities that are in place to bring the new signal of CBC English programming to that part of Canada. Could the Minister indicate when the people living in that part of Canada will be able to enjoy this broadcasting on a daily basis?

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to answer the Hon. Member. This is a question that has been on his mind for some time now. I know that he has brought pressure to bear on CBC to encourage development of this additional coverage.

I am delighted to say that today I have been informed by the Executive Vice-President of the CBC that the CBC English AM service will, as of today, be available on a daily basis on the FM network to the citizens in northern New Brunswick he has mentioned.

I would also like to add, for the Hon. Member's information, that as far as French language television is concerned in that area, CBC coverage in the French language is going out on a test pattern basis at the moment. If those text patterns can indeed be received, as we expect they will be, the French language television service of the CBC will be available on an official basis as soon as these tests have been completed.

* * *

METRIC CONVERSION

ENFORCEMENT OF REGULATIONS—APPLICATION CANADA-WIDE

Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister and it is supplementary to the questions raised earlier by the Member for Peterborough on the metric decision handed down yesterday by an Ontario court, and the Prime Minister's reference to the Charter of Rights.

Implicit in the answer given in the House today by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs was that, until the Government decides what to do, the enforcement of the regulations is now going to be stopped, but only in Ontario. Surely a basic tenet of any decision on any citizen's right, whether it is included in the Charter or not, is that all Canadians from coast to coast should be treated exactly the same under federal law. The answer of the Minister is clearly discriminatory. Will the Prime Minister now indicate if metric enforcement will cease right across the country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Hon. Member is making a representation

and a point. I indicated earlier that I had not read the judgment. I have not conferred with the Minister.

I do not know if any decision has been made to appeal the judgment. Until that is decided it is premature to say that the judgment is the law of the land. It becomes the law of the land when all appeals have been exhausted, or when an appeal has not been lodged.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A short supplementary.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

USE OF WRITS OF ASSISTANCE

Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, in view of the Government's growing trend to deal in a discriminatory way because of court decisions, I would also ask the Prime Minister to look at the decision of the Solicitor General to continue the use of writs of assistance only in those Provinces where the courts have not declared it invalid?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, in that matter we are following a very clear, established policy of this Government, and which was followed by prior Governments as well. When there are conflicting court decisions across the country, or when decisions of lower courts are made in parts of the country, the Government respects that decision for the jurisdiction in which it is decided. But when the matter is resolved at a higher level, that settles it for the country as a whole. I do not see how a process could work on any other basis.

* * *

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

RETENTION OF STATUS BY CANADIAN MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION, BRITISH COLUMBIA DIVISION

Mr. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. It stems from the harassment by the Minister's officials of individuals, artists, and now voluntary agencies across Canada. The Minister may know that on June 22 the British Columbia Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association was advised by his departmental officials to alter proposed amendments to its constitution if that Association wished to retain its charitable status. The objectionable section in the statement of purpose states, "to advocate and lobby for improvement and integration of treatment and rehabilitation services for persons who become handicapped or disabled by emotional disorders." I would simply ask the Minister if he authorized that harassment of the Canadian Mental Health Association.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to indicate to the Hon. Member that the responsibility of Revenue Canada officials is to make sure that the legislation voted by Parliament and the laws as interpreted by our courts are enforced. I urge him to examine the provisions of the Income Tax Act dealing with charitable organizations, as well as the decisions made by the courts. Since the Members of his party have been finding so much significance in court decisions during Question Period today, he should indeed delve into the legal precedents related to charitable organizations and he will realize that the action taken by the Department to ensure compliance with the Income Tax Act is very much in keeping with the legal precedents of the past few years with respect to charitable organizations.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

FUTURE OF BOWATER PAPER MILL AT CORNER BROOK, NFLD.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. He will know that the mill at Corner Brook, Newfoundland, now owned and operated by Bowater, is to be closed by them by next year if they do not find a prospective purchaser, putting the jobs of a thousand people in jeopardy, and all the allied jobs. Is the Government working on any plan that might see the continuation of the operations of that mill, or any plan to see that the mill's machinery is modernized? Is the Minister working with the Government of Newfoundland on this situation?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): As the Hon. Member knows, as I believe I responded in the House two weeks ago, Bowater have not been in touch with my office directly. They have been negotiating with the Premier of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Government for the last three or four months. We were advised by the Government of Newfoundland about three or four weeks ago of the possibility of the mill closing.

As the Hon. Member knows, under a pulp and paper modernization agreement, the Government of Canada committed about $17 million, with the Province of Newfoundland, toward the modernization of that mill a few years ago. The company decided not to proceed with the modernization. That money is still available for any prospective new buyer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Oshawa.

Mr. Crosbie: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Speaker has recognized the Hon. Member for Oshawa. There has been a problem up to this point in recognizing that Hon. Member.

BANK OF CANADA

REQUEST THAT GOVERNOR BE INSTRUCTED TO REDUCE BANK RATE

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Finance has arrived in the House, perhaps we could proceed. In the first six months of this year there were signs that economic recovery was under way. That was largely, but not entirely, due to good export sales. There are opposite signs now that the recovery seems to be stalled and the principal reason for this, according to the Conference Board, the C.D. Howe Institute, and Statistics Canada, is the real level of interest rates, which have increased by 300 per cent during the course of this year. Will the Minister exercise the power that he has, and instruct the Governor of the Bank of Canada to bring down the bank rate?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I apologize if I was somewhat delayed from being in the House this afternoon. I just could not make it earlier.

With respect to the question raised by the Hon. Member, he has a rather simplistic solution to what is a real problem. He knows that the real interest rates in Canada are now lower, indeed, significantly lower than in the United States, when one compares the inflation rates in the United States and in Canada with the level of interest rates.

Since August, 1981, we have succeeded in reducing the spread between the rates in Canada and the United States by 4.7 per cent, which is quite significant in terms of interest rates. We have real interest rates in Canada now that are lower than in the United States.

If there were any way we could achieve even lower interest rates in this country I would certainly not hesitate for one moment to take whatever steps would be required to achieve this purpose, if it were responsibly feasible without creating even more serious problems than the one the Hon. Member is trying to resolve. I must advise him, however, that we have met with considerable success during the course of the last year in reducing interest rates in Canada. Our policy is to achieve a continuation of the reduction of interest rates. I hope that the reduction of inflation rates in Canada, along with steps taken in the United States, will enable us to bring about a gradual reduction in the interest rates in Canada.

● (1500)

REQUEST THAT MINISTER TAKE ACTION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister likes to convey with accuracy statistical reality. In that context, I am sure he will acknowledge that interest rates in Canada are higher than in the U.S., the bank rate is higher than in the U.S., and the real rate of interest is about the same as that in the U.S. In light of the fact that a lower interest rate in Canada would help our exports of lumber products, and it would help the sale of all kinds of export goods in other sectors abroad, as well as stimulate consumer spending, all of which would produce more jobs for Canadians, I repeat, will the Minister exercise the power that he has as

Minister of Finance, take the responsible economic action, and bring down the interest rate level charged by the Bank of Canada?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the latest information I have is that the prime rate in Canada at the present time is 11 per cent. It is the same as in the United States. Second, rates for short-term paper, up to seven years, in Canada and the United States, are about equal at the present time, while over the last couple of years they were significantly higher in Canada than in the United States.

Third, the rate of inflation in Canada is still higher, unfortunately, than it is in the United States and, therefore, the real interest rates in Canada would be lower than in the United States.

Again, to come back to the point raised by the Hon. Member, if I thought the simple issuance of a directive to the Governor of the Bank of Canada would be beneficial to the Canadian economy, I would not hesitate to have recourse to such a step. However, I am convinced that the step recommended by the Hon. Member would indeed be very counterproductive. It would be a completely artificial decision that would not represent the real state of the economy and would lead to more serious problems than the ones we are facing. I think the economic recovery in Canada has been proceeding extremely well this year, and I am confident that we will continue to note a high rate of growth this year and next year.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Presenting Reports from Standing and Special Committees.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has tried to be fair with Hon. Members. Bearing in mind the limitations of time and that it is now beyond three o'clock, with due respect to the Hon. Member for Oshawa, the Chair has tried to accommodate him. At this stage the Minister of State for International Trade has a statement he wants to make to the House, I believe.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. NIELSEN—REFERENCE TO TELEX BY MR. REGAN

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in relation to the Friday, October 28 deliberations in the House and a point of order that was made at that time by the Opposition concerning the tabling of a telex which had been in my possession from the High Commissioner of Barbados to the Department of External Affairs. At that time Madam Speaker, in commenting on the point of order, after hearing both sides, said the following:

I can look at the "blues" after giving the House at this time my preliminary impression about what has just taken place in the House. That would allow the Minister time to reflect upon the nature of that document and tell the House

whether or not he feels that it can be published without any injury to any matters of public interest.

On Monday, October 31, I wrote to the Speaker asking that the ruling on this question be delayed because of my involvement with the federal-provincial trade Ministers meeting on that day and of my inability to be in the House. At that time, in a letter, a copy of which I had sent to the office of the Leader of the Opposition, I also explained, upon perusing *Hansard*, that it had become obvious to me there was confusion in the House between two telexes, both of which had referred to conversations between our High Commissioner in Barbados and the Prime Minister of Barbados.

I think, so that the matter can be properly examined by the Chair, it was important and is important that that distinction be made. There were a number of questions in the House in relation to the discussions that had taken place on the Friday prior to the invasion between High Commissioner Noble Power and Prime Minister Adams, and whether what had been said constituted in effect any warning to Canada of the possibility of an invasion. I was concerned with rebutting that suggestion, and as a consequence I had in the House, though I did not read from it, a subsequent telex that had been sent by Noble Power after the invasion when, at my instructions, he had gone to see Prime Minister Tom Adams to ask for an explanation of why Canada had not been informed. The other telex was not in the House nor in my possession.

The words that need to be examined to determine whether anything was said or done by me that would warrant an order for the telex to be tabled would refer—

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Regan: I am on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is a point of order before the House raised by the Hon. Member for the Yukon. The Chair would like to hear the rest of the Minister's statement and will be pleased to hear the Member for the Yukon as soon as he sits down, if that would be in order, before passing judgment on the matter.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I would—

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deans: Throw him out!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect the Hon. Member for the Yukon, would he please sit down?

The Chair would like to establish the practice, when a point of order is raised, of hearing the statement of the initial person or the initial response, as in this case, and after a period of time in which to investigate the facts, turning in an orderly way to other Hon. Members who obviously are concerned about the matter. With the permission of the Hon. Member for Yukon, the Chair would like to do that in this case.

Mr. Pinard: He is on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I will rise on a question of privilege, if necessary.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has recognized the Minister, and the Chair will certainly recognize the Hon. Member for Yukon as soon as the Minister has completed what the Chair hopes will be a short statement.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Pinard: The Minister is on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will certainly recognize the Hon. Member for Yukon as soon as the Chair has had an opportunity to analyse, to listen, to what the Minister has had to say. The Hon. Member for Yukon's rights will be scrupulously observed. But the Chair would like to hear the rest of the Minister's statement.

Mr. Nielsen: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Go ahead, you have the floor, Gerry.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Speaker—

Some Hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Nielsen: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I understand it is the practice of the House to hear a matter of privilege at any time, bearing in mind that a point of order is under discussion. The Hon. Member for Yukon is rising on a matter of privilege. The Chair will hear him on a matter of privilege.

Mr. Nielsen: I will be very, very brief, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: You can't be brief.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, I can be very brief if interventions will cease and if I might—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon has been recognized and the Chair is listening attentively. Will the Hon. Member make his point of privilege, please?

An Hon. Member: Turn on the microphone for him.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I would love to make my point of privilege if the jackals over there would just be calm for a moment. My question of privilege is that the privileges of all Members of the House are affected when, under the guise of a point of order, a Member, or worse, a Minister of the Crown, reflects on a ruling of the Chair. Madam Speaker made a ruling with respect to the production of the document, which is now being reflected—

An Hon. Member: That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has heard the Member for Yukon. In the judgment of the Chair, a preliminary ruling was made by the Speaker and the Chair has examined it very carefully. The Speaker very carefully said that she wanted the Minister to examine the matter further and see if it would be possible to table a document "without any injury to any matters of public interest." That is a direct quote from Madam Speaker. The Chair at this point would like to hear what the Minister has to say relating to matters of public interest.

● (1510)

Mr. Nielsen: Don't let him reflect on that ruling.

Mr. Regan: Mr. Speaker, the question which was asked by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) was where a reference was made to the telex. I will not read those references.

Mr. Nielsen: You can't.

Mr. Regan: I did not quote from the telex, but if you were to read my two answers to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, it would indicate the words used in the House that could in any way conceivably relate to the only telex I had in the House.

Mr. Nielsen: He is being allowed to reargue his case.

Mr. Regan: If the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) would just be quiet, I might be able to be briefer.

Mr. Nielsen: You are rearguing your case which has been ruled upon.

Mr. Regan: I am not doing any such thing.

Mr. Nielsen: You certainly are.

Mr. Regan: The Hon. Member is a little rusty.

Mr. Nielsen: At least I am not dense.

Mr. Regan: I want to say beyond that that the conversations which took place between High Commissioner Power and Prime Minister Adams in any event were held in confidence. To reveal these telegrams to the House would break the confidence of the conversation, not only with Prime Minister Adams but with other Prime Ministers whose conversations are reported in the same telegram. Such a course would be contrary to the basic conventions of international communication and could adversely affect our ability to have such conversations.

The tabling of the telegram would further involve some risk to the security of the Canadian diplomatic communications service. It would not be possible to table the telex or telegram without harm being done to the public interest. Therefore, I would have to lay that before the Speaker for consideration.

Mr. Nielsen: I submit, Mr. Speaker, without any reflection upon the Chair, that the Minister, if you will examine what he said today in the "blues", has been allowed to reargue a case which was put to the Speaker last Friday and upon which she made a ruling.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague who can interrupt other Members who have the floor on a point of order, I thank you for recognizing me on a question of privilege. You have stated clearly yourself that this was not a ruling by the Chair, but that there had been a tentative or preliminary ruling leaving the door open for additional arguments which might enable the Chair to make a final decision.

Under these circumstances, the Minister cannot be faulted for having discussed or questioned a ruling which has not been rendered by the Speaker. That is why I suggest that the only thing the Hon. Member is trying to do once again is to waste the time of the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair finds itself in the same position as before. The Chair would like to hear the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) and to hear the balance of his statement at this point.

Mr. Nielsen: I am surprised that the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard), who should know better, was allowed to smuggle in under the guise of a question of privilege further argument on a point of order when I was prevented from doing so myself.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker made a ruling and that ruling must not be reviewed. Unlike the President of the Privy Council, she left no doors open with respect to the production of that document. She ruled that it was one of those documents which should be produced.

Mr. Regan: Which one?

Mr. Nielsen: The Minister was only waving one at the time.

Mr. Pinard: Which one?

Mr. Nielsen: What a cop-out! They are now playing the old shell game with documents that should be produced in the public interest. They are saying, "Which one?" We saw him wave one. We saw him quote from it. We must accept his word when he says, "we didn't read from it", but by his own admission he quoted four or five words from that document. That area must not be reviewed, but the Minister was allowed to do it, and that is the only reason I am covering the same ground. He realized his mistake a little further on in the submission and got to the real crux of the matter, which was the only door left open by Madam Speaker at the time she made her ruling. That was, that if the Minister, upon reflecting upon that document, made the decision that it was against the interests of national security—I think the words she used

were, "public interest"—then he could take refuge, which he is doing, in the fact that it would not be in the public interest to release the document. He can take that refuge, but what a cop-out. If that document were to have been produced, it would have proven beyond any rational doubt that what he was doing was playing with smoke and mirrors when he was answering the questions from this side.

We cannot do anything about Ministers who lack courage or about a Government which is so obsessed with the doctrine of secrecy that it takes refuge in the doctrine of its being against the public interest or against the national security to release documents.

I suggest that the defence and the position of the Minister and the Government are absolute hogwash. They do not have the courage to produce the facts, to which Canadians are entitled, to show how inept and bungling they have been through the whole Grenada affair in ensuring that the safety of Canadians caught in that situation down there had not been cared for far sooner than it was. They have bungled. They have been incompetent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: That telex would prove beyond any shadow of a doubt that that is the case. I am sure that is the way it is viewed by the vast majority of Canadians throughout the country.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, you will recall that this matter arose as a result of the Minister's answering a question from me. I am not exactly clear at the moment why the Minister is refusing to table the document. Perhaps Mr. Speaker can help me in this regard. Is the Minister refusing to table the document because he now claims that he did not quote from it, or is the Minister refusing to table the document because he believes that it would, in one way or another, violate the public interest? If the Minister is claiming that he did not quote from the document—and I heard him say that at one point during his statement today—then the way to solve that question might well be for the Minister to show the document to the Speaker in confidence, since the Speaker is quite clearly sworn to secrecy. He could show the Speaker the document to satisfy the Speaker that in fact there is no quote in *Hansard* which was taken directly from one or the other of those two documents.

On the second question, I doubt very much anything can be done if the Minister determines that somehow or other it would be detrimental to the public interest to table the document. I happen to believe, as the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) stated, that the public interest would be better served in coming to reasonable conclusions about what took place in the days immediately preceding the invasion of Grenada if the documents that transmitted the information from our High Commissioner in Barbados could be made public.

However, in order to satisfy what I consider to be a requirement of the House as placed upon the Minister by the Speaker, I ask that the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan) provide for the Speaker the documents in question so that the Speaker can satisfy himself that those documents were not quoted from, and I would be prepared to accept the Speaker's ruling in that regard, whatever it turned out to be.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to draw your attention to two citations in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, namely citation 327 and particularly paragraphs (2) and (3), even though the entire citation makes for interesting reading. The explanations given by the Minister today and on an earlier occasion did answer fully the two questions raised by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). First, the Minister denies having quoted from any telex whatsoever, since the three or four words to which he referred were in his personal notes. As he has already had an opportunity to explain and, secondly, even if we do not admit that he was quoting from that document, even if it were true, Beauchesne indicates that since it cannot be done without injury to the public interest, as the Minister stated, that is sufficient justification for you to prevent him from tabling the document.

As to the new practice suggested by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, it is an insult to the honour of parliamentarians because we do have a well established principle in this House to the effect that, when a Member—particularly a Minister responsible—makes a statement and gives his word that such is the situation with respect to security or public interest, that is sufficient and ought not to be questioned. Therefore, it is not necessary to add to that practice the requirement that the word of a Minister be checked by the Speaker of the House, notwistanding all our respect for the Chair. Citation 327 (2) reads simply, and I quote:

● (1520)

[*English*]

It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the Table of the House, if it can be done without injury to the public interest.

Those are the key words. We do not admit that this document has been quoted by the Minister who, on the contrary, said that the three or four words that he used were from his personal notes. I quote Citation 327(3):

A public document referred to but not cited or quoted by a Minister need not be tabled.

Those two citations should be sufficient for the Chair to prevent the Minister from tabling the telex he talked about. Further, may I draw your attention to the argument made by my colleague, the Minister, who made a clear distinction between the two telexes. This should also be taken into consideration before you make your ruling.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I submit that a ruling is not necessary. Madam Speaker made the ruling that the document was one of those which should be tabled. The Minister shakes

his head in the negative, but that is what happened. She went on to say that if the Minister, on reflection, thought that the production of the document would not be in the national interest or the public interest, then that was his way out. We are satisfied with Madam Speaker's ruling. We are satisfied that now that the Minister has stood in his place and said that it would not be in the national interest or public interest to table a document, it need not be tabled, even though we feel it is a cop-out.

In my submission, the Chair is not in a position now where it needs to make a ruling because Madam Speaker has done that. She made the ruling, left the way out, the way out has been taken by the Minister. That is the end of it. There is certainly no point in making another ruling on top of the one that has already been made. Obviously the document, on the declaration of the Minister himself, is not one of those which need be tabled because he has said to the House that it would not serve the national interest or the public interest to do so. That is the end of it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair has reviewed the remarks of the Speaker. The Chair is satisfied that the Minister has stated that it is against the public interest to reveal the document. That is the end of the matter.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

PETITIONS

MR. PELLETIER—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Irénée Pelletier (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition.

It is addressed to the Honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your Honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. This petition containing 1,400 names was organized by the Conseil estrien pour la paix and the Carrefour de solidarité internationale de l'Estrie. Briefly, expresses the wish that Canada would refuse to test the Cruise missile and humbly showeth:

That the Cruise missile is a military weapon and not a peace weapon.

That its greater prevision and ability to fly without being detected by existing radar systems makes it a front line offensive weapon.

Wherefore, the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon your Honourable House not to authorize the testing of the Cruise missiles on its territory, to support the initiatives for a multilateral disarmament at the special session of the United Nations, to assert its will not to escalate the arms race and to refuse unreservedly the presence of the Cruise missiles in Canada.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray.

[*English*]

MR. SCOTT (VICTORIA-HALIBURTON)—FULL MAIL SERVICE FOR LINDSAY, ONTARIO

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, signed by residents of Lindsay, Ontario, who now exercise their ancient and undoubted right to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that whereas a portion of Oak Street and Birch Court are already receiving full mail service, we the undersigned, do hereby petition for full mail service to the remainder of Oak Street and Birch Court in Lindsay. And as in duty bound our petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ROCHE—AMNESTY FOR POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. Douglas Roche (Edmonton South): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition on behalf of Amnesty International signed by 249 Albertans, primarily in the city of Edmonton. The petitioners claim that it is an affront to humanity for thousands of men and women to be imprisoned throughout the world solely because of their political beliefs, colour or ethnic origin. They also claim that there is an indissoluble link between human rights and world peace. Therefore, they petition Parliament to call for an amnesty backed by the United Nations and declared by all governments for all such prisoners of conscience, which would give effect to the moral and legal principles of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have a few petitions I would like to present this afternoon. They have been sent to me by Canadian citizens. The petition of the undersigned of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party, that they feel the Crow rate must be maintained and that the railways of all of Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—CALL FOR PASSAGE OF BILL C-678

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I should like to present a petition this afternoon signed by the residents of the Province of Quebec who believe that the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada escalates the nuclear arms race and is therefore a threat to world peace. The petitioners ask Parliament to recognize that history proves that as military strength increases, so too does the temptation to use that military strength and, therefore, multilateral nuclear disarmament must occur in order to secure peace in the world. The petitioners call upon Parliament to debate and pass Bill C-678, an Act to Declare Canada a Nuclear Weapons Free Zone so that Canada, along with other countries that wish to participate can, as a traditionally peaceful nation or collection of nations, play a crucial role in mediating the world-wide process of disarmament.

Mr. Gimaïel: How many names?

Mr. Anguish: There are a number of people here. One Member is calling for their names. There are several names. The Member who is asking can inspect the petition once it is laid upon the Table. Most of the residents are from Montreal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member will confine himself to his petition.

• (1530)

MR. ANGUISH—CALL FOR SALARY INCREASES FOR MPS' STAFFS

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, the petition, signed by the residents of Canada who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the salary budget for staff of Members of Parliament is frozen until August 3, 1984, under the six and five program, and that Members of Parliament were not informed of the freeze into the first year of the program, and as a result most MPs' staff will not receive any salary increases during 1983 and most of 1984.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to increase the salaries of MPs' staffs so that these employees are able to meet financial arrangements they entered into based on salary increases Members of Parliament and staff were led to expect. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, the next petition I have is signed by residents of the Province of Saskatchewan. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party and that the Crow rate must be maintained and that the railways of all of Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party's alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass Agreement and rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ANGUISH—CALL FOR PASSAGE OF BILL C-678

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, the next petition is signed by the residents of the Province of Manitoba who support the passage of a Private Members' Bill standing in my name, Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons-free zone. The petitioners believe that the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada escalates the nuclear arms race and is therefore a serious threat to world peace. The petitioners stress that Canada, as a traditionally peaceful nation, can and must play a crucial role in achieving multilateral disarmament. They believe that the passage of Bill C-678 will allow Canada to act as a mediator, along with other countries who wish to participate, in the world-wide nuclear disarmament process.

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, I do have several petitions here this afternoon and I will not go on to present all of them. I will take advantage of other days to do that. I will present one last petition and then I will take my seat.

MR. ANGUISH—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by the residents of the Province of Saskatchewan to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents from the Province of Saskatchewan who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party and that the Crow rate must be maintained and the railways of all Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party's alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

CONSTITUTION ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING DURATION OF HOUSE OF COMMONS

Hon. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-694, an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1867 to 1982 (duration of House of Commons).

Some Hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Howie: Mr. Speaker, my Bill seeks to authorize general elections at statutory intervals under certain conditions and provisions set out therein.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

HOLIDAYS ACT

AMENDMENT TO DESIGNATE "HERITAGE DAY"

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-695, an Act to proclaim the first Monday in August "Heritage Day".

Some Hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Yurko: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to designate the first Monday of August "Heritage Day" and to offer to all Canadians an occasion to express their appreciation and their pride in being part of a multicultural nation. I cite the work of Michael Beaupré and Dianne Davidson of the Law Branch and David Pratt of my office in drafting this Bill. A Member would have to be politically naive not to vote for this Bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

BLUE WATER BRIDGE AUTHORITY ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING INCREASE IN MEMBERSHIP

Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-696, an Act to amend the Blue Water Bridge Authority Act.

Some Hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, when the Blue Water Bridge Authority was established it was assumed that there would be Americans and Canadians serving on the authority. As it turns out, Michigan has decided to put the Blue Water Bridge totally within its highway system. As a result of that, rather than having eight members doing this work we now have four. I am suggesting that the number be increased from four to five so that we can handle the Canadian side.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared again today to forgo the usual practice of reading the riding of each Member presenting a motion for concurrence, the exception being for today only.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed. I will dispense with reading the rather lengthy list.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,243, 4,790, 5,017, 5,023 and 5,260.

[*Text*]

CHANGES TO UI MATERNITY BENEFITS

Question No. 4,243—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Is the Government contemplating introducing changes to the legislative provisions dealing with benefits for reasons of maternity and, if so, would such changes include the right of a claimant to choose the length of time before and after delivery?

2. Were any such changes submitted to Cabinet for approval and, if so, what is the anticipated time that an enabling bill would be submitted to the House?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): 1. The provisions of the Unemployment Insurance legislation dealing with maternity benefits were examined by the Task Force on Unemployment Insurance and their report was tabled in Parliament in July, 1981.

The proposals for revamping the maternity benefit provisions would extend maternity benefits to adoptive parents, and eliminate the "magic 10" rule, Section 46, and the provision which limits payment to the first 15 weeks of benefits.

Under present legislation, a maximum of 15 weeks of maternity benefits is payable commencing eight weeks before the expected date of confinement and ending 17 weeks after the actual date of confinement. Personal flexibility is available within these parameters and the Task Force did not propose any modifications to this particular provision.

2. Following extensive consultation across Canada, recommendations on various provisions of the UI legislation, including several dealing with maternity benefits, have been formulated. An enabling bill will be prepared and placed before the House based on the final decisions of the Cabinet; these have not yet been finalized.

VULNERABLE EMPLOYEES IN EMPLOYMENT AND IMMIGRATION COMMISSION

Question No. 4,790—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. How many supernumeraries or vulnerable employees are presently retained on salary in the Department of Employment and Immigration?

2. What was the total following the reorganization of the Department?

3. What is the budgeted cost of the reassignment program in the fiscal year 1983-84?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): 1. There are a total of 187 vulnerable employees on strength in the Department of Employment and Immigration and the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission. Of this number, 41 are employees whose positions were transferred from the National Capital Region to Bathurst, N.B., as a result of the Government's decision to relocate the Central Index, Annuities and Employer Registration Divisions. The balance are employees displaced as a result of the integration of the former Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Unemployment Insurance Commission. In addition, there are also 112 employees who, as a result of the integration process, have had their positions downgraded in classification level and have been accorded "Present Incumbent Only" status.

2. The integration of positions and employees was a gradual process that took place over several years following the approval in 1977 of the Bill authorizing the creation of the Department of Employment and Immigration and the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission. In view of this fact, an answer to Part 2 is not possible.

3. One officer (PE-2—$24,260 to $34,880) at National Headquarters is currently involved in full-time efforts to find new assignments for vulnerable employees and employees with "Present Incumbent Only" status.

VIA RAIL LOGO

Question No. 5,017—**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):**

1. (*a*) Which agency or agencies or person or persons, and working in what city or cities, conceived and designed the logo and corporate signature of Via Rail Canada Inc. (*b*) what amount and on what date was each agency paid for these and any related services?

2. What means were employed by Via Rail to protect its logo and corporate signature from use by others either within, or external to, Canada?

3. Is Via Rail represented by any subsidiaries, agents or offices in other countries and, if so, in which other countries and by what other subsidiaries, agents or offices?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): The management of VIA Rail Canada Inc. advises as follows:

1. (*a*) The VIA logo and corporate signature was designed by ARC Corporation of Montreal, Quebec in 1976.

(*b*) A sum totalling $15,000 was paid for the design to ARC in January, February and March, 1976.

2. VIA Rail has obtained trademark registration of the logo and corporate signature design in Canada and is currently seeking similar registration in the United States, Europe and the Far East.

3. VIA is represented by general agents in the following countries:

Thomas Cook Ltd.
P. O. Box 36
Peterborough, England
PE3 6SB
Thistle Air Brokers Ltd.
12 Nineyard Street
Saltcoast
Ayrshire, Scotland
KA2 15HS
CN France
1, rue Scribe
Paris 75009
France
NRV Holiday B.V.
Zeestraat 100-104
2518AD The Hague
Holland, Netherlands
Zeppelin-Tours
Karistrasse 57
D-7990 Friedrichshafen
West Germany
Canada Reise Dienst
Grossestrasse 2
D2070 Ahrenburg
West Germany
Touring Club Suisse
Rue Pierre-Fatio 9
1211 Geneva 3
Switzerland
Hans H. Kristensen A/S
56 Aaboulevard, DK-2200
Copenhagen N.
Denmark

TRANSLATION OF PLACE NAMES ON GOVERNMENT MAPS

Question No. 5,023—**Mr. Stewart:**

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources to translate all place names on government maps, in accordance with provisions in the Official Languages Act, and, if so, to reprint all government maps in both official languages?

2. What is the Department's best estimate of (*a*) the number of person-years required to translate place names on government maps (*b*) the cost to reprint government maps with place names in both official languages?

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources reports as follows:

1. EM&R does not intend to translate all place names on government maps. All maps produced by the Department are now available either in a bilingual format or in separate

English and French language publications in accordance with the spirit and intent of the Official Languages Act.

It is the practice of the Department to portray on maps only the official form of the name provided by the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names and as approved by the Provinces or Territories. An exception to this practice is that certain features of national significance are shown with names in both French and English language forms (e.g. Fleuve St. Laurent/St. Lawrence River).

2. Not applicable. See answer to part 1 above.

VICTORIA COAST GUARD RADIO STATION

Question No. 5,260—**Mr. Skelly:**

1. Is the Station Manager of the Victoria Coast Guard Radio station retiring in December of 1983?

2. Will the Department fill this position with a full-time manager through the normal competition procedure and, if not, does the Department intend to fill the position with an acting or temporary manager?

3. If the Department intends to appoint an acting or temporary manager, is the Department beginning to implement a program which would see the closure of Coast Guard radio stations at Victoria, Comox, Alert Bay and Bull Harbour?

4. Is there a committee of the Department of Transport examining the closure of Coast Guard radio stations in B.C. and, if so (*a*) what are its terms of reference (*b*) who sits on the committee?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Not applicable.

4. There is no committee of the Department formed for the express purpose of examining the closure of Coast Guard Radio Stations in British Columbia.

(*a*) There is, however, a committee with Terms of Reference to: "Prepare an area master plan for the updating of the present Maritime Mobile Radio Communications Services provided by the Coast Guard Radio Stations on the West Coast of Canada."

The master plan is being developed by a team of regional and headquarters officials from the Canadian Coast Guard's Telecommunications and Electronics function.

(*b*) The team submits periodic reports to a Steering Committee consisting of:

Chairperson:	Regional Director General, Western Coast Guard Region
Members:	Director, Telecommunications and Electronics, Coast Guard, Ottawa
	Director General, Aids and Waterways, Coast Guard, Ottawa
	Director General, Ship Safety, Coast Guard, Ottawa
Ex officio:	Regional Manager, Telecommunications and Electronics, Western Coast Guard Region

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): If Question No. 4,387 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

• (1540)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 4,387 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

Question No. 4,387—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. For (*a*) 1979 (*b*) 1980 (*c*) 1981 (*d*) the first six months of 1982, how many unilingual (i) Francophones (ii) Anglophones were hired and/or promoted by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in each Province and Territory?

2. For (*a*) 1979 (*b*) 1980 (*c*) 1981 (*d*) the first six months of 1982, how may bilingual (i) Francophones (ii) Anglophones were hired and/or promoted in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in each Province and Territory?

3. For (*a*) 1979 (*b*) 1980 (*c*) 1981 (*d*) the first six months of 1982, how many unilingual (i) Francophones (ii) Anglophones were rejected in the hiring and promotion process of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in each Province and Territory?

4. For (*a*) 1979 (*b*) 1980 (*c*) 1981 (*d*) the first six months of 1982, how many bilingual (i) Francophones (ii) Anglophones were rejected in the hiring and promotion process of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in each Province and Territory?

5. For (*a*) 1979 (*b*) 1980 (*c*) 1981 (*d*) the first six months of 1982, how many unilingual (i) Francophones (ii) Anglophones applied for employment in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in each Province and Territory?

6. For (*a*) 1979 (*b*) 1980 (*c*) 1981 (*d*) the first six months of 1982, how many bilingual (i) Francophones (ii) Anglophones applied for employment in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in each Province and Territory?

Return tabled.

* * *

[*English*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the notices of motions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS—MOTIONS

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

GARRISON DIVERSION—SUGGESTED MEASURES TO PROTECT ENVIRONMENT OF MANITOBA

The House resumed, from Monday, February 9, 1981, the motion of Mr. Sargeant:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of taking those measures necessary to ensure that there is no damage caused to the Manitoba environment by the completion of the Garrison Diversion Unit in the State of North Dakota and, that such measures to be considered could include:

1. The convening of a joint meeting between provincial, state and federal authorities affected by the Garrison project;

2. The offer of legal and technical assistance to those citizen's groups in Canada now attempting to halt the progress of the Garrison Diversion; and

3. The bringing to trial in the World Court, the government of the United States, should Canada be unsuccessful in its efforts to receive satisfactory assurances regarding the future safety of her environment.

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine): Mr. Speaker, this motion refers to the Garrison Diversion project and addresses suggested measures to protect the environment of Manitoba. The first measure set out in the motion is as follows:

1. The convening of a joint meeting between provincial, state and federal authorities affected by the Garrison project;

It is too late for that, Mr. Speaker; it has been done many times over the past few years.

The second measure set out in the motion is as follows:

2. The offer of legal and technical assistance to those citizen's groups in Canada now attempting to halt the progress of the Garrison Diversion;

We are far too late for that, Mr. Speaker. It has all been done years ago.

The third proposal set out in the motion is:

3. The bringing to trial in the World Court—

We do not have time for that either. The United States has made it perfectly clear that it is going to complete the Garrison Diversion project, and it has started work on the Lone Tree section of the project without consultation with Canada.

I have called on the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to contact the President of the United States personally to discuss the Garrison Diversion project and get assurances that it will not continue without further consultation.

I will go into details in a moment of where the United States, especially North Dakota, has made it perfectly clear that it is going to complete the diversion plan. We have been told that a fish screen is to be installed to act as a barrier. The report of the International Joint Commission indicated the commissioners simply did not believe that a workable and reliable fish screen could be developed. It wrote:

It is doubtful that the McClusky Canal fish screen even with modifications would be a reliable and effective barrier to the transfer of foreign biota from the Missouri River to the Hudson Bay drainage basin.

A lot of studies have been done on this fish screen. We do not know who is right and who is wrong, but they are proceeding with it regardless.

I want to make some comments about the Republican Senator, Mark Andrews, of North Dakota. He has described Canadian objection to the controversial Garrison water diversion project as a bogeyman and red herring. He stated that the decision to build this project was not going to be made in Canada and that it would not be made in Washington but in North Dakota. He said that if people there can get their act together, they will have it. There could be no statement plainer than that, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that Senator Mark Andrews will do everything in his power to see that the Garrison Diversion is completed.

I have debated this subject in the past with Senator Andrews who is known to his colleagues as "the king of pork". He persuaded a House-Senate conference committee to reinstate a water diversion project after it had been overwhelmingly defeated in the House of Representatives.

Congressman Silvio Conte stated publicly in Washington that the Senators knew that they must vote in favour of these moneys for Garrison or risk having Senator Andrews put a halt to their own projects. He is determined to have the diversion project completed, Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether we go to the World Court or whatever.

I debated this subject with Senator Andrews at a Canada-U.S. parliamentary meeting in Calgary in 1979. At that time he made a number of statements which I subsequently had Environment Canada check. In a letter to me on September 27, 1979, an officer of the Department stated:

In reply to your question I think Congressman Andrews has either completely missed the point of our objections or is trying to sidestep them. The main thrust of our concerns, and this is a problem that was identified by the International Joint Commission, is that the Garrison Diversion Project would introduce into the Red River drainage biota not naturally found there.

I was given a detailed answer of places where Senator Andrews had misled the discussions at the Canada-U.S. parliamentary meeting.

The Attorney General for North Dakota has said that construction of the Garrison Diversion project will not be stopped by the Canadian Government or by the IJC if the United States determines that the project is in the United States' best interests. He said that the bottom line is that the project will be built if the United States Government decides it is in its best interests. That is what the Attorney General of North Dakota, Walter Wefald told a University of North Dakota law class in 1982. You can see the determination to complete the project and why the motion that we are debating today has come too late.

When the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant) introduced his motion on February 9, 1981, he said:

We in Manitoba have not been reassured in the past with regard to the government's concern about the Garrison diversion project.

NDP provincial Governments in the past have not shown a proper regard for this, Mr. Speaker. They have sat back while the project went full speed ahead.

Following a tour of diversion sites and meetings with American officials, the Manitoba Conservative caucus concluded that key data on the Manitoba situation is missing from American studies and that Manitoba apparently is relying exclusively on these studies for its protection. As a result, the Conservatives called on the NDP provincial Government to do a complete environment impact study, itself. The NDP claimed that no such independent study was necessary because both countries were working amicably on the full range of environmental impact reviews. In addition, Manitoba has a pledge from the U.S. State Department that the Americans will abide by their treaty obligation and do nothing to pollute Canadian waters.

I have just pointed out what the Attorney General of North Dakota stated and what Senator Mark Andrews stated—they are going to complete the project.

The Leader of the Manitoba Conservative Party stated that the Government's reliance on another jurisdiction to protect Manitoba's interest is a gross dereliction of duty. He was referring to the NDP Government of the day. It sat back while North Dakota was proceeding full speed ahead with the diversion project.

The North Dakota Senate commended a former NDP premier of Manitoba for not attempting to stop the Garrison Diversion project. How naive can we be, Mr. Speaker.

A Member of the United States National Audubon Society, Richard Madson, said in an interview that the former NDP Premier of Manitoba received a letter, approved by both the United States Senate and the legislature of North Dakota, which thanked him for not backing a proposal to finance court action against the project. The former NDP Premier of Manitoba had taken this action although the State of Minnesota had come to the conclusion that litigation was the only way to stop the project in time. This former premier now lives across the street from the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker.

It was reported in the *Winnipeg Free Press* that at a time when Minnesota was wisely implementing legal action to protect the rights of its citizens to a clean and healthy environment, the former Manitoba NDP Premier not only blocked such action on the part of Manitobans but received a commendation from the very individuals promoting the development which will degrade the quality of Manitoba's environment. The resolution of commendation from the Garrison promoters is an incredibly clear indication of just how completely the former Manitoba NDP Premier and his caucus had failed in their elected responsibilities to protect the interests of Manitobans.

• (1550)

In October of 1982, the *Winnipeg Free Press* reported that the Manitoba NDP Government spent more than $86,000 that year on its fight against the giant North Dakota Garrison irrigation project without reaping any tangible evidence of success. That includes more than $20,000 in legal bills from a Washington law firm and expenses for a Crown attorney to lobby Congressmen on Capital Hill. The NDP Government has hired more people, spent more money and published more pamphlets, yet has not been effective in halting the Garrison Diversion project, and by the time we go to the World Court to debate the Garrison Diversion project, it will be completed.

If Garrison proceeds, a multimillion dollar Canadian industry will be destroyed simply by changing the direction in which that river water flows. North Dakota is bisected by a height of land or divide. North of the divide, water runs north to Hudson's Bay through the Hudson's Bay drainage basin. Land south of the divide is in the Missouri River drainage basin. The two drainage basins have been separated since the last ice age. Each has developed its own kinds of fish. For the first time, because of the Garrison project, the Missouri River water flow north across the divide. With the water would come fish and fish eggs, as well as parasites and diseases which do not now exist in the Hudson's Bay drainage basin.

Use of this water to irrigate land in this basin would enable Missouri fish to move north into Canada. The International Joint Commission investigated the Garrison Diversion project. The Commission warned that the introduction of foreign species of fish into Lake Winnipeg would result in major reductions in the more highly valued species. Whitefish, walleye and sauger populations could decrease 50 per cent to 75 per cent. This would wipe out the commercial fishery. The IJC further stated that while most of the impacts can be mitigated, those from the possible Biota transfers are so threatening that the only acceptable policy at present is to delay construction of those features of the Garrison unit which might result in such transfers. Furthermore, if this project proceeds, it will violate the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty, which reads:

—waters herein defined as boundary waters and waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury or health or property on the other.

I suggest again, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister of Canada contact the President of the United States and launch an official protest. I understand a report came out of Minneapolis last week that a note was sent recently to Mr. Schultz in the United States. We have been sending notes, having little meetings and writing letters for about seven or eight years, but the project is still being continued. As I pointed out earlier, Senator Andrews and the Attorney General have made their positions perfectly clear. They are going to complete the Garrison Diversion project regardless of what is going to happen to Canadian waters.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, we have gone beyond the point of funding little groups to study the matter, and going to the World Court. The Prime Minister will have to take a position on this immediately and contact the President to ask him if he will investigate and report back to the Prime Minister on whether he will be able to stop this project and make sure that Canadian waters are protected.

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in the debate today on Motion No. 28, a motion which was put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant), and seconded by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre

(Mr. Knowles). This is a motion, as we know, which has to do with the Government's responsibilities as they relate to Canada's intervention in the North Dakota Garrison Diversion unit.

Perhaps I should first make some reply to the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie). Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have a little order over there.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please! The Chair has also noticed that the noise level is perhaps somewhat higher than usual in the House. It is probably due to the excellent attendance on the part of Hon. Members. However, I believe that we should listen closely to the speech of the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie).

[*English*]

Mr. Blaikie: We are not used to having so many Liberals in the Chamber all at one time, Mr. Speaker, except for votes, and those Hon. Members are not used to it.

I would like to reply, Mr. Speaker, to the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine, who has responded with his usual generosity of spirit and lack of respect for the facts. He has taken it upon himself to violate one of the most important features of the struggle against the Garrison Diversion unit, that is, the non-partisan nature, the unanimity with which Manitobans have tried to prevent this environmental disaster from ever becoming reality. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine has disregarded the power of that unanimity and sought to score cheap political points, mainly by referring to supposed or alleged inaction on the part of the former New Democratic Government which was in power prior to 1977 and was defeated in October of 1977. What the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine failed to point out was that until late 1977 all Manitobans were waiting for the report of the International Joint Commission on the Garrison Diversion project. At that point in time there was still reason to believe that whatever judgment that body made would be respected by the Americans.

We learned later, in 1978, that that was not the case. For the next four years, after we had the report of the International Joint Commission, we had a Progressive Conservative Government in Manitoba which did virtually nothing. It put all its faith in diplomatic relations with the United States. That Government said that because of our good neighbour to the south we had nothing to worry about. It displayed that usual uncritical attitude toward the United States, which did not serve it in good stead, Mr. Speaker. However, I am glad to see that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine is finally on board, that he finally has a mature attitude toward the way in which the United States of America acts when its own self-interests are involved. Finally we hear from a Conservative Hon. Member talking about a Republican in North Dakota and saying, that when it comes down to it, the United States acts in its own self-interests. That is the bottom line of American foreign policy. It is refreshing, indeed, Mr. Speaker, to hear that kind of mature analysis coming from a Progressive Conservative Member of Parliament. That is something one can welcome hearing.

I hope I have now corrected the record for the benefit of those Manitobans who may be listening to this debate, who will actually know themselves that the present Government of Manitoba is doing more than the previous Progressive Conservative Government to stimulate public opinion, opposition and knowledge about the Garrison Diversion project. In the end, this is going to be one of the crucial ways in which we oppose this project, by making people aware of this concern and by doing everything we can to bring about an end to that project.

The motion currently before the House says that the federal Government:

—should consider the advisability of taking those measures necessary to ensure that there is no damage caused to the Manitoba environment by the completion of the Garrison diversion unit—

The important word here, Mr. Speaker, is "completion", because the completion of the Garrison Diversion Unit, as the Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine pointed out, means a melding of the Missouri River drainage basin with the Hudson's Bay drainage basin. This is of crucial concern. What is being proposed by the State of North Dakota and the United States Department of the Interior in respect of the Garrison project is indeed mind-boggling and a glaring tribute to the misplaced vanity of man. This Promethean project aims to irrigate about 250,000 acres of North Dakota soil by constructing reservoirs and dams, which will eventually, through human engineering, do something nature never intended, namely, link a southern flowing drainage basin and a northern flowing drainage basin. In effect, the Garrison project will do away with the great continental divide in North Dakota. No longer will all rivers to the north of the divide flow into Hudson's Bay and all rivers south of the divide flow into the Gulf of Mexico via the great Mississippi River. Instead, the two river systems will be linked and the waters of the systems will be mixed.

● (1600)

About ten years ago people in Manitoba who had looked at plans for Garrison started to wonder about the effects it might have on Canadian waters. The two river systems flowing north and south have very different characteristics. There are fish species in the southern drainage system which are completely foreign to Canada, and vice versa. What other kinds of aquatic life such as tiny bacteria or foreign chemicals might also be transferred into Canada by that mixing of the waters, people ask. As Manitobans started to ask more questions about the effects of Garrison, they started to get more worried about what they might be in for if the project went ahead. Manitoba politicians were soon on the phone and using the mails to contact their counterparts in Ottawa about making representations to the U.S. Government about Garrison. Talking to the State of North Dakota was one possible way for Manitobans to get their increasing concerns across, but it soon became obvious to those making the representations that Garrison was as much a U.S. federal concern as it was a state matter. So the Canadian federal Government got dragged in to help Manito-

ba through the intricacies of international diplomacy and negotiation.

Through the efforts of the Canadian Government, agreement was reached in 1975 that the International Joint Commission would do a comprehensive study of the trans-boundary transfers expected to occur as a result of Garrison, a study I already referred to, Mr. Speaker. The IJC was also given a mandate to assess the impact of these environmental transfers on the ecosystem of Manitoba. It was 1977 before the IJC completed its report and made it public. Most people who live in Manitoba did not need to know the minute details of the report to grasp one basic conclusion that the IJC put forward, namely, that Garrison, if it were constructed and completed as designed in 1975, would have a serious impact on the waters of Manitoba. Not only that, but the study said it was likely that various kinds of fish alien to Manitoba would eventually find their way into the Province's lakes and rivers. With them would come the threat of competition for limited food sources and the possible waning of indigenous fish populations to be replaced by the hardier variety of southern fish.

Since the IJC report, Mr. Speaker, and on the strength of that report, Manitobans have been waging war against Garrison. The current Government has established a Garrison focus office to answer citizens' inquiries and to keep on top of the issue. I know the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake and other Members of the House from other Parties have travelled to Washington, along with Manitoba Cabinet Ministers, to lobby American legislators. Indeed, I had an opportunity to do this myself in September of 1981 when I was in Washington with a Canadian parliamentary delegation. I met with American politicians from North Dakota and Minnesota, and tried to get a meeting with Senator Mark Andrews, but he displayed the same kind of closed-mindedness that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine referred to. In fact, he was not even prepared to meet with me. I phoned one hour before the meeting and confirmed that he would indeed be meeting with me, and when I got there he had suddenly been called away. I had hoped to look him straight in the eye and just tell him what this project meant to Manitoba and what the Americans were doing to their relationship with us by being willing to go ahead with this come-what-may, despite the effects on Canada. But there was no opportunity to do that because, let us put it bluntly, he avoided me as I am sure he has avoided others on this issue.

My colleagues and I in the NDP, Mr. Speaker, are kept up to date on matters relating to Garrison by the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake, who has concerned himself with Garrison. I have been informed by him recently of allegations which emanate from the U.S. and involve bogus scientific information as distributed by the Department of the Interior. The information has to do with Garrison, and I would therefore like to move an amendment No. 28 that:

The Canadian Government do everything in its power to investigate charges that falsified information has been used in preparing U.S. environmental assessments relating to wetlands and wildlife habitats in North Dakota and that, further, the Government do everything in its power to ensure that no falsified information has been used which might result in adverse environmental effects to Manitoba's waterways.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Chair would ask the Hon. Member if his amendment is in addition to the present text of the motion or does—

Mr. Blaikie: It is an addition and it will become item No. 4, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Chair finds the amendment to be in order.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, could we have copies of that amendment? Secondly, I assume it will be possible to discuss both the amendment and the motion at the same time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Yes. Debate is now open on the full text of the motion as amended. Strictly speaking, the debate would be on the amendment but the amendment includes the full text of the motion, so if you debate one, you debate them all. Also, the Hon. Member will get copies of the amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Suzanne Beauchamp-Niquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, regarding the motion presented by the Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant):

That, ... the Government should consider the advisability of taking those measures necessary to ensure that there is no damage caused to the Manitoba environment by the completion of the Garrison Diversion Unit in the State of North Dakota and, that such measures to be considered could include—

And at this point, three suggestions are made. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with this opportunity to rise in the House today and address a matter of serious concern to the Government.

The Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake is suggesting that the Government consider taking the measures necessary to ensure that no damage is caused to the Manitoba environment by the completion of the Garrison Diversion Unit in the State of North Dakota. The Government is very much aware of the risk of damage to the Manitoban ecosystem as a result of the present plans for the Garrison Diversion project, and consequently, it has taken steps to ensure that the United States does not renege on the assurances it has already given us that it will not undertake any work in connection with the Garrison project that might have a damaging effect on waters flowing into Canada. As the Hon. Member is aware, these assurances are based on the Boundary Waters Treaty concluded in 1909 between the United States and Canada, which provides, and I quote:

● (1610)

—waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other.

The assurances given Canada by the U.S. Government in connection with the Garrison Diversion project are also based

on the recommendations of the 1977 report by the International Joint Commission. The Commission's main recommendation was that construction of those parts of the Garrison Diversion project that might affect waters flowing into Canada should be put on hold for the time being.

The Government has taken advantage of every opportunity to ensure that the concerns of Canadians and more specifically of Manitobans are fully understood and considered by the U.S. Congress and Administration, with respect to the design and construction of works under the Garrison Diversion project.

Recent developments, including an increase by Congress in appropriations for the so-called Phase I and the contract awarded for construction of the Lonetree dam and reservoir, have been followed very closely by the Governments of Canada and Manitoba, with a view to being ready to intervene at senior political levels in order to protect Canadian interests.

Very recently, after the Lonetree contract was awarded, the Government expressed its concern about the impact of the timing of the contract award on the current consultation process. We still consider consultation with the United States as the most effective way to respond to Canadian concern about aspects of the Garrison project that might have a disastrous effect on waters flowing into Canada.

Mr. Speaker, on October 3 of this year, the Canadian Government, in a memorandum to the State Department, specifically deplored the fact that the contract for construction of the Lonetree dam, the main work of the Garrison project's water distribution network, was awarded on August 24, 1983, before consultations scheduled by the International Joint Commission were finalized and agreement was reached by both Governments. This Government was particularly critical of the U.S. step because it was taken after a meeting of representatives of both Governments in Ottawa on July 20 of this year to discuss technical aspects of Canadian concerns about some of the project works, on the basis of plans and technical specifications that had been submitted to the Canadian side. At the meeting, a substantial amount of useful information was exchanged and resulted in a fruitful discussion that seemed to prepare the ground for a high level consultative meeting equally productive that both Governments intended to have in September. In the memorandum it sent to the State Department, this Government mentioned that realistically, the September consultations could not have given positive results if they had more or less coincided with the Administration's announcement that a contract had been awarded for construction on the main work of the Garrison project, the very part of the project that was still the subject of intense consultations.

The Government of Canada reminded the State Department that in principle, it saw no reason to object to projects aimed at promoting the economic development of certain regions of the United States, as the Garrison Diversion project was, and that it could understand and fully appreciate the American Administration's standing commitment to the people of North Dakota to replace farmland used to build flood control works. Nevertheless, the Government also felt it should point out that certain parts of the plan as authorized by Congress were likely to have a disastrous effect on waters flowing into Canada, as had been the conclusion of the International Joint Commission in its 1977 report to both Governments.

Mr. Speaker, as long as the plan authorized by Congress is maintained, the Government of Canada can only assume it is still possible that the Garrison project will be funded by Congress up to completion, and this includes what is designated as Phase II. This situation will go on fueling the serious concerns which Canadians have with certain aspects of Phase I and the whole of Phase II. On the other hand, the Canadian Government did inform the United States that it appreciated the general assurances given on various occasions by the Administration, as well as the qualification tied to the last estimates approved to this date by Congress for the 1984 fiscal year that no monies earmarked under the current commitments of Congress shall be used for the completion of sections of the Garrison diversion project in North Dakota that could pollute, introduce foreign biota into or unduly increase or decrease the volume of water flowing into Canada. However, the Government fully recognizes that, in order to efficiently protect Canadian interests and prevent pollution of Manitoba waters by foreign biota originating from a diversion of waters from the Missouri River basin, it must make sure that the general guarantees given by the United States at the ministerial level will translate into technical assurances and guarantees included in the specifications for the Garrison project.

For this reason, the Government is currently attempting to co-operate with officials from the American State Department and Department of the Interior in order to monitor, clarify and resolve specific issues of a technical nature raised by the Canadian representatives after a scrutiny of the Garrison project specifications. In the course of that scrutiny, the Canadian officials' major concern has been to evaluate to what extent the specifications involved the hazard of transferring biota, larvae and fish from the Missouri River basin into the Hudson Bay basin. Other questions have been identified in connection with wildlife management plans, especially as far as migrating birds are concerned.

As I have already said, an important bilateral meeting of experts was held in Ottawa on July 20, 1983, which was attended by representatives of the Water Board and the Department of Fisheries and Wildlife of the state of North Dakota, the "Garrison Conservancy District", the Bureau of Reclamation in Bismark, Denver, Billings and Washington, and of the State Department on the American side, and on the Canadian side by representatives of the Department of Natural Resources of Manitoba, Environment Canada, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and also the Secretary of State

for External Affairs. The purpose of that meeting was to give the Administration an opportunity to provide technical data concerning the Garrison project and to allow Canadian representatives to raise other matters and concerns. A first list of technical problems drawn up by the Canadian representatives and submitted to the State Department by the Canadian Embassy in Washington before the meeting made it possible to delineate the issues involved and the discussions that followed.

Mr. Speaker, despite a very useful exchange of information, Canada has not yet received any answer to some of its major concerns about the impact of the project on the flow of water into the Hudson Bay's basin and Canada. Such was the conclusion reached by the officials who attended the federal-provincial meeting held early in September, when the Deputy Minister and officers from the Manitoba Department of Natural Resources met in Ottawa with representatives of Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans and External Affairs.

• (1620)

Consequently, the Canadian government has decided to officially submit to the State Department a final list of technical issues of concern for Canada in connection with the Garrison project. Through that list which accompanied the note delivered by the Canadian government during the first week of October, Canada is asking that technical alterations be made to the works provided under Phase I. By doing so, Canada is complying with the recommendations made in the 1977 report of the International Joint Commission which provides for consultations between Canada and the United States until an agreement is reached so that any piece of work the construction of which has been approved will not affect streams flowing into Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the House about the technical problems which Canada tries to solve through such consultations. I would like to mention more especially the McClusky fish screen, the drainage of municipal and industrial wastes at the Lonetree dam and reservoir and the plan to minimise the impact on wildlife.

Canada is concerned because the Bureau of Reclamation has mentioned in the final schedule to the statement on impacts filed with the Environmental Protection Agency in July 1983 that the construction of the McClusky fish screen is no longer considered. The construction of such a screen was provided in the 1979 statement on the environmental impact, but the final statement mentions that the area now to be developed does not affect any Canadian interests and suggests instead that the water running through the Garrison project be filtered at several locations downstream the Lonetree reservoir.

When a fish screen is built on the channel, the fish, their eggs the larvae and all other biota in the Missouri River could flow directly into the Lonetree reservoir situated in the Hudson Bay drainage basin a few metres away from the Cheyenne River. As the Hon. Members know, the Cheyenne river flows into the Red River which is part of the Hudson Bay drainage basin. The fish and other biota in the Missouri River would not only be found in Lonetree Reservoir but also in the entire system: head races, inner reservoirs, irrigation areas, and retaining channels, thus greatly increasing the danger of biota transfers from the Missouri River drainage basin to the Hudson Bay basin.

The International Joint Commission had based its assessment that the construction of the Lonetree Reservoir was acceptable not only on the establishment of a closed system, but also on the installation of a fish screen in the McClusky Canal. Canada strongly supported the recommendation of the International Joint Commission to the effect that fishing on the Lonetree Reservoir be prohibited. On the other hand, Canada does not believe that this position could be strictly enforced. It has therefore concluded that the fish screen in the McClusky Canal had to be set up during Phase I to act as a first barrier against fish and fish eggs and lessen the dangers of transfers between the basins. Canada has noted similar findings by the Environment Protection Agency in its detailed environmental impact study.

Mr. Speaker, while supporting the setting up of a fish screen, and in spite of recent improvements in the design and use of fish screens, Canada must agree with the International Joint Commission that the McClusky fish screen, just like any other mechanical device, could not entirely and for all times prevent transfer of foreign biota between the drainage basins. On the other hand, Canada would oppose any plan to stock the Lonetree Reservoir with fish to check the effectiveness of the fish screen, in order to minimize the dangers of biota transfer between the basins resulting from fishing activities.

Canada is concerned also with the possible use for municipal and industrial purposes of unfiltered water and the dangers of possible biota transfers from the Missouri River hydrographic basin into the Hudson Bay drainage basin. Canadian experts have indicated that the bolted obturator, which is being planned to close the down-stream end of the municipal and industrial overfall, could easily be opened. In times of drought, the temptation would certainly increase to open the overfall; so Canada has asked that the plans be modified to provide for a more permanent obturator such as a reinforced concrete sluice-gate.

Third, Canada has advised the United States that it would like to open consultations on the 1982 plan for lessening the impact on wildlife, as described in the final supplement to the environment impact study by the Bureau of Reclamation. Although this plan is supposedly based on the creation, preservation and restoration of wetlands and wildlife habitats, as well as related pastures and woodlands, it does not provide for the replacement "acre by acre" of the marshlands which the officials of the international dual commission had recommended. The representatives of the Canadian Wildlife Service who reviewed and evaluated the alleviation plan have pointed out that the modelization process of the habitat assessment

procedure has not yet been tested in the field to determine the validity of the data used in this plan. Canada still believes that the United States must continue to fully respect the spirit of the migratory birds treaty they signed with Canada in 1916.

In addition to the three major concerns which I have just described, the Canadian Government has called the attention of the United States to other technical problems which we would like to have solved in the near future through the consultation process. These issues deal with the question of how to design and build the Lonetree Reservoir to prevent fish eggs, larvae and viruses to filter through the banks and the bottom of the reservoir and join the rivers flowing into Hudson Bay, the possibility that irrigating the lands along the McClusky Canal will result in the transfer of biotas between basins, the need to preserve the present sluice gates of the New Pockford Canal until the Lonetree Reservoir becomes completely operational, the design of the segments of the New Pockford Canal which cross tributaries of the Sheyenne River, the additional information required about the Warwick-McVille irrigation zone, and the fact that the Oakes Canal and the Taayer Reservoir are located very near the watershed of the Wild Rice River, which flows into the Red River.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying that the Government is determined to ensure that in any work of what is commonly called Phase I of the Garrison Project all possible precautions will be taken to eliminate the possible transfer of human organisms from one basin to the other and its effects on Manitoba lakes and rivers. We hope that the problems—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Hon. Member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Tousignant) on a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Tousignant: Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie) at the beginning of his remarks made some allegations that the Government does not care. He is not even here to listen to the answer.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order please! That is not a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I would like to share some thoughts with Members of the House this afternoon and in doing so express the concern of many Manitobans about the Garrison Diversion a project which has been in the works for many years. We are particularly concerned in the Province of Manitoba about the recently announced first phase.

• (1630)

As all Hon. Members of the House know, the Government of the United States recently announced plans to proceed with the $5.82 million Lonetree Reservoir. Unfortunately, that decision was made without sufficient safety precautions having been taken. We in the Province of Manitoba are concerned about this development for a variety of reasons. First, we have been and continue to be concerned about the problem of the quality of water which comes into the Province of Manitoba, particularly in my constituency of Brandon-Souris, from the State of North Dakota within the Souris River system.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. I apologize to the Hon. Member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Clark), but according to the Standing Orders only one Member may be on his or her feet at the same time. I plead with Hon. Members to lower the tone of their conversations.

Mr. Clark (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, your intervention indicates that you understand this is a very serious problem in the Province of Manitoba. We appreciate your concern. As I was saying, we have been concerned for a long time about the quality of the water. Also we are very concerned that sufficient safety measures were not taken into consideration, and about the possibility of seepage and fishermen using the water system in North Dakota and quite innocently transferring foreign species into the Canadian water system. As well we are concerned about the fact that when the first phase was announced, it seemed to come as a surprise to the Government of Canada. As was suggested recently in the Winnipeg *Free Press*, the Canadian Government might not have been surprised if it had taken every available opportunity to have observers on site.

Mr. McKenzie: The New Democratic Party was invited to send scientists and it declined to do so.

Mr. Clark (Brandon-Souris): I hear my hon. colleague. He is quite correct. Prior to entering the Chamber this afternoon, I heard the debate which was taking place. Differences of opinion were being expressed as to the roles of various Manitoba Governments in this case. It is important for all Hon. Members to understand that the concern about the Garrison is something which transcends Party differences. We may disagree on how best to implement the concerns, but it is very important to realize that this is a non-partisan matter about which all the people of Manitoba are very concerned. Therefore, we urge action by all concerned Governments. We believe that this is the time for energetic leadership by both Governments. They should take every available opportunity to ensure that they are as fully conversant with developments as they can possibly be.

Our concern is even greater as a result of recent revelations in the American press. It appears that falsified information was used by some Americans with respect to the environmental impact of the proposed development. Therefore I am very much in sympathy with the amendment introduced by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie). It is important that the House register its concern and do everything it possibly can to ensure that such falsified information has not been made available to Canada so that the sense of security of some Canadians is not based upon false premises.

We need some guarantee that the quality of water in the Souris and Red River will not be impaired by this development. Also we need some guarantee that foreign species will not be introduced into the river system, thereby endangering both our sports and commercial fishing, and that the Governments involved will regard this matter as a very high priority.

As I said in the House prior to the visit of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) to Halifax and his meetings there with his American counterpart, I had hoped that our officials would make this a very high priority. From reading newspaper accounts of those meetings, I suspect that the priority was not as high as I had wished. At that time I was hopeful that the change in personnel in the United States with direct responsibility for this—that is, the dismissal of Mr. Watt—would lead to a more favourable individual assuming his responsibilities. I regret that that does not seem to have occurred.

Therefore, I conclude my remarks by reiterating the belief of the people of Manitoba that this is an issue of paramount importance. We impress upon the Government—and we hope that the Government of Manitoba would be likewise concerned—to approach this question with the utmost urgency.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Gimaïel (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, if I want to take a few minutes to discusss the subject now under consideration, namely the Garrison project, it is because, having been involved in the work of the subcommittee on acid rain, I have been in a position to realize the value of the discussions on environmental issues between Canada and the United States and because, for the past several years, the International Joint Commission has been reviewing the various issues which affect the Canadian and American environments, especially where water is concerned.

I would like to come back to the third suggestion contained in the motion under consideration, namely the bringing to trial in the World Court of the Government of the United States, should Canada be unsuccessful in its efforts to receive satisfactory assurances regarding the future safety of her environment.

I believe that this would to much too great an extent involve a third party in the discussions between Canada and the United States, in view of the fact that in an area as important as the environment, these two countries have managed to come to an agreement these last few years. Involving a third party would show a lack of confidence in a field where close cooperation and consultation between our two countries already exist. It is true that we do not always agree, that our positions can differ, but in the end a kind of tacit understanding does exist as a result of which, until an agreement has been reached, neither country will take concrete steps on any issue relating to the environment. In addition, since the middle of the sixties, a lot of progress has been accomplished in the areas we are discussing, namely the protection of Manitoba waters.

As an illustration, I would point out that, last year, the American Congress, by a very impressive vote of 252 against 152 as I recall, refused to authorize a $4 million allocation for the development of this project. It was the first time that such funds had been refused. It is true that later on they were granted by a joint senatorial and congressional committee, but the fact still remains that a majority of American Congressmen turned down the request for these expenditures which shows how deep is their concern for the environment, both in the United States and Canada. And that is so precisely because the joint committee responsible for looking into environment related issues between the two countries, particularly with respect to waters, has done its job, as it did in other cases such as the Great Lakes, with constant concern for the environment.

Of course, when it comes to an issue such as acid rains, we must admit that there are different opinions. But it is true as well that the Americans view those problems from an angle which differs from ours in Canada. We must keep in mind the fact that there are over 200 million Americans—almost 250 million—in a country somewhat smaller than ours. Obviously, they have commitments towards the population which we Canadians do not have. As Canadians, we have the right and the duty to protect our environment because it is our greatest wealth, and since there are only 24 million of us in the second largest country in the world, we do have wealth and plenty of resources which very few nations of the world enjoy. And I think that, in the name of mankind, we have an obligation to protect the resources of the country in which we live. But the Americans have to reconcile that aspect with the fact that they must provide their population with food, electricity and all kinds of other things. In my opinion, asking a third party to intervene in areas which have been the subject of constant discussions with them over the years would be dishonest first and, second, it might jeopardize what has always been wide open co-operation between the two countries. In other words, the important thing in the realm of ecology is that the two countries maintain a constant dialogue.

● (1640)

If the dialogue were broken, Mr. Speaker, I might consider the suggestion by the hon. member as useful, but certainly not of a nature as to reestablish the dialogue. Quite the contrary! On the other hand, if we did it now when there is constant dialogue between the countries and when there are mecanisms which have been developed by very wise politicians over the years, whatever their political affiliations, I suggest it would be ill-advised at this time to involve a third party which would be entirely unaware of past dealings which go back some 20 years in this case and even more in other cases.

Far from being based on facts, the accusations against the government are quite surprising, considering that the Canadian government is perceived as one of the world leaders in the area of environment protection, that it is probably the one

country which is most responsible for arousing environmental awareness in the United States, especially in the areas of air pollution due to acid rains, or Great Lakes pollution, or the protection of territorial waters, whether Canadian or otherwise. Indeed, if there is a government and politicians who are aware of the importance of sport fishing, or drinking water, it is the Government of Canada which is constantly involved in discussions with the provinces through its Environment and Forestry departments, and which . . . through this House has on two occasions taken upon itself to provide the Sub-committee on acid rains with orders of reference urging its members to take the necessary steps to meet throughout Canada with people on an international level and devise a valid and workable strategy to fight against this curse of the 20th century.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 24(2) to interrupt the proceedings.

Shall all orders listed under Private Members' Notices of Motions preceding order No. 102 be allowed to stand by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*English*]

INCOME TAX ACT

TAXATION OF VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTISTS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead) moved:

That a Special Committee be appointed to review all relevant provisions of the Income Tax Act relating to the taxation of visual and performing artists including, but not limited to, the criteria for establishing the professional status of visual and performing artists and the method for determining allowable business deductions for such artists and to recommend any changes that the Committee deems necessary and proper;

That such review include the hearing and consideration of the views of interested parties and organizations;

That the Committee consist of nine (9) members;

That it be an instruction to the said Committee that it meet forthwith;

That the Committee have the power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine witnesses and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the Committee; and

That the Committee submit its report not later than January 17, 1984.

He said: Mr. Speaker—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): —Hon. Members will know that since I last spoke in this House, I have changed my status and have become a statesman!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): It is in that spirit that I am raising an issue that has nothing to do with partisan differences and has everything to do with our work as Parliamentarians and, in my view, with our identity as Canadians.

The particular issue today is the tax status of visual and performing artists in Canada. That question was dramatized some weeks ago when the internationally successful Canadian artist, Toni Onley of Vancouver, concluded that he had only one way to avoid a tax treatment which almost all visual artists consider to be unfair, and that that way would be for Mr. Onley to burn a million dollars worth of Canadian works of art. Mr. Onley by that action forced us all to face the absurdity of a public policy which through the CBC, the Canada Council and other grants encourages artists to create and, on the other hand, through tax policy, leads them to destroy their works or to limit their imagination.

[*Translation*]

Members on both sides of the House have intervened personally to ask Mr. Onley not to destroy his work. We said we would not only look into his case but also the hundreds or perhaps thousands of other cases to which he has wanted to draw our attention by his dramatic threat. Today we are considering an instrument that would enable elected representatives, Members of Parliament, to deal with a matter that has been a serious problem for at least a decade and that can only be resolved if Hon. Members take a direct and active interest in this issue.

Perhaps I may review past events. For many years, the special status of artists was recognized by Canada's tax policy. In the 60s, although there was no legislation on a special status for artists, the practice was to allow them to be considered as employees for the purposes of unemployment insurance premiums and the Canada Pension Plan, while at the same time they were considered to be self-employed so that they could deduct expenses incurred in the performance of their art. These included purchase of supplies, instruments and costumes and the travel expenses incurred in order to perform on the stage, to paint or to write.

[*English*]

That dual status for artists was an unintended victim of the Government's decision in 1972 to consolidate and rationalize treatment of social security programs by Revenue Canada. That change brought an end to the practice of individual officers of Revenue Canada assessing artists on an individual case by case basis. Instead, the computer did the assessment. The only computer categories into which artists fit were, on the one hand, as hobbyists if they did not generate a profit from their art or, on the other hand, as a manufacturer if they did generate a profit from their art.

If you are an artist whom the computer calls a hobbyist, you cannot deduct legitimate business expenses related to the production of your work. If you are an artist whom the computer calls a manufacturer, you must sell or liquidate your inventory, which in this case is all of your artistic works, on a yearly basis if you wish to deduct all of the legitimate expenses for that year.

The implications of this are staggering. In the case of Mr. Onley, his means of liquidating his inventory so that he can

deduct legitimate expenses was to hold a big bonfire on Wreck Beach. In the case of artists whose reputation in their field is so well established that they are asked to teach and who can earn more from their teaching than from their art, they can become hobbyists to the computer in National Revenue. They probably cannot claim the cost of their paints, research or other preparations. Less established artists who are trying to get started and who are supporting themselves during the time when they are trying to get started in some other job are also hobbyists according to the computer. They cannot deduct their legitimate expenses. It is safe to say that nobody planned things this way. The Government simply wanted to bring order to its taxing operations back in 1972 and Canadian artists are quite literally the victims of computer error. That is what is happening.

An additional and related problem has been to categorize performing artists as employees of the group for whom they perform rather than as independent artists. That has been the case with members of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra. That is a matter which the Government now has under review. It has been a matter in the case of the Carousel Players of St. Catharines. It has been the case with the Mermaid Theatre in Wolfville, Nova Scotia. It has revenue implications for both the performing companies and for individual performers.

● (1650)

These problems are very real to individual artists. They create an atmosphere of stress and an atmosphere, unhappily, of anger that harms not only Canada's artistic reputation but also the interests of our artists in working in their art.

The House may want to know what some of these things mean in human terms. It means, for example, that a film maker from Montreal who is today premiering her latest film with the National Film Board here in Ottawa is classified as a maker of home movies because her films have not yet made a profit. Consequently she faces today a reassessment of literally thousands of dollars in taxes. It means that a professional sculptor from British Columbia whose works are cast in bronze by a Canadian fine arts foundry is told that he has to change his long and delicate process of creating a bronze sculpture because he is classed, not as a sculptor, not as an artist, but as a manufacturer. He has to fit the production, completion and the sale of a work of art into fixed yearly increments just like any manufacturer of widgets would if he wants to be able to deduct his heavy outlays in labour and materials from income earned.

To cite again the case of Carousel Players of St. Catharines where the Government has decided to treat performers as employees rather than as independent artists, Revenue Canada in this case is seeking to recover employee and employer contributions to unemployment insurance and CPP from both the company and the players. The company and the players have no money and they cannot pay. Revenue Canada has issued a third party demand on incoming grants from the Ontario Arts Council and the Canada Council and they have already seized funds in excess of $15,000.

That illustrates perfectly the crazy dilemma that we have to resolve. Parliament deliberately authorized the Canada Council to help artists. We did not deliberately authorize the computers of Revenue Canada to harass artists. No one in their right mind would find any logic in a system in which Revenue Canada is getting grants from the Canada Council, but that is what is happening in this case and it is inexcusable.

As Parliamentarians we have to ask ourselves why we have a policy by default. Nobody planned it this way. None of the Ministers opposite planned it this way. Indeed, some of them have been working to change it. We as Parliamentarians, dealing with a matter of very real importance to our country, have a policy by default. We have to ask ourselves why we have it and why we have it particularly on the issue of taxation of artists which bears so directly on their ability to create and to produce here in our country.

This is the Parliament that has been so preoccupied with creating a Canadian identity, with encouraging Canadian culture. Why not be consistent about it? Why allow a policy developed by default to undercut all of the excellent work we are doing through our work in the Canada Council, in the CBC, in the other instruments of Canadian expression and Canadian identity? I am not blaming the Government, I am blaming Parliament. We have to ask why we have left to the computer and to the tax collector decisions that should be taken here by us as the individual men and women sent by electors across the country to decide important public policy.

The answer to this question is all the more troublesome if we consider that, as long as 12 years ago, the Arts and Culture Branch, which was then new, of the Department of the Secretary of State, as it then was, recognized the pressing nature of the employment status of artists and the attendant problems faced by them. The Government engaged the accountant Russell Disney in 1976 to study all of these issues. He published a report in 1977, the major thrust of which was to call for a return to the dual status concept for artists.

Interdepartmental committees and subcommittees of every relevant Government department were put in place to advise the Government on the implementation of the Disney recommendations. the work of those interdepartmental committees continued for more than two years. In addition, the Government's only review of federal cultural policy, the Appelbaum-Hébert Committee, spoke forcefully for the resolution of these issues, characterizing them as a question not of special pleading by the artist but of simple equity. Simple equity is the language of the Appelbaum-Hébert Report.

Through all of this time individual artists and their professional organizations have had to become experts in the intricacies of Revenue Canada policy as they pursue their cases through the appeals process to Ministers and to the various regulatory boards involved. We will never know how many works of art have been lost in this country because artists who should have been creating art were instead trying to figure out how they were going to deal with policy that this Parliament never approved relating to Revenue Canada. We know that the

anguish and anger that has been caused in the artistic community is severe and it should be stopped.

To date the Government has not taken any steps to implement any of the Disney recommendations. I am not saying there was bad faith. Going back to Gerard Pelletier through all intervening Ministers, including David MacDonald, there has been a very real interest on the part of responsible Ministers in getting action. It is just that until today the issue has not been important enough to enough people to get priority. In this Parliament we can give priority to an issue that goes to the very heart of our determination to encourage a distinctive Canadian culture and a distinctive Canadian identity. It is in our power as Members of the House of Commons to do that.

Recent cases like the Toni Onley case and the Toronto Symphony Orchestra case have brought again public attention to the issue. They have brought public attention to the fact that the present Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) is working very hard to try to have the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Bussières) address these issues.

It appears that within the process of Government the relative balance of demands for policy change in Revenue and Finance is weighted heavily against the small and financially strapped arts community, a community which has seen the average annual income of its self-employed artists fall from $4,835 in 1974 to $4,352 in 1980.

I would argue that it is wise for any society to encourage its creative and its daring, but it is absolutely imperative for Canada to do that because we are a country of such majesty and such complexity that we can be known only by our artists' imaginations. We in this House, whatever our Party, whatever our background, have all had the opportunity to travel very widely in this country. Yet I would wager that most of the important things that most of us feel about our country we have learned from the paintings, songs or literature of Canada.

It is no accident that the most respected of our Native people, the Indians, the Eskimos, people who were on this continent before the rest of us, are their elders. This is not just because they are old but because they transmit the story of what was to those who will carry the tribe forward into whatever the next frontier may be. Perhaps countries with more history need less imagination but this country is a nation whose history is ahead of us and our duty as lawmakers today is to encourage the creative imagination that will let us become a complex, diverse, exciting community.

It is clear on the basis of the last 12 years that nothing will be done unless we do it. That is why I am proposing that a special parliamentary committee be appointed immediately with a mandate to report back to this House no later than mid-January, 1984. I suggest such a committee is the only process which can give a more balanced weight to the issues involved in the taxation of artists. It will provide a public forum for all of the people involved to plead their case.

I urge Members of the House to support this motion in order that we may finally remove from our tax regime some very serious obstacles, that none of us planned or approved to the growth and development of the arts in this country.

• (1700)

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I want to support the motion moved by the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark). Members of this Party can agree with nearly everything he said.

For many years now Liberal and Conservative Governments have recognized, as have the Governments of most if not all modern industrialized countries, that artists, whether they be visual artists, musicians or artists of other types, need support if they are to create the works they want to create. Very few artists are in a position to support themselves through the sale of their work.

Over the years, regardless of which Party forms the Government, we have given support to artists and performers of various types through the Canada Council, through the CBC, through grants from the Department of the Secretary of State and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. But recently, Revenue Canada has come forward with an aggressive policy of zeroing in on artists, musicians and writers in an attempt to reclassify them and make them pay income tax on income three or four years back.

A month ago I put a question to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Bussières) and requested him to put a stop to the present policy of the Department until the matter could be reassessed and re-examined as is suggested in the motion of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead. At the same time, questions were put to the Minister by Members of the Official Opposition and a Liberal Member asked a question about the Toronto Symphony. All Members got a pretty negative or pretty hostile reply.

There are not many Tony Onleys in Canada who have $1 million worth of art to sell. Most artists in this country are poor. Most artists in this country are living in poverty. The Applebaum-Hébert Committee, for example, found that only one of every five Canadian artists earns a gross income of over $5,000, that 60 per cent of artists in a sample survey conducted in Ontario were living in desperate conditions, and that the most recent estimates show that 80 per cent of visual artists in Canada earn less than $7,250 in direct art sales every year.

Recently, Revenue Canada suddenly made a ruling that members of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra are to be classified as employees. That will mean that they will not be able to deduct their expenses as musicians for tax purposes. Members of the Toronto Symphony have a contract which says that they are guaranteed 48 weeks of work per year but only 19.5 hours per week. It is pretty obvious to anyone, except to officials of Revenue Canada, that musicians must have other employment as they cannot live on what they earn with the orchestra. It is important to them that they be able to deduct their expenses as musicians from income as musicians. Yet Revenue Canada has told them that they cannot do that.

Now Revenue Canada is going after writers. Very few writers in Canada can earn a living just by writing. Like many other artists, some of them try to teach, if not every year, perhaps one year in two or one in three or four. That way they can at least have an income they can count on for one year. Now Revenue Canada is starting to put the squeeze on them.

The Minister has been saying that Revenue Canada is only interpreting the law. I find it strange that in 1983 Revenue Canada is making interpretations it never made before. Not only is it being unreasonable about the current year or the last year, but it is going back three and four years and expecting artists, musicians and I suppose writers to account for everything they have done. That is really impossible.

Like the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead, I have had representations from artists and musicians from Vancouver to Halifax. Some of the cases are beyond belief. In Montreal a well known sculptor received a letter from Revenue Canada telling him that it had arbitrarily—and that is the Department's term—decided that his claim for art materials, supplies and expenses is not admissible and that he must pay $8,000 within the next three months. Apparently grants which he has received from the Canada Council to go toward his expenses were judged to represent the extent of his costs. Other costs were disallowed.

In Vancouver an artist was given 21 days to prove that his activities as an artist showed a reasonable expectation of profit. He wants to know how one can prove to Revenue Canada that a reasonable expectation of profit exists in the research, development production, promotion and sale of original works of art.

I would ask Hon. Members to think about some of the most famous artists in the world—Picasso, Gaugin, Van Gogh or any other. When those artists produced their works they could barely give them away, but those works are now worth millions of dollars. Revenue Canada is asking our artists to classify themselves as manufacturers. How does an artist know that the work he produced in 1982 or 1983 will sell or for how much it will sell? The Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead blamed the computer. I blame the people who stopped using their heads and substituted the computer.

Another artist who was the recipient of an honour from the Governor General which made him a Royal Canadian artist is now subject to niggling scrutiny by Revenue Canada for every cent he spends on art supplies. He said that the action by Revenue Canada makes him feel that the honour he received is ludicrous.

All these cases bring us back to one glaring reality: the Government, as represented by Revenue Canada in its efforts to maximize revenue, has lost all perspective of the role of arts and culture in the life of this country. The attack on Canadian visual and performing artists has the potential of retarding the development of arts in this country.

If the present policy of Revenue Canada continues, artists will stop producing. They are already living in poverty and will not be able to afford to continue working. This attacks the most vulnerable group in society. At the same time we have a tax department which permits people who make large amounts of money to pay little or no tax on huge incomes.

• (1710)

Jack McArthur, who regularly writes a business column in the *Toronto Star* pointed out some of the things which go on in this country. He pointed out that in 1980 there were 179 people in Canada with incomes of more than $200,000 who did not pay any income tax at all; that there were 651 Canadians who had incomes of between $100,000 and $200,000 who did not pay any income tax; that there were 4,020 who had incomes of between $50,000 and $100,000 who did not pay any income tax.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of National Revenue and his Department would be doing a much better job in thinking more realistically and more humanely about the burden of taxation which we all have to face if they would concentrate their efforts in trying to plug the loopholes which permit a relatively small number of very large income earners to pay no income tax at all. They should not be concentrating on artists, musicians and writers whose incomes are quite small and who need assistance, help and sympathy from the Canadian Government, rather than the kind of harassment they have received in the last few years.

I have raised this question during the question period and I have arranged, as well as other Hon. Members, I am sure, for meetings between the representatives of the artists and musicians and representatives of the Canadian Conference on the Arts, when I could not reach the Minister. They had a very good discussion and afterward both sides understood better what the other side was talking about. It was obvious that the Assistant Deputy Minister either could not or would not budge. I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is time for the Government to act. I believe the idea of a parliamentary committee to look at this question is a good one.

I wish that we could look more seriously and more quickly at the recommendations made in the Disney Report. I say to the Minister of National Revenue that until this committee meets, has an opportunity to hear representations and makes its report, and until the Government can act on the report, the Minister ought to say to his people in Revenue Canada: "Stop this harassment. Stop this drive to collect what will actually be very small amounts of money." Let us go back to the period of a year ago when the Department was looking at these things with a relatively humane attitude. Until then, Mr. Speaker, we certainly support the concept of establishing this committee.

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark) for introducing this topic and bringing it forward for discussion today. I agree with the motion. I would like to offer some amendments which I believe would help us to operate more easily with the idea. Hopefully, it will expedite our treatment of the idea. I would like to come back to the amendments in a few minutes. However, let me

congratulate the Right Hon. Member for bringing this topic forward.

I come from a background in book publishing. For some 12 years before I was elected I had some experience as an editor and salesman in the book industry. Therefore, I feel I understand something about the problems facing writers in just generating income, let alone getting as far as paying their taxes. Many writers, as has been eloquently stated here, are really very underpaid. We do not in any way reflect in our financial rewards any gratitude at all for the heritage which they are leaving for our country's future, and the great enrichment of our country to which writers are contributing. I know the same is true for visual artists and for performing artists, as the Right Hon. Member noted earlier.

I would like as well to draw attention to the key document, the Applebaum-Hébert Report, the recent survey of the arts in Canada. This study has had a significant impact already and has been referred to the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. That Committee has been reviewing portions of the study. It has completed one significant part, I believe on broadcasting, and is now turning its attention to artists, writers and the performing arts. Therefore, this motion presented by the Right Hon. Member fits in in a very timely way with the study of the Committee on Communications and Culture.

Before I continue, I would like to draw to everyone's attention what I consider to be a refreshing move by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Bussières). Earlier this week something happened in response to a query by the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Peterson) and earlier from the Hon. Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) and, I believe, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). Those Hon. Members have been inquiring about the audit by Revenue Canada of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra. The Minister, because he wanted to be fair, ordered a moratorium on the ruling. He has subsequently met with members of the orchestra. The meeting was very fruitful. I attended the meeting and I feel that the ruling will be reviewed carefully in light of the discussions at that meeting. Certainly, the musicians and their representatives are getting a full day in court from a very sensitive and practical Minister.

I referred a moment ago to the work of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture which is working with the Applebaum-Hébert Report. I will have some amendments to this motion to send to that Committee to tie it into the study of the Applebaum-Hébert Report. That Committee has the expertise to appreciate the story from the artists' perspective rather than from a financial perspective. Therefore, it is appropriate that a motion like this should go to such a group. The artistic community will get its best hearing from that Committee. Certainly, they would be talking to people who understand their working conditions, living standards and the tax problem these people face. The best audience for a motion like this is in the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture.

I know that the Hon. Member for London West (Mr. Burghardt), who is a Parliamentary Secretary working on that Committee, would like to say a few things in a moment about the work of the Committee.

The Applebaum-Hébert Report made several comments on its insight into the nature of these tax problems. It listed several tax problems as follows, if I may quote from that report:

> —matters such as the treatment of artists' costs (and whether or in what circumstances artists should be considered as employees or self-employed), the valuation of works donated by artists to public institutions, and the income-averaging tax provisions available . . . Although such proposals may appear to the department of Finance to require departures from standard practices, to the extent that they involve nothing more than simple equity they can scarcely be construed as special pleading—

That line of thought coincides quite closely with the presentation of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead. The issue over the past few years really has been that artists have been treated as if they are business people or businesses per se. Of course, there is no need to do that. However, that parallel has come about because we have been trying to treat all taxpayers equally.

The question of tax equity has arisen. If we depart from that standard, we must do so carefully because potentially we will be favouring one group and at the same time creating an incentive for a lot of other people to call themselves members of that special group. Before we depart from that standard, we must ensure that we can define who is the artist and why they are getting special treatment. In general I invite the Committee to turn its mind to that particular problem.

● (1720)

Let me take a few examples and just ask for the Committee's advice. The Right Hon. Member raised the question of what is known as the accrual method of accounting. To state it simply, you cannot write off or deduct an expense until the item for which the expense was incurred has either been sold or declared unsaleable. That system applies for all businesses. According to the description of the Right Hon. Member, it is that system which caused Mr. Tony Onley so much trouble. Of course, an artist would like to use the cash system, as would a lot of small businesses. One can write off the expense in the same year it is incurred and you do not have to wait until the item is sold or declared unsaleable. We use the cash system with farmers. But in a debate about farmers we find in a very revealing way the problems you incur with the cash system for one group and the accrual system for another.

Many people would love to have access to the cash system. In my neighbourhood, for example, in Mississauga, there are not a lot of farmers. There is a lot of vacant land and a lot of people sitting on that land and they would love to be able to call themselves farmers and take advantage of the cash system. It would give them a better write-off and they would be able to mix in a lot of different things under this disguise of being a farmer. So I think when the Committee goes to work on this problem it should indeed take a look at potential abuses in the cash system. It looks so temptingly easy and yet farmers'

representatives, such as the Cattlemen's Association, said to me last spring they do not want to lose the cash system and they do not want to have the Government loosen up its regulations and invite abuses of the cash system. Equally, if artists want to have this marvellous advantage, let us hope the Committee will give us some definitions of what an artist is, as well as the areas of potential abuse. Artists can do that. They would have no problem telling us how to define themselves. So we invite artists to come in and then perhaps a committee can look at ways to turn their definitions into a workable taxable definitions.

In the same way let us take a look at another problem. The tax department says to businesses that they have to operate with a reasonable expectation of profit. You cannot set up a business just to write off your living expenses. I know some people like to do that. A lovely yacht, a trip here or there, and people would love to have those kinds of write-offs. It would be a terrific incentive. But the tax department will not let you do that. You cannot write off simple living expenses.

One way to define the difference between legitimate business expenses or personal expenses is to ask whether the person has a reasonable expectation of profit. That is how they do it with a business. That is a reasonable standard. But how do you do it with an artist? How do you do it with someone, for example, who has a brilliant ability but simply has not sold anything, such as a young artist just launching his or her career? Obviously such a person will not have a reasonable expectation of profit in the first few years of his or her career.

I must say there is a butcher near my house who claims that in his early years Danby offered him a print in return for some pork chops. Certainly the print appreciated in value a lot faster than those pork chops and it would have been a real expectation of profit for the butcher. I am not so sure it was for Mr. Danby. However, the problem is there. How do we handle the distinction between business expenses and personal expenses for an artist, especially when that artist is going to go for a long time without making any profit? So again, we invite the Committee to give us some guidelines on that.

There are parallels here again which help the Committee. The Committee might look at the problem of farm losses, how farmers set themselves up and how the tax department treats young farmers or new farm businesses incurring initial losses with the hope of getting a profit. Again we would ask the Committee to bring us the artists' perspective and we will try and turn that into some workable law.

The question of profit helps us with businesses to distinguish between genuine practitioners and phonies. There is a problem we run into with all fields of human endeavour. It is just as true in the arts as it is anywhere else. There are people who are hobbyists, there are people who would love to have the tax write-offs but have not really earned them. They are not really artists, they are hobbyists. The Committee should give us some indication of ways to distinguish between those who are practising a hobby and who want to go to Greece and paint a Grecian sunset. How do we know they are legitimate and should write off the airline tickets and hotel bills and whatever else is incurred, as opposed to some struggling, genuine artists who may be just walking out into the country to paint sunsets there? How do we tell the difference between the two?

Finally, we have the controversy mentioned by the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North, the question of employees versus the self-employed. This has real ramifications beyond the arts. We get into problems with engineers, with professionals in other areas, with people who just set up little companies in order to get tax dodges. Again the Committee should give us some indication of how we distinguish between genuine artists who are self-employed and those people who have put themselves in real employee circumstances. That is a tricky area, not one to be treated lightly at all. We should keep our eyes on the ramifications in other areas as well.

I think the motion has presented an important topic and I personally welcome it. I welcome the guidance the Right Hon. Member has given us in his comments and I hope my own comments pass along a few more guidelines for the Committee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move:

(*a*) by deleting line 1 and substituting the following therefor:

"That the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture review all"

That puts the material into the Committee. Further:

(*b*) by deleting line 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"taxation of visual and performing artists and writers including, but not"

That includes writers in our consideration. The same happens with my third amendment:

(*c*) by deleting line 5 and substituting the following therefor:

"of visual and performing artists and of writers and the method for determin-"

(*d*) by adding immediately after line 8 the following:

"That such review be conducted as part of the Committee's study of the Applebaum-Hébert Report and its conclusions on this matter be reported to the House before the Committee continues to other topics within this Report;"

(*e*) by deleting line 10 and substituting the following therefor:

"the views of interested parties and organizations."

(*f*) by deleting lines 11 to 19 inclusive.

● (1730)

Very briefly, those amendments put this motion into the Standing Committee that is equipped to handle it. The motion ensures that the Standing Committee will deal with the matter as a top priority, that it will report back to the House with its findings and that it will include writers as well as visual artists and performing artists.

Finally, there is a chance that the House will prorogue before all of this is done and we will ask our House Leaders to include this item in their negotiations and that the reference be continued on into the next session.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, the Chair should say that it has some reservations about the wording of paragraph (*a*) of the amendment which reads, "That the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture review all". I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Members to Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, Citation 202, Paragraph (6) on page 169, which reads:

It is not an amendment to a motion to move that the question go to a committee.

Nevertheless, the Chair appreciates that the House seems to be disposed to refer this matter to the Committee, and since Beauchesne deals with procedure and not legality, the Chair is prepared to accept the text of the amendment as proposed unless there is a strong and violent objection from any quarter in the House.

Hon. David Crombie (Rosedale): First, Mr. Speaker, let me pay tribute to the remarks made by the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark). This is his first intervention in the House in some time. It seemed to me that he not only chose an area which needs the kind of weight he can bring to a motion, but he did so so eloquently and in such detail that there is very little left for anyone else to say. I suggest that not only his eloquence but the wisdom of his remarks is already bearing fruit on the Government side because it has now offered an agreement to send this matter to a committee. I will respond to that agreement on behalf of our Party in a moment.

Since I do not want to talk out our own motion, I will underline only three points. First, there was much made of the proposition that this was somehow a new matter that has come upon us and which we must deal with quickly. While we must deal with it quickly, it is certainly not a new matter. This issue has been in existence since 1972, as the Right Hon. Member has said. Indeed, the Disney Report was published in 1978. That report is the basis upon which the Committee can answer many of the questions raised by the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher). Indeed, I suggest that if this report had been dealt with by the Government when it was first published five years ago, we would not have the kind of problem that exists now, where artists are finding it almost impossible to figure how to go about the business of creativity without either going to jail or going broke.

I simply say that the questions being raised were not raised for the first time today by the Hon. Member for Mississauga North. The Disney Report dealt with this problem five years ago. We would have saved people a lot of pain if the Government had dealt with it then.

The second point I want to underline is that we are talking about the importance of establishing a tax status for artists. Again, this is not something new. While it is new to the Government, it is not new, as noted in the Disney Report, to 14 other countries surrounding us. Countries in the western world have been doing this for a decade. Those countries which appreciate the importance of art to them have found a way to deal with the tax status of artists so they can continue to be artists. The important function of the Committee will be to recommend a tax status for artists which will allow them to be artists in this country.

The third point I want to emphasize is something which the right hon. gentleman mentioned earlier. This is not a small matter. Artists are small in number but they are fundamentally important not only to us but our children and our grandchildren. The only way that people in this country know who they are and where they are going is ultimately through performing artists, writers, sculptors or musicians. We learn who we are and where we are going through art. Surely it is not beyond the competence of this House and the Committee to come up with a status which allows those people who define who we are to be able to do so.

With respect to the agreement offered by the Government, we agree with the motion and that is why I seconded it. We do so with the understanding that the Government has undertaken to raise the matter of prorogation with the House Leaders if, indeed, the matter will die as a consequence of the House being prorogued. Second, we also accept that it is clearly understood that the artists and those affected by the legislation will be heard by the Committee. Third, we accept the proposition that the Government will do its best to bring forward the resources at its command within National Revenue to make sure, at the end of all of this, that we are not simply talking once more but actually doing something for the artists of this country. That will make this day possible.

Mr. Jack Burghardt (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I certainly welcome this opportunity to speak for a couple of moments about the Right Hon. Member's interest and concern in this question. While it does not fall within the mandate or directly affect the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox), it does affect directly the community for which the Minister of Communications is responsible. On that basis we certainly welcome the opportunity to speak to this matter which has come before the House.

As the Hon. Member knows, the question of the methods whereby the federal Government creates a climate in which the arts can flourish has been a matter of intense study by the Government over the past three years. The report of the federal cultural policy review committee has already been mentioned. The Standing Committee on Communications and Culture has, of course, looked at one phase of this, that dealing with broadcasting and film. Certainly it is the intent of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture to review the entire Applebaum-Hébert Report. As a matter of fact, just yesterday the Standing Committee voted to seek a renewal of that reference in any new session so that it might continue the work already begun. Certainly the question of the tax treatment of artists is a priority among the issues that will be examined in that context.

I agree with the Hon. Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) when he suggests that we should be able to call witnesses to that Committee. Witnesses from all endeavours of the artistic community should be heard so that we can properly understand this very burning problem in which the artistic community is now engaged. We certainly want it rectified.

I think that has already been proven on this side of the House by the work done by the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. While I recognize the urgency of the Right Hon. Member's motion, I too would like to add my voice to the opinion that the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture is the proper forum to study this particular question.

It certainly would be irresponsible of me to assure Members that total solutions will be found. As Russell Disney prefaced the recommendations in his famous report, the problems he was dealing with were the residual hard core of issues where fundamental differences of opinion and principle exist between fiscal policy and cultural policy. However, I can assure the House that serious efforts are being made and will be made to come to terms with these problems and resolve them.

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

Some Hon. Members: Question.

● (1740)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Fisher) agreed to.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion (Mr. Clark, Yellowhead), as amended, agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Shall all items listed under Private Members' Notices of Motions preceding Item No. 43 be allowed to stand by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

NARCOTICS

CANNABIS OFFENCES

The House resumed from Friday, December 11, 1981, consideration of the motion of Mr. Gass:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should reconsider its plan announced in the Speech from the Throne to move cannabis offences to the Food and Drugs Act and to remove the possibility of imprisonment for simple possession and should consider the advisability of leaving cannabis offences as they are in the Criminal Code.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): When the House adjourned the previous debate, the Hon. Member for Lambton-Middlesex (Mr. Ferguson) had the floor.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, in view of the lateness of the hour and the importance of the subject, I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Malpeque (Mr. Gass):

That we call it six o'clock and that the remaining time on Motion No. 43 be either number one or number two on the next Private Members' day.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, the procedure proposed by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) requires notice. We cannot agree to the moving of the motion. We would be willing to call it six o'clock, but in so far as the condition that the next time we deal with the motion, either as number one or number two, that matter should be left for the House Leaders to negotiate in the meanwhile. If the Hon. Member is seeking unanimous consent that we call it six o'clock, we agree. I would be willing to consider the Hon. Member's second request. I am not saying I will agree to it, but I will consider it.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, just before we agree to that let me say I understand the Government House Leader's concern. It does highlight the problem that continues under our present rules with respect to Members' private matters when we get into this position. It is a matter that has been brought to the attention of the House Leaders and the House generally which is still not resolved. We had hoped that the precedent of either extending the hours or extending the courtesy of a place at the next proper time for Private Members' business might have been followed. Having said that and having highlighted the necessity of resolving the problem in a formal way, we agree.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, let us make it clear. What we are saying is not that we resume debate on Motion No. 43 the next time. First, the reason we agree to calling it six o'clock and we are not able to proceed on this matter is that the Hon. Member for Malpeque (Mr. Gass) is not here. We are accommodating the Hon. Member by saying yes, we will call it six o'clock because the Hon. Member for Malpeque is not here.

An Hon. Member: He is here.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, if he is here and he wants to proceed, fine.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. I should inform the President of the Privy Council that this is continuation of debate and the Hon. Member for Malpeque has already spoken.

An Hon. Member: He is here.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member wants to go on with this debate, we will not object. If the Hon. Member for Malpeque prefers that we call it six o'clock, we are willing to agree to that. But we do not want any strings attached. In so far as House business is concerned for the week to come, whether it be the next Wednesday or the following Wednesday, I suggest that be discussed among House Leaders.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The motion proposed by the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) is unacceptable for the obvious reasons cited by the President of the Privy Council. However, I detect there may be unanimous consent to call it six o'clock. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland): Mr. Speaker, before addressing the substance of this motion, I would like to point out to Hon. Members that cannabis offences are not presently under the Criminal Code. They are covered under the Narcotic

Control Act. The fact that the Hon. Member earlier made this mistake is not untypical of the confusion regarding the current laws on cannabis and the proposals contained in the Speech from the Throne for reform of these laws.

Since the announcement in the Speech from the Throne, the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) and his colleagues, the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin), have received many letters and phone calls from individuals concerned that the Government intends to legalize cannabis or in fact reduce the status of the offence to that of a traffic violation. They are concerned that the Government is condoning the use of a potentially noxious substance. Let me state categorically that this is not and was never the intention of the Government, and surely it was no intention of mine as a Private Member. As was stated by the Minister of Justice in an appearance before the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee of the House of Commons on May 26, 1981, concerning cannabis, he said:

> It is our intention to bring about changes which will serve to lessen the severity of the penalties for possession of this substance, without "legalizing" or even "decriminalizing" marijuana. The Government believes that marijuana is a health hazard and intends to launch an active public education program among Canadians, especially the younger members of our society, to continue to discourage its use. Furthermore, we will continue to prosecute with vigor all those who traffic in this drug.

This statement is self-evident and is a direct quotation.

The Government does not condone the use of marijuana and other cannabis products by Canadians. That should be clearly understood by all Members of the House as well as the general public. We are concerned with the adverse health and safety effects of drug use and will be doing more to inform Canadians in this area.

As a high school teacher some years ago we found in many of the schools in our area cannabis was beginning to be a problem. I am happy to say from the information forthcoming in the last few years this problem has subsided somewhat. This is an encouraging sign for those still in education and for myself in public life who must deal with these problems on a weekly basis.

Why did the Government propose to change the cannabis laws? The pressure for change stems from the inadequacies and unfortunate consequences of the application of the present law. Under the current legislation, possession of cannabis, even in minimal quantity, exposes a person to the possibility of damaging criminal records entailing difficulties in terms of social stigma, employment and immigration. In the past ten years more than 200,000 Canadians have been found guilty of possession of cannabis, and in spite of considerable enforcement efforts, an increasing number of Canadians use cannabis, indicating an apparent lack of effectiveness of the law. The cost to society of using the full weight of the criminal process to discourage cannabis use has been very high, and I might add with very little return.

● (1750)

During the course of the next few minutes, I would like to indicate some of the background factors which influenced the Government to initiate its study on the problems of cannabis use and cannabis laws per se. Cannabis is not an opiate narcotic in any pharmacological sense, yet the control of cannabis is now under the Narcotic Control Act along with such other substances as heroin and cocaine. This may be due to the fact that little was known about cannabis back in 1923 when it was first added to the schedule of prohibited narcotics under the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act of 1920.

It is unfortunate that cannabis has been grouped together with narcotics because in the public mind they are seen to be equally harmful substances with the same addictive properties, producing the same physiological damage. The Narcotic Control Act is reserved for more harmful drugs, the narcotics. Therefore, the law regulating the control of these substances is much more severe. This fact is worth nothing because I think the general public is unaware of the penalties listed in the law when they hear or read about courts giving discharges to offenders. The Food and Drugs Act is the statute reserved for the control of non-narcotic drugs that may be subject to abuse. Many argue that cannabis more properly belongs under that statute. I want to make clear at this point that this is not my view. I am not convinced as a Private Member that it should come under the Food and Drugs Act.

It may come as a surprise to Hon. Members to learn that the maximum penalty in law for possession of cannabis is seven years, if it is proceeded with as an indictable offence. Normally it is proceeded with as a summary conviction offence, in which case the maximum penalty is $1,000 and/or six months for a first offence and $2,000 and/or one year for a subsequent offence. The offences of trafficking and importing carry very severe penalties, up to life imprisonment. In the case of importing, it is further specified that the minimum sentence is to be seven years imprisonment, with a maximum of life imprisonment also. I state categorically that for those people trafficking in drugs and importing them, I believe the full force of the law should be applied.

Unauthorized or simple possession of cannabis is the offence which concerns us most. I believe it is what we are discussing today. It is the most frequent offence and the one that results in so many of our young people being perceived as criminals. Simple possession is a hybrid offence, that is to say, punishable either on summary conviction or by way of indictment. However, at the initial stage it is treated as an indictable offence, which means that the individual is usually fingerprinted and photographed and a centralized permanent police record is created. Hundreds of thousands of Canadians, many of whom would not have otherwise become involved in this stigmatizing process, have been fingerprinted and photographed for simple possession of cannabis; some have even been imprisoned. In addition, the majority of those charged are found guilty and now bear the burden of a damaging record.

The fact that many people are breaking the law and being convicted is not reason enough to change it. However the law should reflect the gravity of the conduct penalized. The current high maximums relating to simple possession of cannabis products bear no relationship to present sentencing practices

and can hardly be justified with respect to any offence of a basically non-violent nature where the main victim is the user. Here again I digress. If we were to take this statement as it is, there would be the implication that we would be condoning the use of cannabis. That is our last idea. Because it is so damaging to the people who use it—and it is my belief that the Le Dain Commission which brought down its report some years ago did not have the facts at its disposal which we now have—we must make decisions on behalf of Canadians.

The law should also reflect the attitudes of Canadians generally. In this regard it is worth noting that national surveys conducted in 1977 and 1978 indicated that about two-thirds of the population was in favour of either a regulatory scheme or minor penalties for possession of cannabis. Only one-third favoured the present law or something more severe. I count myself among that third. A survey conducted in 1980 confirmed that this support has remained about the same, with some increase in favour of the status quo.

A Gallup omnibus study on marijuana, jointly commissioned by the Department of Justice, the Department of National Health and Welfare and the Ministry of the Solicitor General in August and September, 1981, explored a different aspect of marijuana control—the severity of penalties imposed by the courts. In terms of the perceived appropriateness of the sentences imposed by the courts for possession of marijuana, 15 per cent of the respondents thought the penalties were too heavy, 26 per cent thought they were about right, and 36 per cent thought they were too light. The remainder, 23 per cent, had no opinion or thought that possession was legal. A clear majority of respondents believed that penalties imposed by the courts for trafficking and importing marijuana were too light. The point which has to be emphasized in the House of Commons is that when we are dealing with trafficking and importing, these are the people who must be stamped out; they must be caught and must be the ones who are most severely punished by society.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Parent: Also the survey indicated that over 80 per cent of respondents said that a change in the law would not affect their decisions concerning whether or not to use marijuana and, in the case of users, how often to use it. About one in six respondents reported knowing of someone who had been caught by the police for possession of marijuana. In virtually all these cases, those apprehended were reported to have experienced problems, namely with their families and arising from having a criminal record.

The reform of cannabis legislation has been commented upon by a variety of interest groups. Some of these, such as NORML—the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws—have been organized specifically for this purpose. Most others, such as the Canadian Medical Association and the Canadian Bar Association, have commented upon it due to the interest of their members.

From the public pronouncements of these various groups there does emerge a consensus. Generally they agree that possession of cannabis should remain an offence, with which I agree; that it should be shifted to the Food and Drugs Act, about which I have reservations; that the consequences of conviction should be reduced. If they mean the consequences of conviction with regard to those people who are caught, I do not know that I would want to go that way. The consequences of conviction also imply that we are dealing with the families of people who are known or caught using this narcotic. Finally, they agreed unanimously that there should be increased efforts at public education, with which I believe everyone in the House would agree.

Reform of cannabis laws is not a recent issue. This matter was considered previously by the Government. As a result of the Le Dain Commission which was completed in 1973, there were several tentative steps toward reform. The House may recall that the Government introduced Bill S-19 in the Senate. The Senate passed that Bill but it died on the House of Commons Order Paper at the end of the 1974-75 session of the Thirtieth Parliament. The problems associated with the current law continue, so this most recent initiative to review the law was launched by the Government.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please! It being six o'clock, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow, pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 6 p.m., the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 3, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

● (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Monday, October 31, 1983, consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motion No. 58 (Mr. McKnight).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Before we proceed with further consideration of the Bill at report stage, I would like to refer to the motions placed on the Notice Paper last Monday with the unanimous consent of the House.

As Hon. Members are aware, a great many of these motions were previously ruled out of order on procedural grounds. It is not the intention of the Chair to interfere with the unanimous agreement of the House to place the motions back on the Notice Paper for consideration. However, even though the House has agreed to set aside its rules and practices in some regards and go beyond any procedural limitations in regard to these motions, the Chair is still confronted with a major difficulty.

Eight of the motions involve the additional expenditure of public funds and, therefore, require a Royal Recommendation which can only be signed by His Excellency. The four motions standing in the name of the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), namely Motions Nos. 14A, 74A, 157A and 160A, have been covered by the required Royal Recommendations. However, Motions Nos. 51A, 125A, 126A and 157A, standing in the names of the Hon. Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong), the Hon. Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko), the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) and the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) respectively, are not so accompanied.

Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, Citation 543(1), provides:

> If any motion or bill or proceeding is offered to be moved, whether in the House or in a committee which requires, but fails to receive, the recommendation of the Crown, it is the duty of the Speaker to announce that no question can be proposed upon the motion, or to direct the withdrawal of the bill, or to say that the problem may be rectified by the proposer obtaining a Royal Recommendation.

The citation is clear and unequivocal and is backed by long practice. Under the circumstances and in light of this citation, I do not see how I can in conscience, respecting my obligations to the House, accept that Motions Nos. 51A, 125A, 126A and 157B can be proposed for consideration. No unanimous consent can get around the problem. I regret very much that I have to reach this decision, but I hope all Hon. Members will appreciate the difficult position in which the Chair has been placed.

I would also like to indicate to the House that the motions placed on the Notice Paper by unanimous consent on Monday last have been inserted in their proper numerical order and given, as the case may be, a letter A or B, in addition to an arabic numeral, so that all those motions which have been before us would not need to be renumbered. The new motions are Motions Nos. 10A, 14A, 74A, 90A, 134A, 154A, 157A, 160A, 165A and 165B.

Once consideration of Motion No. 58 now before the House is completed, the next motion to be considered will be Motion No. 10A. It in turn will be followed by debate on Motion No. 14A. Both will also be voted on separately. Motions Nos. 157A and 74A ought to be debated together. Since Motion No. 74A is consequential to Motion No. 157A, a vote on Motion No. 157A would also dispose of Motion No. 74A. Motion No. 90A should be debated and voted on separately.

Motion No. 134A will be grouped for debate with previously grouped Motions Nos. 63, 68, 69, 99 to 103 inclusive, 115, 127, 128, 130 to 133 inclusive, 136 to 138 inclusive, 140 to 144 inclusive, 148 and 149. An affirmative vote on Motion No. 133 will dispose of Motion No. 134A; however, a negative vote on Motion No. 133 would necessitate the question being put on Motion No. 134A.

Motion No. 160A should be grouped with the previous grouping of Motions Nos. 159, 160, 161 and 162 for debate, which had been grouped for debate but separate votes. It is my intention to group Motions Nos. 160A and 160 for voting as follows: An affirmative vote on Motion No. 160A negates the need for putting the question on Motion No. 160, while a negative vote on Motion No. 160A would require the putting of the question on Motion No. 160.

Motion No. 154A will be grouped for debate with the previously grouped Motions Nos. 153 and 154, and each will be voted on separately.

● (1110)

Motions Nos. 165A and 165B ought to be grouped for debate and an affirmative vote on Motion No. 165A will dispose of Motion No. 165B; however, a negative vote on Motion No. 165A would require the putting of the question on

Motion No. 165B. I am sure all of that is clear to Hon. Members.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hope that you will be prepared to hear at least some argument on the question of whether certain amendments are admissible or otherwise. I would like to draw your attention, if I may—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Is the Hon. Member not accepting the decision of the Chair with regard to four amendments that have been ruled as requiring a Royal Recommendation and are being rejected accordingly? Is that the point of the Hon. Member?

Mr. Deans: Well, it is not a matter of not accepting it. I would like to put before you some considerations which may not have been taken into account by the Chair in arriving at the preliminary ruling.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair cannot accept argument on a decision of the Chair after the decision has been rendered.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It has been a practice of the Speaker to allow some discussion on rulings such as this immediately after—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair does not permit debate on a ruling of the Speaker. That was a decision in our Standing Orders taken some years ago. The Chair intends to respect the clear intent of the Standing Orders of the House of Commons. A decision has been made by the Chair on these matters.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, might I just interject, not for the purpose of coming to the rescue of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), but merely to make an observation without in any way reflecting on the ruling of the Chair. There has been a practice that has grown up in the House which I, and I am sure all Members, would like to see retained in situations such as the one which the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is attempting to speak to today and which by our custom he is prevented from doing.

Normally the occupant of the chair, as Madam Speaker did when these amendments had to be dealt with, generally expresses concern about the acceptability of a motion or motions and warns Members that the Chair does have concern and will hear submissions at some later time. I am in accord with the Chair, so naturally I cannot question it. However, I would suggest that we would not want to dispense with that past practice and replace it with the practice where the Speaker initiates rulings without any warning to Members who may wish to make some submissions in the future.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) has made an observation which the Chair will heed carefully. The Chair, however, has considered this matter, taken advice and is firmly of the opinion as expressed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to remind the House of Standing Order 79(10), which provides, and I quote:

(10) The Speaker shall have power to select or combine amendments or clauses to be proposed at the report stage and may, if he or she thinks fit, call upon any Member who has given notice of an amendment to give such explanation of the subject of the amendment as may enable the Speaker to form a judgment upon it.

It is clear that in this case, the Chair did not think it would be useful to exercise its discretionary powers and call upon a Member to explain the subject of the amendment. The Chair made its ruling without consulting the Hon. Member, and I think this is sound practice because it saves considerable time. Not long ago, this latitude was still granted, and the result was that precious time was wasted in the House of Commons, and I think that the Chair now tends to simply apply the Standing Order. I realize that the Standing Orders are seldom crystal clear, but I must say I welcome this return to strict application of the Standing Orders, as opposed to a not so literal interpretation when the Standing Orders are clear and allowing any number of interventions, as has been the case in the past, unfortunately, which has led to considerable waste of time.

● (1115)

That being said, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that notwithstanding the Chair's ruling, which I respect, if there is a way to allow the House to give its unanimous consent for a vote on the amendments that were rejected this morning—I realize that the Chair, in giving its ruling, explained that it was difficult, but nevertheless the Chair reiterated that on this side of the House, we would give that unanimous consent if it was required and if it would allow the Chair to put the question on these amendments. However, without wishing to oppose the Chair's ruling, I want to make it quite clear that this is not a case of obstruction or opposition on the part of the Government. The Chair's ruling is there, and we respect it, but if unanimous consent would be useful for the New Democratic Party, we are prepared to give it.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is in a difficult position. The Chair has considered the matter of the Royal Recommendation, a long-standing practice of the House. Motions that require a Royal Recommendation and do not have a Royal Recommendation cannot be put before the House. The Chair has not been able to overcome this very great difficulty, in fact insuperable difficulty, with regard to procedural acceptability of motions. If there is unanimous agreement of the House Leaders to put some type of motion or amendment before the House, the Chair at this stage can only suggest that there might be consultations and it might be possible for the House Leaders to come back with further suggestions. The Chair is the servant of the House, but at this stage the Chair cannot see its way to accepting motions that clearly require a Royal Recommendation, which is not there for those four amend-

ments. With regret, because of the unanimous decision of the House, the Chair has had to make the ruling that it has made and the Chair does not do this lightly.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I am in a bit of a quandary because we understood when we agreed to give unanimous consent to allow certain matters to be put on the Notice Paper and voted upon that we likewise were being given unanimous consent for that practice to be followed in the case of the amendments we put in. We had no indication from anyone at the time that there would be a counter-ruling made which would result in our not being permitted to vote on our amendments. I must say that had that matter been made clear to us at the start we would not have acceded to the unanimous consent being given on the other questions.

I want to suggest that there is perhaps a way out. The unanimous consent was given, I believe, by both sides of the House with the understanding that the questions would be put to a vote. I would like the Chair simply to consider whether or not in the circumstances, given that the Hosue is entitled to give unanimous consent to a matter such as this, and without establishing a precedent, as is clearly set out in Citation 14 of Beauchesne, that the intent of the House would be thwarted if the vote were not allowed to be taken.

I can appreciate the difficulty of the Royal Recommendation. I would like to suggest that what we are offering in at least two of the three amendments can be considered as amendments to the Government proposal which has, in fact, a Royal Recommendation. The Government has put forward a proposal on the question of shipper share under 157A, and in the normal process of debate we would have been able to offer an amendment to that proposal as long as our amendment did not require the Government to spend more money than they had heretofore allocated for 157A.

• (1120)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is listening to the Hon. Member and is seeking a way out of the difficulty. All the Chair can suggest at this point is that there might be some conversations between House Leaders of the Parties to see whether amendments can be offered in a form which would come within the scope of the Royal Recommendation. It appears from what the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is saying that there might be a disposition on the part of the Government to make amendments to the legislation so that matters might be so considered.

The Chair has a problem with the Royal Recommendation. The precedents are abundantly clear. It is one of those things that the Chair cannot set aside.

The Chair would like to suggest that the House Leaders, especially the House Leader for the Government and the House Leader for the New Democratic Party, have a private conference and see whether it is possible to frame amendments in such a way that they can be brought within the scope.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to make sure that the record is clear. There are two points to be made. First, we did hold discussions concerning the acceptance of amendments for debate, and the position we took was that if Members of the Opposition Parties wanted to bring such amendments forward, we would not object. I think it is important to point out to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) that in the discussion we did not receive copies of their proposed amendments until minutes before Question Period—almost minutes before consent was to be given. We had no opportunity to determine their advisability within the scope of what is normally considered the Royal Recommendation. I believe that that is within the discretion of the Chair. The offer was made and accepted but because there was no time to give them a full examination and make that judgment, I do not think we can be held responsible.

Second, let us make it clear that there is no disposition on the part of the Government to accept such amendments. We are prepared to have them debated but I want to make it clear we are not prepared to have them accepted. If they want to debate them, that is well and good. But if you are suggesting that we try to rework them so that they are acceptable, I think you will find that negotiations would not lead very far.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I want to carry on with the debate on the motion put by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight).

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I thought we were still debating this point of order but since my hon. colleague is entering into debate—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, there is no further debate on the point of order; the matter has been settled. The Hon. Member is recognized for debate.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order.

[*Translation*]

All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that you made a ruling this morning, we are abiding by that ruling and we can live with it. However, since you suggested that I have some discussions with the New Democratic Party's House Leader, if the Chair is not advised of any unanimous consent in the course of the day, the Chair's ruling stands and we shall vote on the amendments as the Chair ruled, and I want that to be quite clear.

In other words, I would not want your suggestion for consultations to be an excuse for delaying the vote until later this evening. I want to make that quite clear.

[*English*]

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the merits of the debate. At the outset of today, the last day of report stage because of the invocation of closure by the Government, I think it is important that we spend time debating the issue.

The Government House Leader mentioned that there have been delays on points of order. I suggest that the ultimate

delay was caused by the Minister himself when he had the audacity to move the adjournment of debate at 4.30 on Tuesday morning. At that time, Members on this side of the House were quite prepared to continue debating on our own time, regardless of whether we got any sleep, because we believe this is an important issue. The Minister was embarrassed and ashamed of the position of the Government on this issue and so moved the adjournment. This caused him to lose the ability to put this matter through before the Armistice Day break. I know that Members of the Liberal Party are seething and unhappy over the incompetence of the Minister in the way in which he did this. I simply would like on one occasion to join with Liberal backbenchers and say that I am mad as hell about this and so is everybody on our side.

• (1125)

This particular proposal, which was put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight), is a very sensible one. Before the Minister moved the adjournment of the House at 4.30 a.m. on Tuesday, he said he was going to take this matter under advisement but he did not think that any of his legal advisers were up at that time. He wanted to adjourn the House so he could get competent legal advice with respect to the admissibility of this very sensible motion. The Minister has had all of Tuesday morning, all day Wednesday, and all of this morning to consult with his legal counsel to find out whether or not this particular provision can in fact be accepted by the Government. I will be anxious to hear, now that the Minister has had three days to consider the matter, whether this motion will be accepted.

This motion proposes to specify that in fact the railways will be held under obligation to provide suitable accommodation for grain. This is a matter of some serious consequence because the whole proposal which the Government has brought forward is an extremely rich package as far as the railways of Canada are concerned. I said on an earlier occasion that if I were on the board of directors of CPR I would commission a statue of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and have those statues put in the foyer of the headquarters of the CPR, because the CPR is really beholden to the Government for this rich package. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of western Canada understand that. When they are called upon to pay an enormous price in terms of extra cost to move their grain, they will not forget what the Liberal Party has done to them with this legislation.

Another point made by my colleague, which I believe is very helpful, is that under this provision the Administrator of the transportation agency is deemed to be a shipper for purposes of making an application, which would be at public expense but on behalf of the producers, with respect to any inability on the part of the railways to carry the grain of the western producers. I believe this is a very sensible proposition because what is going to happen, under the circumstances we now have in this Bill, is that if there is any complaint, the individual producer, either himself or in co-operation with his fellow farmers, will at his own expenses have to petition with respect to inequities which may in fact occur as a result of the inability of the railways to carry out their mandate and obligation to move the grain to export points.

I also want to voice my concern that one of the motions which has been proposed by the New Democratic Party has in fact been ruled out of order. The reason I am sorry that this motion was not brought up for a vote on the floor of the House is that it is a motion which, in my estimation, demonstrates the greatest turnaround by any political party in recent history. With respect to the motion brought forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster, in regard to assisting the movement of grain and making sure the railways carry out their obligations, the New Democratic Party has now done a great flip-flop in its attitude toward the retention of the statutory Crow rate. The implication is clear from the motion it put forward that the New Democratic Party, as my colleague the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) has said, has now taken the position that the Crow must go. It has done a complete 180 degree reversal over the position they ostensibly took.

Mr. Hovdebo: Do you believe that?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: As you can see, Mr. Speaker, I have two pieces of paper. One is the motion put forward by the Minister of Transport with respect to the safety net provisions. The other one, Mr. Speaker, is an NDP amendment. You can see from your chair that these two documents are typed on the same typewriter. They are precisely the same with one exception; they blotted out a part of the safety net provision and inserted their own figures. Instead of the Government provision of 4 per cent in 1984, 5 per cent in 1985, 8 per cent in 1986, 9 per cent in 1987 and 10 per cent after 1988, they put in their own provision of 3 per cent.

• (1130)

Mr. McKnight: It must be a mistake.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: No mistake, Mr. Speaker. As I said, they did not have the grace to use their own typewriter; they used a Government typewriter and put in exactly the same motion. What does this mean, Mr. Speaker? It means the NDP has flip-flopped.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, not only is the Member wrong but he is debating a motion just ruled out of order. I would very much like to have had this motion debated by the House and voted on. This motion would not only have preserved the Crow but would have reduced—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deans: —the impact on the farmers of western Canada. However, now that the Hon. Member is able to hide behind the Speaker's ruling, he is taking a position he would not have been able to take. I ask that he be required to speak to the amendments before the House and refrain from speaking to amendments ruled out of order by the Speaker.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) suggests this part of my reference to motions and positions of the Party, whether they have been accepted or not, is not relevant to this particular motion. I point out that there is nothing more relevant to the motion put forward by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster, which requires the CTC to ensure the railways carry out their obligation to provide adequate accommodation for the movement of grain. What are they going to consider? They will consider the cost to the railways and their level of payment. Therefore, we have then to assess how much should the railways be paid. Their motion, whether it was ruled out of order or not, deals specifically with that very question. Therefore it is of the highest relevance.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain raised a point of order and he is correct in that at some time during the remarks of the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West considerable reference was made to a motion ruled out of order. I think the proper route for me is to suggest the Hon. Member try to address himself to Motion No. 58 and try to contain his remarks in that regard.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: You have a record of fairness and equity in this matter, Mr. Speaker, and as you know I always follow your rulings with absolute dedication. I propose to do just that. All I can say with respect to the position of the NDP—I am not going to refer to any particular motion ruled out of order so I will not be irrelevant—is that their position, generally speaking, and having no regard to motions ruled out of order, is that they have done a flip-flop on how much the railways should in fact receive for the movement of grain. These people are absolutely shameless.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, my understanding of the rules of order in this House is that Members in debate cannot impute motives to individual Members or Parties.

Mr. Forrestall: Who was imputing? I thought it was a very direct charge.

Mr. Althouse: I think the Hon. Member has done this by a total misinterpretation of something of which he apparently knows very little. If I may explain—

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. McKnight: Try and explain it during the election.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I think the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) should seek the floor in debate if he wishes to explain something. With respect to the point of order, the Hon. Member is correct but I think the Chair has a duty to allow as wide ranging a debate as possible. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West has only four minutes approximately remaining. If he could be allowed to continue his remarks we can move on to less rambunctious debate.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the NDP is so sensitive over this terribly bad policy they have adopted. Imagine how you would feel if you had gone around telling the people of western Canada that you want to retain the Crow and the first chance you have to do anything with respect to this legislation is to give the western farmers a hick in the slats to the extent of a 20 per cent increase right now in the cost of transporting grain. You would be livid, Mr. Speaker, and I see you understand that.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, we in this Party have taken a firm and consistent position with respect to the retention of the Crow. The freeze is an understandable, fair and reasonable position for our Party to take with respect to this matter until after the review period has been completed.

What do I mean by that? We say out west you do not want to buy a pig in a poke. They say that out east as well, and I am going to say it right here in central Canada. We do not want to buy a pig in a poke. We want to see how this system operates. Would you buy a bill of goods, Mr. Speaker, and pay for it before you see whether it works, without any guarantees? Not on your life. But that is what the grain producer is asked to accept. There are all sorts of vague references to the obligations of the railways, all sorts of talk about safety nets, but in the final result the NDP and the Liberals are saying the farmers pay more without seeing whether or not this system is going to work. Well, we say the western farmer does not deserve that kind of contemptuous action on the part of the Government.

My colleague from Kindersley-Lloydminster, along with Members of our Party, attended faithfully all the hearings on this matter in committee. Where were the NDP Members? Where were these defenders of the Crow? Except for the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin), the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) and the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre who were there half the time, the rest of them were there on one or two occasions to get their pictures taken. This was so that they would have a photograph to send out in their householder mailing.

People in our Party hold permits and know what it is to get on the land and produce. They know the problem involved in grain transportation. My colleague makes a proposal which is going to put an additional and specific obligation on the part of the railways to deliver, and I cannot understand why anyone in this House would not support this wholeheartedly.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Minister, before he moved adjournment of the House, indicated he was sympathetic to this matter. I think it would be incumbent upon him or his Parliamentary Secretary to let us know whether or not we are going to have this proposal added to the Bill. Opposing as we do the ruinous aspect of this legislation, we have tried to be constructive in this debate. We have attempted to say that we object to this legislation but here are some things the Government should consider. I hope the Minister will give fair and sympathetic consideration to putting in this very useful

amendment and I look forward to someone from the Government standing up and accepting our proposition.

• (1140)

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn) requested that someone from the Government side respond to his remarks. I would like to take this opportunity to do so.

Mr. Mazankowski: Why not the Minister?

Mr. Flis: The Hon. Member asks why not the Minister. He knows the rules of the House. We are only allowed to speak once for ten minutes on each amendment.

The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West said that people in our Party hold permit books yet not once did I hear any Member from the other side get up and declare a conflict of interest.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Flis: As a lawyer, perhaps he should look into that.

The Hon. Member opened his remarks by blaming the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and the Government side—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I listened without interruption to the Hon. Member. I would ask him to give me the same courtesy.

The big concern of the Hon. Member is why we moved adjournment at 4.30 a.m. I will tell him why, and I would suggest to him that had he been here all night like the rest of us, he would have known why.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I was here.

Mr. Flis: The Minister got up to make a remark and I will quote the Minister.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a legitimate point of order. I do not want the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to be acting under any delusions. I was here from the beginning to the end of the debate for absolutely 100 per cent of the time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, over a week ago—

Mr. Gustafson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. The Hon. Member refers to a conflict of interest. I want him to know that the present Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board does hold a permit book, and rightly so. There is absolutely no conflict of interest if he wants to rule out all farmers having any voice in terms of producers. That is absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker. I think he should reconsider.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Flis: Since I have heard that there is no conflict of interest, I will withdraw those remarks.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Flis: In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, a little over a week ago I rose in the House asking to extend debate time past six o'clock. The Official Opposition turned that down because I did not add to my request a time limit. I did not say that debate should end at 10 or 12 or at whatever time. The Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) got up on Monday and made the same request, again applying no time limit. That meant that we could have sat, Mr. Speaker, for one or two weeks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I have had occasion to ask other Hon. Members to try to keep their remarks relevant to the motion before us. I think I have to ask the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to do the same.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: If you are going to move adjournment, sit down.

Mr. Mazankowski: The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Flis) complained about the fact that he was not as successful in moving the motion to extend hours as was I. I suspect that my powers are a little more persuasive than his. Furthermore, if the Liberal Party would have had 25 Members in the House, it could have prevented the situation from occurring rather than having the embarrassment of moving the motion to adjourn.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, you asked me to remain relevant to the motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Yes, I did, and I would appreciate if the Hon. Member would.

Mr. Flis: My remarks are relevant because the Hon. Member asked why we moved adjournment when we were debating Motion No. 58 which is before us. The Minister got up and said, and I quote from page 28614 of *Hansard:*

> I will take into account Motion No. 58, but obviously I would like the time to consult with legal counsel. Perhaps at that time I would be in a position to respond to the concerns of Hon. Members of the Opposition or to determine if the complications are too overwhelming to accept. Perhaps some other wording might be accepted, or adapted, which would incorporate the reference to grain requirements throughout the Bill without getting into the contradictory propositions mentioned by legal counsel during the committee hearings.

During the committee hearings we heard from two legal counsel who stated that there was no need for this lengthy amendment since most of it just quoted from Section 262 of the Railway Act. This Bill continually refers to other Acts, Mr. Speaker, and if we were to quote from every other Act every time one was mentioned in the Bill, the Bill would be so lengthy that it would be too heavy to lift. We were advised in committee that there was no need for Motion No. 58. We

voted it down, but the Minister, in good faith, made the following proposition: "Give us time to check with legal counsel again and maybe we can accept it".

The next day, Mr. Speaker, instead of coming to vote before eleven o'clock so that we would not have lost the day, Hon. Members of the Conservative Party decided to come to the House after eleven o'clock.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I note that the Parliamentary Secretary is suggesting that the Minister wanted to have time to seek legal counsel. I am wondering, since the Bills of the House are written in legal language, if he would be in conflict of interest if any lawyers happened to read that Bill.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, Conservative Members came back the next day. Had they come before eleven o'clock, we could have gone into day two of the debate and considered Motion No. 58 at great length. No, they decided to waste another day of the House.

Mr. Mazankowski: This is day two.

Mr. Flis: The Hon. Member who spoke before I rose got up and blamed the NDP—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I understand the points being made by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary but I think he should restrict his remarks to the nature of Motion No. 58.

I would remind the Hon. Member that there is some difficulty in that Members are not permitted under Standing Orders to cast reflections upon a vote. He is approaching the area where it becomes difficult for the Chair. Perhaps he could try to address himself to Motion No. 58.

Mr. Flis: Thank you for your advice, Mr. Speaker. However, the whole debate arises out of Motion No. 58 and whether to accept it or not. I am trying to present arguments to show that had Members of the Opposition co-operated in good faith, as they say they do but never do, there may have been the possibility of accepting that motion. However, if they are going to play these kinds of obstructive games, my advice to the Minister will be to vote the motion out.

Members of the Opposition have wasted day after day. Together with Members of the NDP, they wasted three full days on procedural wrangles. They wasted a day with petitions that could have been tabled and they wasted a day by coming in after eleven o'clock. That makes three parliamentary days that they have wasted during which we could have debated every amendment that is put before us on the Table, including Motion No. 58.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would just like to draw to your attention the rule of relevancy and I invite you to enforce it. I am sure you would get support from all concerns of the House. Previous Speakers have done that in the past. I understand the rule and we all understand it. For the sake of the debate, I think the Parliamentary Secretary should obey that rule as well.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I believe that the question of relevancy is very important now that we are under the constraint of closure. I would simply want to add my voice to the argument that all comments should be strictly relevant. If not, there are so many motions on this complicated Bill that we will never get through them before 5.45 p.m. and will not, in the true parliamentary tradition, have a legitimate opportunity of looking at each of these items.

In terms of the response of the Parliamentary Secretary, the Minister has now had three days to consult his lawyers—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. Order.

Mr. Flis: He is the same Member, Mr. Speaker, who five minutes ago tried to blame the NDP in order to cover up the Tory flip-flop. He is now standing up on a point of order.

Hon. Members of the Progressive Conservative Party said that they were bringing forward motions like Motion No. 58 to protect the western producers. Let me ask Hon. Members opposite how Motion No. 58 protects the poultry producers, the livestock producers and the specialty crop producers who have told us time and time again that the retention of the Crow rate has hurt those producers with a 86-year distortion. The Hon. Members who were on the committee heard this. They are nodding.

• (1150)

How is Motion No. 58 going to get rid of this distortion? How is Motion No. 58 going to get rid of this hurt that has been caused to the farmers in the west over 86 years? They have not addressed that. They kept flip-flopping. They were against the Gilson proposal. They were against the Pepin 50-50 proposal. They came up with their own freedom of choice. When we came in with payment to the railways, they then wanted to support the Pepin 50-50 proposal. Then they come in with the three-year freeze. How was that three-year freeze going to protect these producers who are hurt by the retention of the Crow, who have had this distortion imposed upon them by the retention of the Crow?

Mr. Malone: The hurt has increased.

Mr. Flis: Now they are trying to say that the NDP is flipping. We know the NDP's position. The NDP has at least been honest and upfront right from the beginning. But I cannot say that for the Progressive Conservatives, Mr. Speaker. They were dishonest. They were flip-flopping all over the place on this Bill and they still are with this amendment.

An Hon. Member: You are defending the NDP.

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Motion No. 58 which presents a long and detailed regurgitation of a lot of what is now in the Transportation Act. It attempts simply to restate some of those clauses

into this Bill. I do not know whether there is very much to be said about this long and detailed amendment except that it contains a lot of words that are already written into law and are part of the current Transportation Act. It really changes very little or changes nothing. It simply goes over many things that are now in existing laws. It simply transfers some phrases into this Bill.

For instance, the first aspect of the motion talks about furnishing adequate and suitable accommodation for the receiving and loading of grain offered for carriage upon the railroad. This would normally mean new sidings. That has been part of the Railway Act for many years. It has been written into law that the railways must provide the sidings. But in actual fact if a customer wants a siding, for the past number of years the customer has had to pay for it. That has been written into this Bill, but it is already in other laws. Therefore, it will not change anything. I submit that it will only reiterate present laws that are not being enforced.

This motion also goes on to say that it would furnish adequate and suitable accommodation for the carrying, unloading and delivering of grain. That sounds like hopper and railway cars. Yet we know for a fact that in spite of this being part of the existing Railway Act, no cars have been purchased by either railway company for the movement of grain since the 1950s.

In subparagraph (c) we read:

(c) without delay, and with due care and diligence, receive, carry and deliver all such grain;

That provision is already in the Railway Act. It is a very detailed piece of legislation, yet we know that in 1977-1978 the CPR refused to supply cars to move grain and the Wheat Board and the Provinces ended up having to buy cars to get the grain moving again.

Motion No. 58 subparagraph (d) reads:

(d) furnish and use all proper appliances, accommodation and means necessary for receiving, loading, carrying, unloading and delivering such grain;

One would think that would include up to and including branch lines. We know that in spite of this being a part of existing transportation law, and having a branch line act providing subsidies to provide service on those branch lines, the branch lines are not being maintained, even those that have been designated to be kept up by the Canadian Transport Commission. We know the cost of upgrading them to meet CTC rulings is something like $1.6 billion. The Government has only $1.1 billion to put toward that objective and the railways are refusing to find the other half billion.

We know these things are not happening in spite of all these fine things in Motion No. 58 that already exist in laws and apply to the railway system. We see that there are sections on due payment of tolls lawfully imposed by the Act. We see there are portions in here that deal with payments. There is a section dealing with how persons who are aggrieved by the railways under this act may act against the companies for the refusal of the company to comply with the requirements of this section. It is almost a straight removal of a similar section in the Railway Act that exists now. We know that was not successfully used. It is not something farmers can use. Farmers did take the CPR and the CNR to court because of their refusal to provide adequate rolling stock and service in 1977-1978. The courts ruled that the law was not strong enough. The court said the farmers were not in law the shipper and could therefore not act against the railway. These fine words being lifted out of a couple of other acts and put into this one will not change the way the system operates.

I would like to say a few words about the producers' share of costs in this Bill. It seems to me there is not a current way of protecting farmers from paying more than a specified share of the cost of freight. That is why there has been a discussion about 3 per cent or 7 per cent or 10 per cent.

I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that over the past number of years the shipper's share of the freight charges on the six major grains, according to figures put out by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool, has been as follows. In the 1979-1980 crop year the average percentage of the price of the shippers' share was 3 per cent. In 1980-1981 the average share of the freight for the six major grains was 2.6 per cent. In the 1981-1982 crop year the shippers' share was 3 per cent. The shippers' share is not quite the same thing as the safety net, but I put in these figures so you can compare them with the proposal for the safety net to show how relevant the figures are, Mr. Speaker.

The safety net is a ceiling that would provide a net above which—

Mr. Mazankowski: It is 2.5 per cent.

Mr. Althouse: —the proportion of freight costs cannot climb. I have just read into the record how it has been 3 per cent for the last couple of crop years and that it dropped to 2.6 per cent in 1980-1981 essentially because the price of the grain went up in 1980-1981. That is the secret. If the price of grain continues to fall along the line that it started back in June, 3 per cent would be a safety net even under the current rate.

If the Conservatives could do arithmetic or had any analytical ability, they would know, even under the current rate which is what we have been talking about all through this debate, that if the price of grain goes below $1.50 per tonne for the six grains on a weighted average, there would be more than 3 per cent of the producers' income going to pay freight even under the current Crow rate. A 3 per cent safety net guarantees producers against additional freight costs even with the existing Crow rate. That is a fact that some of my colleagues on this side of the House totally ignore. They are completely ignorant of facts. They do not wish to read, listen or understand. While we hear a lot of them saying they are farmers, that they have quota books and their understanding of this issue is all knowing and supreme because of this fact, they, I think, are kidding themselves. They are attempting to fool the Canadian people, but they are only fooling themselves.

• (1200)

If they were farmers and had to make their living from agriculture, they would have sharp pencils and know the real effect of the safety net as proposed in this Bill and how important it is to keep that safety net at 3 per cent. It would be a protection, even with the current Crow rate, at a time when prices are falling. It would provide a protective blanket. With the 3 per cent safety net which I have proposed, when the price of grain falls a little more, as has been the case in the last few months, the actual Crow rate would be forced down.

Since this matter has been raised six or seven times by Hon. Members of the Conservative Party, I think it is time the true facts on the safety net were presented. I hope it is debated from here on in on the basis of the actual facts instead of illogical falsehoods.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak a few minutes to motion No. 58 and explain briefly that the purpose of the motion is, in fact, to insert Section 262 of the Railway Act in Bill C-155. During the proceedings in Committee, it was generally understood, except by the Progressive Conservatives, that it was useless to add Section 262 because it was already referred to in the Bill.

For the sake of comprehension, I would like to refer to the comments of Mr. Lefebvre who assisted us during proceedings in Committee, and perhaps I may read a few lines of what this expert told us at the time, and I quote:

MR. D. LEFEBVRE: Mr. Chairman, for the record I would like to say that as Bill C-155 now stands, in my view it is clear that Section 262 applies. However, I might add that to repeat in a statute something that is already there, even if you repeat it at length, does not make it any stronger or any clearer.

When the railways came because they alleged that the compensation Bill C-155 afforded them was barely enough, it was contended that it might be some sort of an excuse for the CTC not to enforce Section 262. The amendment that has been circulated, I believe, makes it clear that is no excuse and the compensation provided by Bill C-255 is adequate.

The amendment: Again from the point of view of drafting legislation, one objection I would have is that it repeats a good part of the law. In large measure I think we should try to co-ordinate statutes and when something is said and we want to deviate to reinforce it, I think we should concentrate on it rather than repeat extensive provisions of the law that already exist.

Mr. Speaker, what the Progressive Conservative Party is trying to do with this motion, and I say it again, is to simply include a provision that already exists in other legislation, in other words, it is repeating it. Far be it from me to give you a lesson in law, but I remember when we were studying the principles of interpreting laws, Justice Pigeon, of the Supreme Court, told us that whatever is in the law is there for a purpose. Therefore, a single reference to a section of the Railway Act would be adequate, in the circumstances. I think that wasting time in Committee and wasting time today in the House on such an elementary principle is ample proof that the Progressive Conservative Party still wants to obstruct the proceedings of the House and still wants to waste the time of the House when it is considering a measure as important to Canadians as Bill C-155 concerning changes in the Crow rate. These past few weeks, we have witnessed the Progressive Conservative Party taking various positions which amount to a filibuster of a piece of legislation which would serve all Canadians. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Flis) alluded to that a few minutes ago, and all we can say is that the position of the Progressive Conservatives has been shifting all along.

When we went to Western Canada . . . I am talking about the current position of the Progressive Conservatives with respect to the whole Bill, but more particularly to Motion No. 58 generally. The Conservative Members are now advocating the status quo. I would refer them to some of the statements made in Vancouver by Mayors Colgur, Lester and Harcourt who appeared before the Committee. If I may, I would like to quote the words of Mayor Colgur, among others:

Mr. Chairman, our greatest fear is that nothing will happen, that we will fight and that the committee will fight to maintain the status quo. We are concerned that that could be devastating to the Province of British Columbia.

We are mindful of the problems—

And further:

But, Mr. Chairman, if the committee chooses to do nothing, we believe that will be devastating to all Canadians. Certainly we have our own constituents who we have to represent and we are mindful of doing that, but if we have to advise our constituents that after having gone through this process nothing has happened, I believe that all of Canada will be the worse for that.

I draw the attention of the House to the fact that those statements were made by witnesses who appeared before us in Vancouver, not by a Government Member. Mayor Lester also said, and I refer to the proceedings of the Committee on Transport, page 117:179:

We have not got excellent relations with the CNR, still I think that the state of the railway is of real concern to us, and we can see very clearly that the maintenance of the Crow rate has damaged the railway and distorted the transportation system. And, of course, if that were to be changed, then the situation would be reversed.

That was another statement made by one of the mayors of the Vancouver region.

Here is another statement by Mayor Colgur, of the Vancouver region in British Columbia, which I would like to quote:

I think I can speak generally on that point, Mr. Chairman. What the member is suggesting is tantamount to doing nothing . . .

He was then referring to a statement made by a member of the New Democratic Party whose riding I forget. However, my colleague did say earlier that those mayors were supposed to be Social Democrats, therefore against the Progressive Conservatives. Now, this was in answer to a question asked by a Member of the New Democratic Party:

I think I can speak generally on that point, Mr. Chairman. What the member is suggesting is tantamount to doing nothing, and that is our concern, that no decision is the worst possible decision. That to me—and I believe I am speaking for the other mayors—is tantamount to another elongated delaying tactic, which

will really result in our having nothing in Canada other than what we have had for the last 85 years, which is basically now long out of date. I suppose another way of looking at it, Mr. Chairman, is: it is tantamount to trying to update the dinosaur, which is now extinct.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not the one who mentioned the dinosaur, it was a mayor of British Columbia. Anyway, the current position or policy of the Progressive Conservatives might be described as a standpat policy, and that policy has gained the full support of the Members of the New Democratic Party. That is rather strange because, on July 11, 1983, I received a letter from the new Leader of the Opposition addressed to me personally: Mr. Gaston Gourde, M.P., Confederation Building. Here is part of that letter:

With respect to your remarks in the House of Commons concerning the Crow rate—

I had taken the floor one day to find out whether the new Leader of the Opposition might for once indicate to us the position of his party on a topical issue. We all know that in many other fields the Leader of the Official Opposition has decided to remain silent in the belief that, if he did not say anything, he would not put his foot in his mouth. In any event, we had asked him to state his position, and he did just that.

I continue the quotation:

I must advise you that I stand squarely behind the Progressive—

—the word "Progressive" is there all right.

—Conservative Members who have stated the policy of our Party. As you undoubtedly know, the Hon.—

—I have to read the name—

—Don Mazankowski made an important speech in the House on May 12, in which he set forth our position in detail.

● (1210)

[*English*]

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I notice that the Hon. Member is reading from some document. I wonder if he might table it when he has finished his speech.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gourde: Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to table an excerpt from my latest householder to all the residents of my riding, and I hope the Canadian people will make good use of it. And it will probably—

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Bloomfield): Order. I have to tell the Hon. Member that his time has expired.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gourde: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would seek unanimous consent to continue my remarks for a few minutes—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. That is up to the House to decide.

[*English*]

Order. Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to continue?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Doug Neil (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde) expressing the reasons why this Bill should pass. He quoted extensively from evidence that was given at committee by various mayors and others who were present for the passage of the Bill. I can understand the concern of these witnesses. However, what the Government has overlooked and what many of these witnesses have overlooked is the effect that Bill C-155 has on the producer, because the producer in western Canada is the one most affected by the change. I suppose the attitude of the Government is based on the fact that it does not have within its caucus any producers from the Wheat Board area.

I was surprised that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Flis) should make a comment regarding the fact that a number of Members on this side of the House were in conflict of interest because they held permit books. I was happy, however, that he did withdraw those comments subsequently. It is an indication of the attitude of this Government which is not concerned and never has been concerned about the farmers of western Canada.

I can put the New Democratic Party in the same category. The Members on the Government side say that what I am speaking about is a lot of nonsense. The Members on the Government side have looked after the railways very handsomely as far as dollars and cents are concerned, but what they are attempting to do as far as the producer is concerned is to bankrupt him. The Government wants to increase the rates so it will be prohibitive for the producer to raise grain in western Canada. The barley producer and oats producer will be out of business because, on the basis of this Bill, it will take half the selling price of those two grains to pay the freight. Therefore, the producers cannot survive.

I was saying that the NDP are in somewhat the same position. They have been rather embarrassed by the motion they put which will have a safety net of 3 per cent and which in effect would immediately, on passage of this Bill, increase the freight rate to the farmer. In the short time allotted to me, I would like to discuss the particular amendment we are dealing with at the moment.

This amendment substitutes the proposed section for Section 262 of the Railway Act. The question might arise as to why we want to put in this section and not leave Section 262 of the Railway Act in place. A few minutes ago the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) said that Section 262 of the Railway Act had been ineffective. What we are attempting to do in our Motion No. 58 is to bring in a section which is similar to 262 but which deals specifically with the transportation of grain. In addition, and I will speak to this in

a few moments, there is added strength in the section that we are seeking to amend.

The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) appeared at the committee hearings in Vancouver for about one hour and then disappeared. I wish to quote what he said about Motion No. 58. I quote from page 28605 of *Hansard* for October 31, 1983:

> This amendment is a piece of fluff. That is what it is. It is a piece of fluff . . . It is all fluff and no substance.

The Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre says that Section 262 has not been effective. Under these circumstances, it would seem that the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre and the other Members of his Party would be supporting an amendment which would be effective in ensuring the carriage and transportation of grain by the railways.

Motion No. 58 tightens up what used to be Section 262. It is interesting to refer to the Transport Committee minutes. I refer to issue No. 132, page 91 Mr. Thompson, counsel for the committee, was asked about this amendment and about Section 262. I quote from page 91 of the proceedings of the Transport Committee:

> When the railway officials were here they indicated basically that the revenues they were going to get under the provisions of Bill C-155 were adequate, but one got the impression that they were saying that they were sort of minimally adequate or barely adequate. Now, in the event they would attempt to accord less beneficial treatment to grain traffic, subclause (8) is available for the commission to take a look at.

Subclause (8) is part of Motion No. 58, but time will not permit me to read it.

• (1220)

There is one other aspect that Mr. Thompson spoke about when he was giving evidence, and he refers to subsection 10(a) of Motion No. 58 which has to do with the Administrator being allowed, on behalf of any grain shipper or group of grain shippers, to take proceedings before the commission. This is what Mr. Thompson says:

> The basic purpose of Subclause (10) is to provide a means by which a senior government officer may, on behalf of the grain shipper or shippers, lead the way towards the recovery of some sort of remedy for a shipper or a group of shippers. If anyone is in doubt about the cost of litigation, I can assure them that litigation is extremely expensive and it is a very difficult burden for any small operator to bear. If the administrator were to bear this responsibility, it would be a very small matter in terms of the expenditures of the government, but it might be a very significant matter to assist the shippers.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time is almost up but I would like to say in closing that I am very disappointed in the Minister. First of all he brought in closure and then, when we on this side extended the debate and were debating Motion No. 58, he stood up and said this particular amendment was interesting and he might be able to accept it, but because it was the middle of the night he could not contact legal counsel in his Department to discuss it. But he said he would like to look at it. Having said that, he then adjourned the debate.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister stands up and takes part in debate on this motion it would end the debate as far as this particular motion is concerned. It would seem to me that the Minister could, on a point of order, stand up without closing debate and tell this House what consultations he had with his legal counsel and what decision he has taken with respect to this particular motion.

Amendment No. 58 strengthens the power with respect to the railways so that they may be held to the rules when delivering grain. I invite the Minister to stand up on a point of order, or alternatively I am sure that the Members of this House would give him unanimous consent, to tell us what his decision is with respect to Amendment No. 58.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Dubois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take part in the debate on Bill C-155 and more specifically on Motion No. 58 before the House today.

I must say I find the Motion situation—we have now had over 80 motions—rather surprising after sitting on the Transport Committee and conducting hearings across the country, and subsequently considering the Bill, clause by clause, in late August and all through September—and seeing a situation where motions were submitted to the Committee by the Official Opposition to reduce the number of members on the administrating Committee and today, another motion is being proposed to have the same number we had in the Bill originally. As for Motion No. 58, when questions were asked during clause by clause consideration in committee, the legal expert said at the time that this provision already existed in the Railway Act.

I am rather surprised at the whole situation, because to me, Mr. Speaker, this is just filibustering, and has definitely no connection with the aspirations of Canadians, not even those of Western Canada. I heard the previous speaker saying that no one on this side of the House understood the producers, and I would like to remind him that when we were conducting hearings in Regina, his hometown, the chairman of the Prairie Farm Commodity Coalition, when asked whether producers were able to pay more, answered yes, and of course, there were many members of the National Farmers Union in the room at the time in Regina who did not entirely agree. But I think that the Prairie Farm Commodity Coalition is a very farsighted group that sees the future of Western agriculture in a different perspective, and it was, in fact, Mr. McMillan who said at the time that producers were able to pay more.

As for the motion before the House today, namely Motion No. 58 which concerns Clause 33, and considering what we were told by Mr. Lefebvre in his answer to a number of questions, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this motion is merely being added to the number of motions we already have to add to the delay, just like the four positions of the Progressive Conservative Party, and perhaps I may explain. It has become their trademark to put motions like the one before the House today to make people think they are very concerned, when in fact, they are merely trying to play for time or to waste time, because, Mr. Speaker, since I chaired a sub-committee in the

Quebec caucus on this issue. I remember clearly that in March, the Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) said in the House, when the motion was being proposed, that the Liberal Members who had formed the sub-committee should persuade the Government to change the method of payment and that it was intolerable. He even wanted us to resign. At the time, the Member for Joliette was referring to payments to the railways and not to producers. Then all of a sudden we heard their official critic talking about freedom of choice. This option, and even Motion No. 58, are issues we discussed with representatives of the agricultural industry in Quebec, to find out what they thought. Well, the answer we got when we conducted hearings in Quebec was that the concept of freedom of choice was the ultimate in hypocritical posturing, and that was the position defended by the Progressive Conservative Party.

I would like to comment on another position defended by the Progressive Conservative Party and a statement was reported in the newspaper *La Terre de chez nous*, referring to the leadership campaign when the present leader was still just a candidate he said in Alberta that he was going to help producers and if possible direct payments to producers. That was the third position taken by the Progressive Conservative Party. And finally, they managed to come up with a fourth position when they talked about maintaining the status quo, and this is because Official Opposition does not know where it is going and is really ambivalent about the issue, because when we were in the Vancouver area and people came to our hearings, they said: to do nothing would be the worst that could happen. Something must be done about the very substantial investments expected in the Vancouver area. Local Members who were there—some were not—and even some Members of the New Democratic Party came to our hearings, and that is where they heard from the local mayors. Some of them were more or less told off and even Members of the Official Opposition were told that the worst that could happen in connection with the Bill and investments to be made in the Vancouver area by CN and CP, if the Bill was not passed, doing nothing would be the worst that could happen. So I feel that as the Government we must make a choice, and consider what is important for breeders and producers, and in this connection, we must not forget that under Clause 59, we are establishing a committee to review the operation of this legislation and the effectiveness of the method of payment, and to examine the implications. We met members of the Prairie Farm Commodity Coalition, and of course they had some apprehension, but this is a solution that is attractive to them and they are in favour of being able to examine the implications and having a committee consisting of at least three and not more than five members and reporting before March 1985, to inform the Department about what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that in view of the situation and the large scale investments expected both in Western and Eastern Canada, including the manufacturing of hopper cars and railroad tracks, and prospective investments in the Vancouver terminal area, to create jobs in an area which, as the House knows, is suffering from some disruption at the present time, that is why a group of mayors came to give us their point of view.

I believe that we must not stop this process and that we must therefore see to it that the bill is passed. Unfortunately, because of the obstructive methods used by the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party, we have been forced to set a limit on the number of days for the debate. Normally, Mr. Speaker, the Committee was to report to the House on September 12. However, there were many discussions in committee and the Opposition members said: "We may not be able to do it by September 12; we shall perhaps need a few more days." We trusted them and granted a few more days to discuss this bill. However, it was a futile exercise because, when we were able to report to the House, there was still more obstruction in spite of the fact that during the committee hearings, we had heard all possible viewpoints about this bill and absolutely everyone was heard.

I even recall one day in Regina when our hearings began at 9 o'clock. We did not stop for lunch or dinner. We heard all the groups and even individual witnesses until 10:30 or 11 that evening. Committee members on both sides organized a rotation. We heard all the witnesses. It has been said that producers cannot pay more, but some of them at least tell us that they can. What they fear is the effect on livestock producers and the possibility of these producers being hurt by this bill.

As for the livestock producers, they are the ones who asked the government to change not this bill, but this situation because of the problems involved. They are asking however that the payment be made to producers on the basis of acreage.

There had been the Gilson report. Then, there was the 50/50 formula and another proposal for a middle-of-the-road solution. This is why now with this bill, Mr. Speaker, we must make the payment to the railways because it is a transportation problem, and afterwards look at the effects of this change in committee.

It is not what the Progressive Conservatives and the NDP want. So far the Progressive Conservatives have had four positions. They are all mixed up because they have to say something in Quebec and something else in Western Canada, so that they will not lose any votes. That is in fact their position. As for the New Democratic Party, their position is to do absolutely nothing, to maintain the status quo, in spite of everything that the progressive groups in Western Canada want.

We should therefore pass this bill and implement it. Then, when the Committee submits its report in 1985, people in Western and Eastern Canada will know what are its final consequences, and if it is necessary to make adjustments to improve the situation, the Government can make them, but

without following the example of the Progressive Conservative Party and taking four positions, particularly a special position in Quebec because they need votes in that province. They have to get some votes in Quebec, but they are simply being hypocritical when they talk about freedom of choice in Quebec. Then, as concerns the issue of payment to the producers, they say: It is a transportation problem. That is the position of the Progressive Conservative Party, to try to win votes by being on both sides of the issue without ever saying anything, like their new Leader.

Mr. Speaker, this is why their attitude should be condemned. The bill must be passed without delay to ensure that the producers will know what is really going on.

• (1230)

[*English*]

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak following a most despicable performance.

Mr. Rossi: You don't know where you stand, just like your Leader.

Mr. Malone: I know where I stand. I stand in this House of Commons as a Member of a Party with regional relevance. We have just listened to a speech from a member of the St. Lawrence Seaway party, a little party that just sits along the Seaway. It is a part of no other part of Canada. It has nothing to do with the north or the west and hardly anything to do with the Atlantic region.

Mr. Rossi: You are just like your Leader.

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, let me bring to your attention some of the things that just came spilling out of the mouth of the Hon. Member for Lotbinière (Mr. Dubois). He said that the progressive groups in western Canada know that we must have this change. I am going to issue a challenge to him and I will eat a little crow if he can meet it. I want him to name one group that favours the Crow rate. There is not one prairie Government, one agricultural group in western Canada that favours the present legislation on Crow rates.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Malone: There is not one. I stand here as a Member of Parliament from western Canada. The Hon. Member opposite says that we are holding up the House because the progressive groups in western Canada want this Bill. That is a complete fabrication of the facts and I dare the Hon. Member to establish what group that is. It is not the farmers' union; it is not the Wheat Pools; it is not Pioneer grain; it is not Cargill grain; it is not the Alberta cattlemen's association; it is not the western stockgrowers association; it is not the pork producers; it is not the poultry producers; it is not the Alberta Government; it is not the Saskatchewan Government; and it is not the Manitoba Government. He cannot produce any evidence for that false statement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dubois: Mr. Speaker, I would ask my hon. colleague whether he attended the hearings in Regina when the President of the Prairie Farm Commodity Coalition indicated to the Committee that he was in agreement with the producers paying more. I would like him to tell us whether he was there.

[*English*]

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I want to take up the challenge that has just been issued to me. The question was whether I attended the Regina hearings. I attended nine hearings but I did not attend the one in Regina.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Malone: I wrote down what the Hon. Member said and that was that they sat in Regina from 9 a.m. to 10 p.m. without stopping for a meal. What he did not say was that there was virtual unanimity throughout that Regina hearing on one point: every person there spoke with emotion and compassion and said this Bill is wrong.

Mr. Dubois: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Taylor: Sit down. You were heard.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I have to remind the Hon. Member that points of order are not acceptable as a mechanism of intervening in debate. I will recognize him but I hope it is on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dubois: Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to tell me whether he read the record of the hearings held in Regina, and whether he can tell us at this stage what was said by the representatives from the Prairie Farm Commodity Coalition?

[*English*]

Mr. Malone: Mr. Speaker, I know what the position of the Prairie Farm Commodity Coalition is. I have met with it many times. I should like the Hon. Member opposite from Lotbinière—

Mr. Blais: Lotbinière.

Mr. Malone: Lotbinière. I stand corrected on the pronunciation. I wonder if he would be so good as to look at something that is relatively recent. A newspaper headline of November 2 reads "Prairie groups withdraw support for federal Crow Bill". Yet the Hon. Member tries to say that all those progressive organizations are giving support. The truth of the matter is that the Hon. Member speaks from a vacuum. His neurons are lonesome. He stood in this House and said that beef producers want change. Let me tell you, Sir, if he can—

Mr. Dubois: Yes they do.

Mr. Malone: —find one beef organization anywhere in this country that is asking for a change, he should name it. He accused the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski)

of sticking fast. I wrote down what he said. He said that they wanted to pay the railways because this is basically a transportation Bill. That is a statement that came from the Hon. Member.

Mr. Dubois: Yes.

Mr. Taylor: It is completely wrong.

Mr. Malone: This is not a transportation Bill. This is an economic development Bill. If the Hon. Member thinks otherwise, I challenge him to go back to the time when the Crow rate was written. What Members of Parliament of the day were talking about then was not just running a train west; it was the economic development of all of western Canada. That is what the Crow rate was about. It was about the economy and the diversity of the country. By taking away the concept of freedom of choice which the Hon. Member chose to attack today, what the Hon. Member does in supporting that position—

Mr. Dubois: What is it?

Mr. Malone: —is to kill the red meat industry in western Canada. He intends to take away 6,000 jobs from the packing plant industry. He intends to hurt the Province of Alberta by some $6 million annually. That is the kind of tactic he would choose. It is his position that if you pay the railways, the only way the farmer can get his share of the subsidy is if he exports his grain. That means the poultry, pork and beef industries, and those value added industries, do not have the opportunity to have the usage of feed grains because they are going to be exported out of the Province.

● (1240)

Mr. Dubois: It is for Western—

Mr. Malone: Why not sit here and listen, Sir? You do not come from the Crow region. It would pay you well just to listen.

Today is the first day we have seen Liberal backbenchers speaking on this Bill. It is the last day of closure, Mr. Speaker, and they stand to speak. How I would love to use an unparliamentary word to express what I think of that. Here we are in the last few hours on the Bill and they fill up the time with Liberal backbenchers. Where were they before, when this Bill should have had its examination, when we should have had full debate in this House? They rise today and suggest that, because they are backbenchers and it is the last day, they have an equal right to time. I defy that kind of—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dubois: Mr. Speaker, concerning the reference to where Hon. Members were, I would like to tell my colleague opposite that when all the hearings started in June, July, August and September, there were on the Committee eight Liberal Members who sat through all of the hearings, but not the way the Hon. Member from Alberta did!

[*English*]

Mr. Mazankowski: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There may have been eight Liberals, but they sat in silence most of the time.

Mr. Dubois: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Hon. Member for Lotbinière (Mr. Dubois) rises on a point of order, I must of course hear him.

[*English*]

However, I am concerned that he is using points of order which are in fact points of debate.

Mr. Evans: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that you consider Citation 306 in Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. I will quote it for you:

> A Member who, during a debate, has spoken to a question may again be heard to offer explanation of some material part of his speech which has been misunderstood; but he must not introduce new matter or endeavour to strengthen, by new arguments, his former position which he alleges to have been misunderstood, or to reply to other Members. Here again, a greater latitude is permitted in cases of personal explanation, where a Member's character or conduct has been impugned in debate. The proper time for explanation is at the conclusion of the speech which calls for it, but it is a common practice for the Member desiring to explain, to rise immediately the statement is made to which his explanation is directed. If the Member in possession of the House gives way and resumes his seat, the explanation is at once received; but the explanation cannot then be offered if the Member speaking declines to give way.

I am not sure that an Hon. Member can rise on a point of order to make such a explanation. However, certainly an intervention by an Hon. Member who has previously spoken, who has been misunderstood and who has been misquoted or whose character is being impugned, has the right of reply in this House. He has the right to rise and make that statement.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): We will continue with the same point of order. The Hon. Member for Bow River on the same point of order.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Speaker, not one of the items mentioned by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre has been the case. He is simply getting up and introducing new debate.

An Hon. Member: He was misunderstood.

Mr. Taylor: He was not misunderstood.

Mr. Rossi: There is a Speaker here. Sit down.

Mr. Taylor: He is just getting up to talk.

Mr. Rossi: Who are you to judge that? Sit down.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tessier: Mr. Speaker, I would simply remind the Hon. Member from Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), who suggested that we were there but remained silent, that we said in a few seconds what he relishes in repeating for hours on end.

[*English*]

Mr. Keeper: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is bad enough that the Government is using closure to silence opposition to the Crow rate. Now those Hon. Members are abusing the rules of the House and using points of order to stop the opposition—

Mr. Blais: Now who is the pot who is calling the kettle black?

Mr. Keeper: —from bringing forth valid points on this legislation.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, Hon. Members opposite cannot have it both ways. One day we are being criticized because we are not taking part in debate to allow them more time. Today we are being criticized because we are taking too much time, too active a part in the debate. The opposition cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Keeper: You just conceded the point of order.

Mr. Malépart: Mr. Speaker, all the difficulties come from the fact that the Hon. Member is completely irrelevant. That is why we are standing up, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Crowfoot.

Mr. Malone: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For a moment I thought you had forgotten I was here.

An Hon. Member: We prefer to do that.

Mr. Malone: We really did want to debate this Bill. We were here ready to do it and certainly would have liked to do so. However, the Minister chose to close the House up and said we could not continue the debate because he wanted to get some legal advice on this piece of writing known as the Crow rate. However, one of the Hon. Members opposite says that farmers should not be writing the Crow rate Bill nor speaking on it because it would be a conflict of interest. I suspect that probably what he is suggesting is that those people in the House who are doctors should not have anything to do with medical Bills because of a conflict of interest. Lawyers should never read any of the writing which is in *Hansard* because a lot of that is in legal form. Therefore, anyone who knows anything about anything should never do anything—which sounds to me very much like the kind of Government we have, Sir; those who know the least do that which they know the least about. I find that has certainly been the tradition with the Liberal Party in Canada. I suspect it will probably continue to act that way until there is no one left in that Party.

There is something else I would like to note. One of the Parliamentary Secretaries suggested that I was impugning the character of an Hon. Member. I tell you, Sir, that he is expert in doing that for himself. I do not need to impugn his character. When he comes forward and gives these kinds of speeches, making statements about the great acceptability of Crow rates in western Canada, then claims he was there in Regina, by golly, I dare him to make that statement and then read the record of the situation in Regina. It is too bad we do not have a videotape so he could see the anguish on those people's faces.

The truth of the matter is that there is pain and hurt in western Canada, caused by a group of people called the "St. Lawrence River Party", a little party in the middle of the country without regional relevance which is impacting upon the great economy of western Canada. They claim that freedom of choice as part of the legislation is something which cannot even be considered, and by that move they have ruined the meat industry in western Canada because feed grains will be exported. I see an Hon. Member shaking his head. I hear him shaking his head from over here, Sir.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Malone: An Hon. Member whose constituency is five or six provinces away from the west shakes his head. That defies logic. The truth of the matter is that if you pay a subsidy and the only way you can get the subsidy is by putting the grain on the train, if you attract the farmer that way, he is going to export. How are they going to feed their cattle if the federal Government dangles a $651 million carrot to make the farmer export his grain? How do you look after the feedlots, the poultry barns and the like, when the source of your feed stock is now being exported out of the province? Farmers know that and they are worried.

Today we get a lecture in the last dying hours from Hon. Members in the back row opposite who never chose to speak before today. There are some exceptions, but certainly that Party did not speak en masse like it is today. I have to ask, where is the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael), the only other Member of Parliament from the west other than the Minister? Oh, my gosh, he is here! I am looking forward to a western Liberal speech from him.

This Crow rate does impact on all of Canada, because it is only when there is an enrichment in their economy that western producers have the wherewithal to buy the refrigerators, cars and farm machinery which are made in central Canada. There is an interdependence in this country. We ought not to lose sight of the fact that we are a country, a nation, that we are bound together and that all parts are better off when one part is better off. This is not a fight between east and west and it should not be viewed that way. There is an enormous potential for growth.

• (1250)

I say to my Quebec friends on the other side—

Mr. Tessier: You have friends in Quebec?

Mr. Malone: —those of you who thought that enrichment of the western red meat industry was a threat are dead wrong. We can extend our markets into California, which are not your markets. You can have your markets in central Canada and the northeast United States.

There is an opportunity here for changes to the transport policy which would contribute to the economic development of our country where we would all be better off. This debate has been a farce. It has meant a delay because the fundamental issues could not be heard. But whatever the tactics were to try and get the deadwood heads to listen, there was a tremendous number of great amendments which would have made a bad Bill acceptable all across the country and they are not going to be heard. It is an unfortunate sham. Long after the vote is taken on this issue there will still be anguish in the major part of this country because the St. Lawrence River party decided to impose its might against those with legitimate rights to have their views heard in a major debate in the House of Commons of Canada.

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I was happy to see the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) acknowledge there would be anguish for a long time around this House. I hope it is an offer of a solid seat in The Battlefords-Meadow Lake for one Anguish.

Just leading into the remarks I would like to make on Motion No. 58 to Bill C-155, Mr. Speaker, I am a little concerned when Members opposite do not want to listen to the Opposition Parties, whether it be the NDP or the Progressive Conservatives. The great philosopher Voltaire once said that one of the very basics in democracy is: I may disagree profusely with what you have to say but I will defend to the death your right to say it. Honesty, openness and a willingness to listen makes for much better government for the people of Canada rather than always having the Government Party disagree with Members of the Opposition and not even listen to them.

From the knowledge I have, that has been the way since the beginning of this great country in 1867. Ever since that time there has been a sort of parliamentary wedlock between the Conservatives and Liberals. They say one thing in opposition critical of their partner in wedlock on the other side, and then when they are in Government it is a complete switch about. It has always been like that.

The New Democratic Party is the only Party which has consistently maintained we should have the statutory Crow rate unaltered for the protection of the western Canadian producer. The Conservatives started at the beginning of this Bill to say the Crow had to go. In fact, when they were the Government they were planning exactly the same piece of legislation which the Liberals are implementing by closure here today through Bill C-155.

Mr. Mazankowski: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the Hon. Member has an obligation to prove to the House what he just said. He said the Conservative Party had exactly the same piece of legislation ready to present to the House to dismantle the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. I ask that he substantiate that statement or else withdraw it.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to do that if the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) would table in this House all the documents he was privy to while he was Minister of Transport.

Mr. Evans: The onus is on you.

Mr. Anguish: If we can examine those documents, I will be more than happy to point out the accuracy of the allegation I have made. But until that happens I will go on—

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the Hon. Member has no evidence to substantiate the statement he made.

Mr. Manly: You have the evidence, you table it.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, the plan the Liberals are implementing now, which would have been put in by the Conservatives, would have cost the producers in my riding dearly. For example, the Meadow Lake delivery point—

Mr. Mazankowski: I hate to dwell on this point, Mr. Speaker, but I think the Member has an obligation either to put up or shut up. If he cannot prove his statement, then he should withdraw it.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I think the Conservative Party has an obligation to make clear to this House and the Canadian people that they mean that this Crow legislation must be stopped. They have talked only of postponing it.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, under the plan I was talking about put forward by these partners in parliamentary wedlock, it will cost the farmers who deliver to the Meadow Lake delivery point—

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I respect the Hon. Member and I hope he respects the traditions of this House. I think it is most unfair for a Member to make a statement which has absolutely no foundation whatsoever. Unless this hon. gentleman can substantiate what he has stated, namely that we as a Government and I as Minister of Transport had legislation exactly the same as this legislation ready to be introduced, which is absolutely false, I ask the Hon. Member either to produce the evidence or withdraw the statement.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The difficulty is that the Chair is not in a position to rule on whether or not debate, or some part of it, is either true or false, accurate or inaccurate, or whatever. That is not the function of the Chair. The Hon. Member for Vegreville had a grievance and I think he has certainly made clear his difference of opinion and his grievance. At this point in a procedural sense I simply have to leave it to the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake to proceed as he wishes.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, what I have said has more foundation than what the Conservative—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tessier: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Mégantic-Compton-Stanstead on a point of order.

Mr. Tessier: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order as my colleague for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), maybe the Progressive Conservative Party did not have any legislation ready, but originally they had the same thing in mind as this Government, but they want to see this Government incur all the odium of such a legislation. They are not ready to face up to their responsibilities.

[*English*]

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, the assertion I made certainly has as much a foundation, and likely more, than that of the Members of the Conservative Party who stand in this House and say the NDP is tryingto break the Crowsnest Pass Agreement.

Mr. Neil: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member alleges that what the NDP is doing in its safety net amendment is not breaking the Crow, I would like him to explain why their proposed amendment would have had the effect of immediately increasing the cost to the farmer of moving grain by 20 per cent. How does he explain that?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I have asked Hon. Members to attempt, if they can, to avoid using points of order to intervene in the debate of another Hon. Member. I leave it entirely in the hands of the Hon. Member for The Battlesfords-Meadow Lake, but in view of the interventions, perhaps he would like me to call it one o'clock. Would that be convenient for him?

● (1300)

Mr. Anguish: Not at the moment, Mr. Speaker. In regard to the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Neil), he was either not listening or not present in the House of Commons, because this morning the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse) in his intervention explained exactly what was happening. I do not have the table here before me.

I would like to go on with my comments on Motion No. 58, Mr. Speaker, which is designed to protect the producers by guaranteeing them service from the rail companies relating to movement of grain from western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I see you are rising. Shall I call it one o'clock and resume my remarks when debate begins after the Question Period?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I nodded my head in agreement, which is to say that I shook my head, something that I do not ever want to do again after hearing the comment made by the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone).

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1.02 p.m. the House took recess.

S.O. 21

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

INCOME TAX

CANCELLATION OF NORTHERN BENEFITS

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, the Government proposes to cancel the special tax advantages available to people working and living in the North despite the protests of every group with any understanding of development in that area, including some parts of the Government itself.

The cancellation of these northern benefits will bring in only a small amount of additional revenue to the Finance Department and have a disastrous effect on industries such as mining. It will do nothing to assist northerners whose disposable income is dramatically reduced by high costs of living. Instead, it will simply add employees of large companies and Governments to the list of people suffering these disadvantages.

We on this side of the House can find only one explanation for the decision, and that is that the Government intends to replace a stimulant available to all, with a grant system available only to those it selects. This has been the pattern of economic assistance over the last several years, and it is one with grave consequences. Industry spokesmen have pointed out that the grant system rewards industries whose imminent failure means political problems for the Government. They have said the grant system is "addictive", and that it forces bureaucrats to make decisions about the validity of industrial efforts with which they may not be familiar.

It is time the effort was made to provide stimulative tax measures for everyone, so that personal and industrial initiative can take advantage of opportunities instead of turning to the Government and asking for a special grant or loan.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

LEBANON—SYRIAN ATTACK ON PALESTINE LIBERATION ORGANIZATION CAMP

Mr. Roland de Corneille (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, at this very hour the Syrian backed faction of the PLO is attacking the camp of the PLO loyal to Arafat in the city of Tripoli, in northern Lebanon. The Syrians in the surrounding hills are pouring artillery shells on the camp, and we have learned that already many civilians in that camp have been killed and wounded. Arafat is pleading with world leaders to save the people from a Syrian backed massacre.

S.O. 21

Is it not ironic, Mr. Speaker, that it is only a matter of days since our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) was in Syria, and was assured by Syrian leaders, according to the Minister's own words, that Syria would like to see a sovereign and independent Lebanon, that Syria would like to see the process of reconciliation there take place, and that it would be unwise to disregard the role which Syria occupies in pursuing the path to peace?

In the light of the slaughter taking place in Tripoli at this very time, Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that, although PLO factions have for years been terrorizing innocent Israeli and Lebanese civilians, massacring innocent Jews throughout the world, and now are terrorizing one another, Canada is in contact with the PLO and is even musing aloud on upgrading the level of that contact.

At the very time when the PLO is increasingly discredited, in disarray, and treated with disdain by more and more Arab nations, I oppose that Canada should be giving any appearance of shoring up the sagging fortunes of these terrorists. Instead, perhaps our Government should review its policy on the PLO and, based on its recent contacts with Syria, should on humanitarian grounds call on Syria to stop immediately the slaughter it is perpetrating in Tripoli.

* * *

TRADE

RESTRICTIONS ON TRANSPORTATION OF HAY TO UNITED STATES

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to a situation which is causing concern to a number of Canadians, many of whom reside in my constituency of Fraser Valley East and other areas on the Province of British Columbia. I am speaking of the problem of reciprocity in the treatment of truck drivers between Canada and the United States.

The situation has been ongoing for a number of years, but on June 1, 1983, the Canadian hay dealers were notified that they no longer would be allowed to take unloading crews into the United States. While the order in itself does not constitute a serious limitation to hay movement if the situation is handled the same on both sides of the border, the enforcement has been much more prohibitive in the United States than in Canada. United States drivers continue to assist in the unloading of hay imported into Canada from the U.S.A. by United States dealers.

As there are some 4,000 instances of hay importation from the United States to Canada, and as U.S. alfalfa hay will remain in demand for our high producing dairy herds in British Columbia for many years to come, we urge that customs officials take measures to ensure that equal treatment is accorded to Canadian hay dealers to permit them to compete in their own marketplace.

As well, there is concern that loads of hay are not moving directly from the U.S. to the farms which have bought the hay. In some cases U.S. hay dealers have set up a sales location to use as a base from which to sell hay. Such action constitutes further unfair competition with Canadian hay dealers.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INCOME TAX

ARTS AND CULTURE—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Robert Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity today to congratulate the former Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), who has finally discovered the sad predicament the artists are in two years after I introduced in the House a motion to amend the Income Tax Act in order to alleviate the financial problems threatening the very survival of those who are part of our Canadian culture. The party opposite has discovered overnight the difficulties experienced by Canadian artists, but I merely want to remind the House that the government Members had already done their job. Unfortunately, copyright does not seem to mean much to the former Leader of the Opposition and former Prime Minister.

* * *

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

SAFEGUARDING OF TOBIQUE BAND FUNDS

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the Tobique Indian band in New Brunswick held a duly called election on September 19, but because of a narrow interpretation of the Indian Act, Department of Indian Affairs officials will not allow the new chief and council to take office until November 29, ten weeks after the election.

The new chief and councillors fear that in the interim the outgoing chief will spend the meagre funds the band has to operate with for the rest of the fiscal year. In spite of these fears, the Minister and his officials have refused a request from the new chief to freeze funds until the new council takes office.

Indian Affairs will act to enforce the fine points of the Indian Act no matter how ridiculous, but the Department will not accede to a request from an elected chief to safeguard band funds. Small wonder that the Tobique band members have occupied the council office to try to get attention for their problems.

The Tobique band is one more reason why the Indian Act must go, and one more reason why the Department of Indian Affairs must go, and why Indian people must have the right to conduct their own business without interference by federal or provincial bureaucrats.

[*Translation*]

RAILWAYS

SPEEDY ADOPTION OF BILL C-155 URGED—POSITION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA RAILWAY COMPANY

Mr. Jean-Guy Dubois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the House that some time ago I received a telegram from the company operating the railways in British Columbia praising the Transport Committee for accepting to deal with an amendment to Bill C-155 concerning the British Columbia Railways. What I found both surprising and extraordinary was that after commending us for accepting the company's position, the telegram urged us to rush through this legislation which it said was of paramount importance for British Columbia generally and the Vancouver area in particular. As this is the second day of debate at the report stage and the Third Reading will be tomorrow, I warn the Official Opposition and the other party that we must hold the votes quickly today and proceed to Third Reading tomorrow to meet the expectations of Canadians. I challenge all Hon. Members from the Vancouver area to stand in the House and voice their opposition to my own position and that of the British Columbia railway company, and more especially that of the people in the Vancouver area who want to see this bill adopted so that the infrastructure may be strengthened, investments encouraged and job creation increased in their area. I hope that we will complete the study of this bill very quickly.

* * *

• (1410)

[*English*]

UNITED NATIONS

INVASION OF GRENADA—CANADIAN ABSTENTION ON NICARAGUAN RESOLUTION

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, within hours of a rescue operation being launched in response to a request for aid from the island of Grenada, the Liberal Government condemned the rescue move. Yet, last evening a vote took place in the General Assembly of the United Nations on a Nicaraguan resolution condemning the rescue operation. Our Government did not vote for the resolution, nor did it vote against it, as did such Caribbean countries as the Barbados, Dominica, Jamaica, St. Lucia, and as did Israel, and the United States. Our Government boldly abstained.

Does this mean the Government has changed its mind? Does it now realize that it was too rash in initially condemning the intervention? What is the Government's position as of this moment? Surely this once again demonstrates the need for the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence to review the Government's handling of the entire

S.O. 21

Grenadian affair, to review what forewarning the Government had as to what was happening on that island—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

INCOME TAX

REQUIREMENT THAT SENIOR CITIZENS PAY TAX IN QUARTERLY INSTALMENTS

Mr. Jack Burghardt (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, senior citizens are a most important, yet often forgotten, segment of Canadian society. During retirement years an individual's income in the majority of cases will drop dramatically, and many financial adjustments are made necessary. Also, many seniors will discover that for the first time in their lives it has become necessary to pay their income tax by quarterly instalment. This longstanding provision of the Income Tax Act was originally designed to help individuals avoid interest penalties. However, through lack of understanding of the income tax provisions, and because of errors in the calculation of yearly income, many senior citizens are still faced with instalment interest penalties at year end.

While the Department of National Revenue has made an effort to improve the notification process for individuals who are required to pay their income tax by instalments, there is a need for further review and clarification of this provision as it affects senior citizens. It is my hope that the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Bussières) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), in reviewing any changes to the Income Tax Act, will give the concerns of Canada's seniors their utmost consideration.

* * *

MULTICULTURALISM

CALL FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SEPARATE MINISTRY

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, people from many lands have come to Canada's shores and contributed to the rich cultural and linguistic mosaic which is Canadian society today. Canada is now a multicultural, multiracial, and multireligious country. It is a heritage which makes us the envy of the world.

Those who sought the freedom and opportunity offered by our country must be encouraged to participate fully in Canadian public affairs. We must recognize the diversity of culture, race, language, religion, and heritage, which forms the basis of our society and undertake a determined initiative to ensure equality of access for all Canadians.

In order to facilitate this process I urge the Government to strengthen the structure of the present multiculturalism directorate by creating a separate multiculturalism ministry with its own independent budget and minister. This ministry should be

a vibrant centre, and given responsibility for ensuring that every government Department, Crown corporation, board and committee truly understands and responds to the multicultural reality of Canada.

At present there is no central source of information for the collected experience and knowledge relating to multiculturalism. In addition to its monitoring duties, the new ministry should assume a role as a national multicultural information bank in order to facilitate greater understanding of minorities which have yet to be included in the mainstream of Canada's social, political, and economic life.

* * *

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

OBJECTION TO DESIGNATION OF FRASER INSTITUTE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, events in British Columbia have reached a crisis as provincial public sector employees have been forced to strike by the intransigence of the Conservative-Social Credit Government which is misguided by right-wing ideology. We have been reminded frequently of the influence held by the right-wing Vancouver think tank, the Fraser Institute, in providing policy direction to the Socreds before, during, and after the 1983 provincial election.

The Fraser Institute has held charitable tax status with Revenue Canada since October, 1974, when it reportedly was financed by Conservative business interests who were more concerned with the overthrow of the progressive Government of the day led by Dave Barrett than with the generation of new ideas.

Common law has solidly established that if any purpose of a group is to influence Parliament or a legislature to change existing laws, or to enact new laws in accordance with the views of interested bodies, that purpose will not be charitable. This principle is supposed to guide Revenue Canada officials in their granting of charitable status. Many research organizations have been denied such status due to this principle. Revenue Canada in fact published a pamphlet explaining the consequences of a charity having political objectives and carrying on activities which are political in nature.

The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Bussières) must re-examine the policies of his Department regarding charitable status in light of this accepted common law. Either he should grant tax exempt status to research organizations regardless of their political colour, or he should direct his officials to revoke the tax number of the Fraser Institute. It is clear that there is nothing charitable about this right-wing—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

SIZE OF GOVERNMENT'S DEFICIT

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. He has not given the House any hard information on our fiscal situation since April when he brought down his last budget, but he shared some of his musing with *The Globe and Mail* yesterday. Would he tell the House what is the expected deficit of the Government now for this financial year, and whether or not it is still $31.3 billion? If it is not that, what is it? Could he also tell the House whether our expected revenues are up or down, and whether our projected expenditures are up or down? What is our present fiscal position? We have passed seven months of the financial year. What is the position?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, to answer the hon. gentleman very briefly, I would say that some of our revenues are higher and some are lower, some of our expenditures are higher and others are not as high. Generally speaking, I am maintaining my deficit forecast of $31.3 billion, but I shall be reviewing the situation in detail with my officials around the end of December, when figures for the third quarter will be available. I shall then be in a better position to provide a more precise estimate of the deficit for the current year, but I have no reason to make any substantial changes in the forecast I made in my last budget.

[*English*]

Mr. Crosbie: That was very informative. When the Minister is high, he is often at his lowest, or when he is highest he is lowest, and when he is lowest he is highest. In other words, the Minister is saying that he has no information for the House.

UNEMPLOYMENT FORECAST

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. He told *The Globe and Mail* that growth in 1984 would be worse than even he predicted. That would mean higher unemployment than the 11.4 per cent which he predicted in the budget. Could the Minister tell the House what steps the Government will take to counteract this new forecast of increased unemployment? Will he increase real personal income, for example, by eliminating the Canadian ownership charge, or reducing interest rates? What steps will he take to overcome this pessimistic forecast which he gave publicly this morning?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for explaining his own jokes, but I would hope that he would be better at explaining articles in *The Globe and Mail*. What the article in *The Globe and Mail* indicated was not what the Hon. Member said. I indicated that

for this year the growth in Gross National Product would be significantly higher than I had anticipated last April, that inflation would be lower, that unemployment would be lower, that employment would be higher and that, therefore, all the main economic indicators would be more favourable this year than I expected at the time of my budget.

As far as 1984 is concerned, I indicated that the Gross National Product increase might be between 4 per cent and 5 per cent. It may be closer to 5 per cent than to 4 per cent; I am not in a position to forecast that. In the budget last April I indicated 5.2 per cent. Obviously, if we have a significantly high rate of growth this year, this establishes a higher base from which to start. It would be normal, if we keep roughly the same forecasts as I am forced to do at the present time until we review them at the end of the year, that since we would start from a higher base in 1984 that would mean the rate of growth itself would be somewhat lower, but not significantly. I am happy to inform my colleague that unemployment is expected to be lower next year, 1984, than I forecast in my budget of last April.

● (1420)

MINISTER'S STATEMENT ON INFLATION

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, the Minister is saying that what he says he does not mean, and what he means he does not say. I quoted to him from what he said, according to this morning's *Globe and Mail.*

The Minister also said that he is "stepping up his crusade against inflation since he has no other practical options for substantially reducing unemployment". Since we just had a record number of bankruptcies, a record number of unemployed, and record misery because of the Minister's crusade against inflation, what is he now going to do as he steps up his crusade against inflation? How many more unemployed will there be? How many more bankruptcies will there be? What does he mean by this confession of failure? Will he get out of the way, if he has no practical options to offer to overcome unemployment?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, from hearing the Hon. Member the only conclusion I can reach is, as I said, that he does not want to understand. I will try again.

The level of unemployment is lower this year, and will be lower this year than even I anticipated in April. The number of jobs created will be higher this year than we had anticipated. The rate of inflation will be lower than we had anticipated. In 1984 those figures will also be better than had been projected in the budget of last April. The clear conclusion what my colleague should reach is to the effect that the economy will have been performing better in 1983 than I had forecast and better than most forecasters had forecast. It will perform better in 1984, better than all the forecasts we have seen. That is what is foreseen for next year.

As far as the number of unemployed is concerned, unemployment is expected to be lower this year than had been anticipated. Employment will be higher. If we want to achieve that growth, and a sustained growth in this country, we will have to maintain our level of inflation at least close to that of the United States. I would be even happier if it were below that of the United States. I do not think we will achieve lower unemployment in this country by jacking up inflation. Everybody would suffer if we followed the role recommended by the Hon. Member.

SALES TAX INQUIRY

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. In his confession to *The Globe and Mail* the Minister indicated that he really thinks growth is going to be down from his forecast. He admitted that to my colleague from St. John's West, that it will be down to the 4 per cent range. In view of that decline in anticipated growth, will he be introducing increases in sales tax as contemplated in his April budget?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that in 1983 we will have a higher rate of growth than had been anticipated, significantly higher. If you start from a higher base, it would be normal to expect that the rate of growth next year would be somewhat slightly lower than had been foreseen when we foresaw a rate of growth of only 2.3 per cent this year. It is likely to be above 3 per cent this year. This is simply mathematics. It is easily understood. It does not mean that the economy is going to slow down next year. It is going to grow, and grow quite significantly and rapidly. As I said, I had foreseen 5.2 per cent in the budget last April.

I will have an opportunity to introduce a new budget some time in 1984. By then I will be able to give a specific figure to my hon. friend. However, if next year we end up with a growth of 5 per cent or 4.9 per cent, compared to the forecast of 5.2 per cent last April, we will still know a higher rate of growth, especially in view of the fact that we will have grown this year by much more than had been anticipated.

INTEREST RATES CHARGED BY CHARTERED BANKS

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, we now know that four is higher than five point two. I will now turn to the question of interest rates.

The Minister will know that the Economic Council, the Wood Gundy Report, and the Conference Board have all indicated that interest rates, in their view, must come down. We see that the Bank of Canada rate is roughly 150 or 152 points today below the prime rate that the chartered banks charge. Will the Minister do something about interest rates, such as have a conference with the chartered bank presidents and ask them to reduce their prime rate to, say, 10 per cent? The history is that for years the chartered banks have been able to get along with a spread of no more than 50 bases points. Why do they now need 152 bases points?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I answered a similar question yesterday by the leader of the New Democratic Party. I informed him that interest rates in Canada had dropped significantly during the past year, that if we went back as far as 1981, there was a spread, interest rates in Canada being 4.7 per cent higher than they were in the United States. Today, the bank rate is the same as in the United States, and rates for short term paper are slightly lower or about equal to American rates. We have compressed interest rates in Canada to a very significant extent over the last two years, and especially during the past year. We managed to do so without affecting the value of the Canadian dollar, and I said that if interest rates in United States were to drop again, Canada would be in a position to benefit immediately, as would most other industrialized countries.

I can inform the hon. gentleman that I shall be meeting with major directors of Canadian banks in the near future, and certainly intend to discuss with them the whole issue of current real interest rates in Canada. Once again, if we really want our economy to prosper and to reduce interest rates, it is important not to have an inflation rate that is higher than the U.S. rate, as it is at the present time.

[*English*]

IMPACT OF NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister of Finance. In the last few days he indicated that he expected the unemployment level to remain in the 12 per cent range until 1984. He has also indicated that he and his Government have little room to manoeuvre in terms of any real job creation. Is one of the reasons that the Government has little room to manoeuvre because the National Energy Program provides for Canada's most wealthy investors an opportunity to receive 80 per cent of their investment back from the federal government in cash grants?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have stated quite clearly and repeatedly that in 1983 the level of unemployment will be lower than had been anticipated. We had foreseen an average of 12.4. I expect that this year it will likely be below 12 per cent. As far as 1984 is concerned, I want to tell the Hon. Member that the level of unemployment is expected to be below 12 per cent, not above 12 per cent as he has suggested.

As far as the specific point he has raised is concerned, I remind him that the grant system that has been introduced with regard to the oil and gas industry has been introduced as a replacement of a fiscal system one of whose basic characteristics was that it was mainly helping the wealthiest companies, which fundamentally were foreign multinationals. The new system is biased in favour of Canadian firms. It has succeeded in significantly expanding Canadian ownership of the oil and gas industry. I am amazed that even the NDP cannot realize that.

TAX WRITEOFFS

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I want to rephrase my question in human terms. Very specifically, I want to ask the Minister whether he, in his previous position and present one, has introduced legislation that would provide someone making a $7,000 investment with the opportunity of securing a major tax writeoff worth many thousands of dollars for this year, and then receiving $18,000 in a federal cash grant for 1984? Is this the kind of step that the Government has taken in an effort at job creation in this country, with these unbelievable tax giveaways?

• (1430)

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, what the Hon. Member does not realize is that such benefits will materialize if there is an oil or gas discovery, and the Canadian public gets 25 per cent interest in any discovery that is made. The Canadian people are going to be rewarded for their investment in the discovery of oil and gas in this country, not only by achieving self-sufficiency and energy security, but also by sharing in the wealth that will have been discovered due to the support that is provided by the Government of Canada, to all companies, but more particularly to Canadian investors. We will all benefit by such a regime. This is a better regime than the one which existed before, which benefited mainly multinational companies.

USE OF ENERGY TAX FUNDS

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, certainly people are being rewarded for a $7,000 investment with $18,000 in cash plus tax benefits. Will the Minister confirm that, in a consumer-led recovery which he had hoped for, by increasing taxes under programs such as the Canadian ownership special charge he is doing two things? He is taking money out of the hands of the Candian taxpayers and hindering a recovery and, perhaps as important, is collecting money from the Canadian taxpayers to enable him to give these unbelievable tax holidays to the most wealthy Canadian investors. Is that not what he is doing in terms of redistributing income upwards?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I must say I entirely disagree with the hon. gentleman. Once again, grants paid to businesses in the gas and oil industry are basically earmarked for gas and oil exploration in this country. The grants in question are paid only if the money is spent on prospecting for gas and oil. If none is found, the $7,000 and the government grant will have been spent on wages and services in an attempt to discover gas and oil. If gas and oil discoveries are made, the Canadian Government and the Canadian taxpayer will have a 25 per cent interest, and in this

way we shall have made a contribution towards achieving energy security and self-sufficiency, something all Canadians want to achieve and the basic objective of our national energy policy. I would like to say to the hon. gentleman that if he looks at the facts, he will see that we have made tremendous progress in this respect over the last two years.

* * *

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF MINISTER OF JUSTICE AND OF THE MINISTER RESPONSIBLE FOR INDIAN AND NATIVE AFFAIRS, OF THE PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to call to the attention of the House the presence in the gallery of the Hon. Gary Lane, the Minister of Justice of Saskatchewan, and of the Hon. Sid Sutchak, the Minister responsible for Indian and Native Affairs, of Saskatchewan.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

AIR CANADA

RESIGNATION OF CHAIRMAN

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley-Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the temper and tone of the letter of resignation of the Chairman of Air Canada this morning, will the Minister table in this House those parts of the report of the RCMP investigation not relating to criminal matters, but rather pertaining to conflict of interest and improper conduct of the Chairman in the discharge of his mandate?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member should know by this time that any investigation of that kind is a matter in the jurisdiction of the police officers and authorities who undertake such investigations. It is not the practice to make reports of such investigations public, for all the obvious reasons. I would say that the Hon. Member is intemperate in asking for such.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE REPORT

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley-Hants): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister. Since the Minister has seen the RCMP report, will he state in this House on his ministerial oath that, separate and apart from the criminal aspects, there is nothing in that report pertaining to conflicts of interest, improper conduct, or irregular conduct of the Chairman in the discharge of his duties? Is the Minister really trying to pretend that the Chairman is a martyr, or should he really be complimented on being a great barterer since he is going to be paid one and one-half time his salary in a lump sum?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member has any further allegations to make, I would invite him to make them outside this Chamber.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

[*Translation*]

COPYRIGHT

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Robert Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who is also responsible for the copyright legislation. I am pleased to find that the Opposition has finally discovered that some artists do reside in Canada. Yesterday I noticed that the former Prime Minister and former leader of the preceding Government was asking for special rights for authors, and I should think that the copyright is the first right that must be given to Canadian authors and composers. Can the Minister tell us what the current situation is and whether some progress will soon be made in that field?

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to answer the Hon. Member's question. The Minister of Communications and I have been working very closely for the past couple of months on the development of new copyright legislation which is long overdue in this country. We hope to produce results very soon.

* * *

SMALL BUSINESS

REQUEST FOR EMPLOYMENT TAX CREDITS

Mr. Otto Jelinek (Halton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. The Government has been most generous in recent years with Canadian tax dollars in bailing out super-large multinational corporations, often throwing good money after bad. Since the small business sector remains the largest potential employer in Canada, will the Minister, in fairness to small business, commit himself today to redirect at least a portion of his Government's so-called bail-out fund to the establishment of employment tax credits or similar incentives for small business? This is where jobs can and should be created. Why is the Minister not acting in this regard?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wonder where the Hon. Member has been for the last six months? I will send him a copy of the budget and, if it is too big, I will send him a copy of "The Budget in Brief". It is short; it is all listed there. He will find that there are hundreds of millions of dollars in tax incentives that were included in the last budget.

An Hon. Member: You have not passed one piece of legislation.

Mr. Lalonde: The measures addressed to the corporate sector in the last budget were, on the whole, biased in favour of small and medium-sized businesses. All the measures that were contained in the budget, whether in the area of research and development or in the area of investment, were available to all business, particularly small business. In many instances there was a special bias in favour of small and medium-sized business. If the Hon. Member is interested, I will send him my own copy.

* * *

NUCLEAR ENERGY

REQUEST THAT ROYAL COMMISSION INQUIRE INTO NUCLEAR INDUSTRY

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Close to half the nuclear reactors in Canada are closed down, this coming at a time when the United States has cancelled proposals for 48 more nuclear reactors this year. At the same time the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has endorsed 12 more for Canada. In light of the visibly bankrupt economics of the nuclear industry in Canada and the unlikelihood of Canadians continuing to support the nuclear industry, particularly exports to the United States, or accepting strawberries back from Romania in return for a Candu reactor, will the Minister stop being a lap dog to Bill Davis and the nuclear mobsters in this country, and establish a Royal Commission of Inquiry into the entire nuclear fuel cycle?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, there was a lot of investment made by Canadians in that system. It is a very good system. In operation you can always have some problems, but it is very evident that the problems that have been faced in Canada have been well managed. There was no danger to anybody. The system is very safe and it has been proven that, under the circumstances, there was no danger to anybody. Hydro Quebec, Hydro Ontario, and the federal Government have proven that we can operate Candu reactors in Canada. It is a good system. We have invested too much just to cancel a big program like that in a flim-flam way as the Hon. Member would like us to do.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, talk about flim-flam. I would like to get a yes or no answer from the Minister of Energy. The nuclear industry in Canada is in absolute chaos. The Ontario Government is proposing to expand the nuclear industry in order to deal with acid rain. It states it can shut down coal-fired plants by expanding the nuclear industry. Will the Minister support a Royal Commission of Inquiry into an industry that is obviously in chaos, is endangering Canadian health, and is dragging at least Ontario into bankruptcy?

• (1440)

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no to a Royal commission.

* * *

CANADA POST CORPORATION

IMPACT OF ACTIVITIES ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Canada Post but, in his absence, I should like to put it to the Acting Minister. Can he explain why Canada Post encourages its employees to use its own private travel section for their private travel arrangements, pockets the commissions, and thus forces small travel agencies into even more trouble? Why does it use its admail service to promote the delivery of advertising flyers through the mails, thus drawing revenue from local newspapers, the backbone of Canadian communities, and from the small printing shops? This action is subsidized by a Crown corporation and creates direct competition for small business which is trying to create new jobs for Canadians.

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for the Post Office could not be in the House today. I will be pleased to take notice of the question and draw it to his attention. He will undoubtedly give an answer to the Hon. Member's question.

* * *

SHIPBUILDING

UNEMPLOYMENT IN INDUSTRY

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the wonderful promises made by the Minister when he announced changes to the excise and customs jurisdiction in order to protect the Canadian shipbuilding industry last December, how does he account for the fact that the shipbuilding policy is still not in effect, when two foreign-built ships are entering Canada for every one that is currently being built in Canadian shipyards? Unemployment in the shipbuilding industry is at the highest point it has been since 1939. There are 8,000 unemployed shipyard workers waiting for the Minister and the Government to stop dithering over this issue.

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the legislation, perhaps the Hon. Member would like to direct his question to the Minister directly responsible for the legislation.

The Hon. Member should know that there is substantial under-capacity utilization throughout the world in the ship-building industry; it is not just in Canadian shipyards.

The announcement made by my colleagues, the former Minister of Supply and Services and the former Minister of National Defence, with respect to the frigate program indicated one of the largest megaprojects and job-creation programs in all of Canada. As well, there was the Minister of Transport's announcement with respect to the Coast Guard frigate program. Obviously the Hon. Member has not paid attention to the recent announcement made by my colleagues in this House.

* * *

FISHERIES

STATE OF INDUSTRY IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Of late the issue of extra berthing costs has been raised in the House. I should like to ask the Minister if the position he is taking is the result of recommendations made by the Minister's advisory council. As he knows, the salmon industry is already prostrate and this issue is strapping it even more.

With respect to the proposed buy-back program, I should like to ask the Minister if, in the implementation of that program, he will respect the prudence of those who have been in the industry for a while and who have acted cautiously, and see to it that the buy-back program will not be a bailout of the banks.

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member has put his question in that light. The problem of the fishery on the Pacific Coast is very serious. The first responsibility of the Minister is to look to the stocks, because the whole industry is based on the stocks. At the moment they are under very heavy pressure from over fishing. The report of Dr. Pearse, that we should reduce the fishing effort, is something with which I fully concur.

As the Hon. Member said, I have received the advice of the Minister's advisory council, and that includes about 17 associations, on how to go about it. My Department is carefully reviewing those recommendations. I can tell the Hon. Member that I will be giving the recommendations the highest consideration. I hope that in due course I will be able to announce the policy of the Government.

[*Translation*]

FISHERIES

RESTRUCTURING OF INDUSTRY IN EASTERN QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mrs. Éva Côté (Rimouski-Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, and it has to do with the information he gave us yesterday concerning the restructuration of fisheries in Eastern Quebec. I would like to know from the Minister whether it is true that his Assistant Deputy Minister and senior officials of his Department are to meet in Rimouski tomorrow with fishermen in the Gaspé to pursue the discussions on the restructuration of the processing plants in Quebec?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to confirm to the Hon. Member for Rimouski-Témiscouata that, among others, Newport fishermen did call my Department and asked for a meeting with the Assistant Deputy Minister with a view to going over the details of the offer made by the Canadian Government to the entire Pêcheurs-Unis movement. Needless to say, the officials of my Department gladly agreed to meet with the representatives of Newport fishermen, and I might even say that if they were invited to go to Newport, they would do so. As for me, of course, I have no intention to behave as my Quebec counterpart did, that is go over everybody's head, up the ante and try to make people believe that the problem can be solved by concentrating the efforts in a single place. The issue facing us is to find a solution to all the problems of the Pêcheurs-Unis movement, not only to those of one community at a time.

* * *

[*English*]

TRADE

PACIFIC RIM MARKETS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for International Trade. Earlier this week the Minister met with his provincial counterparts. One of the requests they made was that, in his exploration of closer links with the United States, markets in the Pacific rim not be sacrificed. They expressed real concern that we explore the Pacific rim for more markets. Because of the importance of this to job creation in Canada, with the high unemployment rate, and the importance of the Pacific rim to western Canada as a market for many of our products, can the Minister tell us what concrete steps he is planning to take in the next few weeks to expand our trade with Pacific rim countries such as Japan and China?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Mr. Speaker, some two and a half weeks ago I participated in two investment seminars, held in Tokyo and Osaka. They were aimed at increasing the level of Japanese investment in this country, which at present is only $1.2 billion

as against the book value of foreign capital investment in Canada of over $50 billion. We believe that there are ample opportunities for jobs to be created in this country through additional Japanese investment in addition to the creation of jobs through the sale of Canadian goods.

The Hon. Member may be aware that several months ago I led a mission through the ASEAN countries of Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Hong Kong and Singapore. On that mission we signed contracts for $166 million worth of Canadian sales, and we also set the stage for several hundreds of millions of dollars worth of contracts. Those later contracts are developing at a rapid rate.

Our rate of growth of sales into the Pacific Rim market is very encouraging. The Hon. Member should also recognize that sales into the United States, where a more rapid rate of recovery is occurring than anywhere else in the world, are also important as they create jobs. A 10 per cent increase in sales to the United States would amount to more additional sales than anything we could achieve elsewhere in the world.

Mr. Nystrom: As a supplementary—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Malpeque.

UNITED STATES HEARINGS ON IMPORTATION OF CANADIAN POTATOES

Mr. Mel Gass (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture my question is directed to the Minister of State for International Trade. As he is aware, the potato industry in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick is anxiously awaiting the announcement of the U.S. Department of Commerce concerning allegations of the dumping of Maritime potatoes into the New England states. Sales to the United States from the Maritime potato industry have averaged $32 million per year and this is crucial to the economy of the Maritime Provinces. Not only are these financial aspects at stake, but this case will set a precedent for all cases concerning trade with the U.S. in agricultural commodities.

I think the Minister is aware that recently a Bill was introduced in the United States Senate by Senator D'Amato which, if passed, would impose heavy tariffs on all fresh vegetables entering the U.S. from Canada.

● (1450)

In view of the importance of the outcome of these hearings to all of Canada, will the Minister tell the House what the Government is doing to assist the potato farmers of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick in their struggle against the dumping allegations?

And is the Minister aware that incomes for potato farmers in all five of Canada's eastern potato producing provinces have been reduced by not less than 20 per cent by the 17.9 per cent surcharge which the Americans are imposing upon us? And does Canada—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Hon. Member for his keen interest in a very important and serious problem. I want to tell him that the Canadian Horticultural Council is co-ordinating the reply of the industry in the battle against this threatened action. We believe that there is no justification for the anti-dumping charges which have been laid. We have made representations on a continuing basis to the American authorities to ensure that this matter is dealt with in the quasi-judicial sense which is provided for by the law down there.

The strange thing, of course, is that many years we buy more potatoes from the United States than it buys from us, primarily in western Canada. The circumstances under which its potatoes are marketed in this country, from a pricing point of view, are remarkably like those under which our potatoes are marketed into the United States. I feel it is certainly not in the interests of the United States, or of good relations in trade between our countries, for any anti-dumping charge to be laid by the Americans—

Mr. Stevens: Do you believe this?

Mr. Nielsen: How about him? Order.

Mr. Regan: May I say I am in close touch with the Horticultural—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. A short supplementary to a previous question. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville.

INVOLVEMENT OF FOREIGN-OWNED BRANCH PLANTS IN EXPORT TRADE

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nystrom: My supplementary question is directed to the Minister of talk, because all we have had is a bunch of bull. The Minister is aware that one of our major stumbling blocks in diversifying our trade is the export restrictions put on branch plants by their parents. I would like to ask the Minister specifically if he is willing to bring in a Bill which would prohibit export restrictions on foreign-owned branch plants in this country, in order to create more jobs for Canadians?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member talks—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Regan: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member talks about bull. It is quite true that we do export some bulls as part of our export trade—

Mr. Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Some of it stays here, too.

Mr. Regan: —and, indeed, the export of cattle is an important part of our international trade.

The Hon. Member then quickly changes the subject and talks about restrictions on subsidiaries of foreign companies operating in Canada, in relation to their capacity to participate in export markets. I can say to the Hon. Member that this is a matter which has been of serious concern to a succession of Governments. As a consequence of global mandates in particular products, it is less a problem than in previous years, and more and more subsidiaries of foreign companies in Canada are increasing their exports. We hope that healthy trend will continue.

UNITED STATES POTATO IMPORT HEARINGS—REQUEST FOR CANADIAN REPRESENTATION

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to that of the Hon. Member for Malpeque. I would like to direct my question also to the Minister of State for International Trade. Will representations be made to the U.S. in the strongest possible terms regarding the consequence of comparable applications of surcharge for other food products exported from Canada to the U.S.? Will the Minister's own Department and the Department of Agriculture send representatives to the ITC potato hearings scheduled for November 18, 1983, in Portland, Maine? Would the Department also supply statistical data respecting total fruit and vegetable trade between Canada and the U.S., illustrating the extent of the unfavourable balance of trade which Canada is experiencing? Would the Department supply statistics to show the percentage of U.S. consumption supplied by Canada—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member is asking a question of which the level of detail is more appropriate to be placed on the Order Paper. However, the Minister may reply to the question.

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has asked a series of questions. May I say that the response of the Department on these matters has been that which has been worked out in conjunction and through consultation with the Canadian Horticultural Council. If it feels there is some particular advantage in representation at the hearings, then, yes, we certainly would be prepared to provide it. We are staying in close consultation with them as to the best way in which this matter can be combated.

In relation to the other vegetables, the Hon. Member may be aware that there are many, many bills of a protectionist nature which are introduced in the American Congress. They are regularly opposed by the administration, and very few of them progress very far. However, we are watching the Bill to which the Hon. Member refers. We will monitor it closely and take appropriate action.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

RECRUITMENT OF INDIAN URBAN ENTREPRENEURS

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question would likely best be answered by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It is in regard to previous questions I have raised in the House when I informed the House that the Cabinet was considering a Machievellian scheme whereby $345 million of taxpayers' money would be spent to recruit urban Indian entrepreneurs who are leaning toward the Liberal cause. It is one thing to consider something like that in Cabinet, and quite another to implement it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member should ask his question.

Mr. Oberle: Yes, I will. Can the Minister tell the House why it is that he did not respond to very serious efforts by his own colleagues in the Liberal Party to delay the announcement of this Liberal vote-buying scheme headed by Maurice Strong? Why did he not delay the announcement at least until such time as the report—which he ordered delayed—is published, which will be within days? It could be considered by Cabinet, particularly those recommendations in the report which deal with the spending of such money in a way which would not only mean economic development for Indian people but would—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Minister reply to the question?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I find so many humorous undertones in that question, I would just love to answer it. But it is not—

Mr. Oberle: It is not funny.

Mr. McDermid: There is nothing funny about that.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): I find it very funny. However, Mr. Speaker, it is not my responsibility. The Hon. Member should know it is the responsibility of the Minister of State for Small Business.

* * *

MEDICAL CARE

GRANT MADE TO NOVA SCOTIA HEALTH COALITION

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare who has been all over the House in the last two days—

An Hon. Member: She is campaigning for Chrétien.

Mr. Halliday: She is the peripatetic Minister.

Mr. McDermid: She is campaigning for the leadership.

An Hon. Member: Here she is.

Mr. Halliday: Mr. Speaker, the Minister will know that her Department has awarded $25,000 under the Community Forum Program to the Health Coalition of Nova Scotia so they can hold a series of public meetings in support of her yet-to-be-seen-by-Parliament Canada Health Act. Would the Minister indicate to the House, first, when the program was announced? Second, why was there no news release issued? And third, how was the Nova Scotia Health Coalition, whose views are known to be sympathetic to the Minister, apprised of the program?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in the information program about one of the most expensive and best programs for Canadians, namely, Medicare, we have a small sum of money put aside, as we do often in my Department, for voluntary associations which have public meeetings on preserving Medicare. If the Hon. Member did not receive any documents, I will make sure he has them as soon as I return to my office.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EMPLOYMENT

CANADA WORKS PROGRAM—QUEBEC MUNICIPALITIES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Since the period provided for submissions under the Canada Works Program is now over and as I understand there is still no agreement between Quebec and Ottawa, can the Minister confirm today that the amounts available under the Canada Works Program cannot be distributed to the municipalities under an agreement with Quebec? Must we conclude that there has been no agreement between the two levels of government?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, if I understood the question asked by the Hon. Member, I believe that he has confused several matters. It is true that discussions are going on between the Quebec Government and Ottawa to determine how the Federal Government could deal with the municipalities in various cases, including employment projects. We have always believed that, as the Government of Canada, we should be able to deal with the municipalities in Quebec, as with the municipalities everywhere else in Canada, to create jobs. This position has been questioned by the Quebec Government and discussions are now taking place.

However, we have also decided that, if there is some money available that cannot be used in cooperation with the Quebec municipalities because the provincial Government has prohibited such an arrangement, this money will be used for other projects in Quebec so that the citizens will not be deprived of these amounts. We still want to continue as in the past to ensure that the funds put aside for job creation in Quebec will be used. We hope to use them for this purpose thanks to common sense and goodwill.

* * *

• (1500)

[*English*]

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petitions, with the exception of two, presented by Hon. Members on Wednesday, November 2, 1983, meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

The petition presented by the Hon. Member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott) and the petition presented by the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) do not meet the requirements of Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I have several questions with respect to the Government's intentions concerning the business of the House. All Members will of course be anxious to learn what business the Government intends to call tomorrow. Under the experimental rules the House will be rising tomorrow at the close of business and ordinarily would not be returning until Monday, November 14 next. That generates the question as to whether the Government has any intention of recalling Parliament next week. In addition, does the previous prediction of the Government House Leader with respect to a Throne Speech around November 14 or November 15 still prevail, or is the Government now thinking of another date?

While he is pondering those questions, will he also look into the matter of Bill C-653. I understand the committee has had only two meetings on that matter. There is no reason why the committee could not conclude its work and report back to the House forthwith, which is the sincere desire of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

Lastly, will the Government House Leader, in view of the obvious reluctance of the chairman of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence to call a meeting to consider the Grenadian affair and the removal of Canadians without the fumbling of this Government, ask the chairman of that Committee to convene the Committee immediately so we can examine and expose to the cold light of day the facts surrounding the obvious mismanagement of the whole affair by the Government of Canada?

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I will try not to play the same kind of political games that my colleague is now playing.

On the last point concerning the Committee dealing with the Grenadian invasion, if it was so urgent we would have expected questions today in Question Period. Despite the lack of interest by the Opposition, and in particular by their Leader, on anything for that matter, I will nevertheless raise the matter with the very distinguished chairman of the Committee who I understand is consulting.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: Who with, Andropov?

Mr. Pinard: On the second point raised by my colleague concerning Bill C-653, he suggests I consult and I will consult.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, as regards the first question, the Government's priority is to create new jobs, and we believe that the hundreds of thousands of jobs that will be created, once Bill C-155 to repeal the Crow rate is passed, should be a priority, not only for the Government, but also for the Opposition. Furthermore, we hope that if the Opposition is willing to show its good faith, and if especially the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party would care to observe yesterday's tragic anniversary in a more positive fashion next time by promoting employment instead of massive lay-offs, we shall, with the unanimous consent of the House, be able to dispose tomorrow of the third reading stage of Bill C-155.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, our priority is Bill C-155. This evening, we shall be voting on the report stage. Only one day of debate is left, and tomorrow will be designated for that purpose, in the hope that, I repeat, the Opposition does not try to prevent the creation of jobs in Canada. Tomorrow, we shall seek the unanimous consent of the House, and all Government Members will be in the House to try and create those hundreds of thousands of jobs. Tomorrow we shall seek the unanimous consent of the House to put the question on third reading before the end of the day. Not until Bill C-155 is passed by the House of Commons and the Senate and has obtained Royal Assent will we be in a position to consider a reasonable date for proroguing Parliament, no matter when or at what time Royal Assent for Bill C-155 is granted.

In the circumstances, we hope Bill C-155 will be passed as soon as possible, and as soon as the Bill is referred to the Senate, and until it is either referred back to the House or receives Royal Assent, I hope the House will be able to dispose quickly of the following Bills, subject to change, as usual, it being the Government's prerogative to establish the Orders of the Day and to change them, subject, of course, to reasonable notice, and I am referring to Bill C-170, Bill C-96 and Bill C-91.

If we assume that the Bill is referred to the Senate tomorrow evening, the House will definitely not be sitting next week. Should Bill C-155 not be referred to the Senate tomorrow evening, like all Members I shall be waiting for the Speaker to recall Parliament, and if the Speaker does so, I shall act accordingly.

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I did not quite hear the tail end of the translation so I missed the last half of the Government House Leader's response.

Some Hon. Members: Ask your Leader.

Mr. Nielsen: However, if the jackals would be quiet for a moment, I did not get a specific response with respect to the intention of the Government. Is it the intention of the Government to recall Parliament next week or is it not? We assume from the House Leader's remarks that we will be proceeding with the Crow tomorrow. In view of the fact that the stupidity of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) prevented us from dealing with the fisheries Bill tomorrow by way of his closure on closure the other day, can the Government House Leader inform us when he intends to bring that very important legislation forward?

● (1510)

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I deplore the attitude taken when questioning on House business. When I answer in English, the Hon. Member never complains but when I answer in French—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Pinard: When I deal with sensitive parts of House business in French, and this is not the first time I have done so, he is always complaining about the translation while my colleagues on this side and the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) who sits beside the Hon. Member understand me very well. Therefore I do not intend to repeat in English what I just said in French. We have very good translators. I suggest that my hon. colleague has been playing politics with the Minister of Transport, a man who is doing a marvelous job trying to create hundreds of thousands of jobs in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pinard: I think the Hon. Member should ask questions of the Leader of his Party. The Leader does not want to ask questions but I hope he will be able to answer the questions of his own House Leader on this subject.

May I remind my hon. colleague from Yukon that his Party is responsible for having wasted time last Tuesday. Members of his Party decided to spoil a whole day for reasons of their own which I do not share. We intended to proceed on Tuesday. It is obvious that we had sufficient Members present and ready to vote in the House before eleven o'clock. Therefore they wasted the time, not the Minister of Transport.

The Hon. Member knows that we have a meeting at four o'clock this afternoon. If he wants some clarification on our intent, I will be pleased to repeat in English what I just said in French over coffee in my office.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair would like to recognize the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) at this point.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all courtesy to everyone concerned, the Chair would like to recognize the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain and then recognize the Hon. Member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I have—

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain has been on his feet repeatedly seeking to be recognized and the Chair would like to recognize him. The Chair will then recognize the Hon. Member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: I have a question of privilege.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must confess that it is a little difficult to be heard.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: Question of privilege!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has recognized the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Nielsen: Question of privilege!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon on a question of privilege.

Mr. Nielsen: My question of privilege, Sir, is that by long-standing traditions and practices in the House, the House Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in the House of Commons is recognized until the question of House business has been exhausted. I was just going to ask one further brief question which, as House Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in the House of Commons, I am entitled to do and I would like to have the Chair's blessing in order to do so and perform my function. I say, Sir, that it is not the practice of this House to deny that right to the House Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is within the discretion of the Chair to recognize Hon. Members. The Chair tries to be impartial and catch the eye of Hon. Members while bearing in mind the total circumstances. The Hon. Member for Yukon was recognized for purposes of asking a question about House business. He has been subsequently recognized twice to clarify House business—

Mr. Nielsen: Once.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair stands corrected on that matter; I was under the impression the Hon. Member was recognized twice. The Chair will recognize the Hon. Member for Yukon for a short supplementary question and will then recognize the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I shall begin my short supplementary question by stating to the Government House Leader that I was not complaining about the translation. I was listening in English just as he listens in French and I have no complaints with the excellent translation. It was simply that I did not get the last half of the Minister's answer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's point does not appear to relate to House business.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Hon. Member wishes to clarify House business, he may do so. Matters relating to translation surely are not House business. Will the Hon. Member—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will Hon. Members please be quiet? The Hon. Member for Yukon has a supplementary question on House business and I invite him to place it.

Mr. Nielsen: I had finished my clarification. The question I wish to ask is, in view of the stupidity of the Minister of Transport in moving closure on closure and thus wiping out that day, when will the fisheries Bill come before the House? That was the question he did not answer. Perhaps he could answer it now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I answered the Hon. Member's question earlier, in French. I suggest the hon. gentleman read what I said in *Hansard*. It was very clear. It was about Bill C-170 which I mentioned earlier.

[*English*]

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, is it not interesting how the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) cries?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deans: I seem to recall that when I disobeyed the Chair, I got turfed out.

Some Hon. Members: Out with him!

Mr. Deans: However, I understood the Government House Leader to say that he would be seeking—

Mr. Kempling: "Ian Nepean".

Mr. Deans: That was very interesting and very clever. Imagine the Hon. Member for Burlington (Mr. Kempling) thinking that I—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain please ask his question?

Mr. Deans: Thank you very much. I have been trying to ask my question but I was interrupted by the Hon. Member for Burlington. If I understood the Government House Leader correctly, and I am sure I did, he appeared to indicate his intention to ask for unanimous consent to deal with Bill C-155 at third reading stage tomorrow. Did I understand that correctly?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Some Hon. Members: Read the "blues".

Mr. Deans: My understanding was not correct? I just wanted to make sure that the Government House Leader understands that he will not get that consent.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I want to be very clear. I was not seeking unanimous consent to deal with third reading tomorrow because we do not need unanimous consent to do so. We will deal with third reading tomorrow unless the Opposition prevents us from reaching that stage. If this is a notice of obstruction, that is another matter.

Assuming, Mr. Speaker, that, like a normal Parliament, we will seek unanimous consent to vote tomorrow as opposed to allowing the vote to be deferred. That is the unanimous consent of which I was speaking.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I anticipated that that might well be his answer. Now that I have it perfectly clear, there will be no unanimous consent tomorrow.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of that position, can the Government House Leader now tell us whether he will be recalling Parliament next week?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member would care to analyze the answer I gave earlier, he will have the answer to his question.

* * *

● (1520)

[*English*]

PRIVILEGE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has received notices from the Hon. Members of matters of privilege to be raised at this point. The Chair will call first on the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell).

MR. WADDELL—WITHDRAWAL OF REMARKS CONCERNING MR. RON ATKEY

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of privilege with respect to a disservice I did to Mr. Ron Atkey, a previous Member of this House and a former Minister. At page 28450 of *Hansard* for Friday, October 28, 1983, I asked a question of the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts). In my supplementary question, I mentioned Mr. Atkey's name. I would like to read just a part of my question as follows:

> A number of immigration consultants and lawyers, including the Hon. Minister's predecessor, Ron Atkey, the Conservative Minister, have been to Hong Kong to take advantage of this bonanza business. Does the Minister think that our immigration policy, which favours business investment over family reunification, can lead to inequalities, and encourages these sharks to go to Hong Kong and say that you can in fact buy your way into Canada, at a time when the Hong Kong people are very uneasy over the renewal of the British treaty with China? Is not the policy itself inherently inequitable when it leads to this kind of situation?

It seems to me on rereading *Hansard* that I was inadvertently classifying Mr. Atkey as a shark. I did not want to do that. I never intended to do that. Mr. Atkey is not a shark. He is a prominent and good lawyer. I have dealt with him in the past.

He has not approached me. I read *Hansard* and I realized that I would be doing a terrible disservice if I left my remarks as they were in *Hansard*. I tried to clarify the matter outside the House with the press. I kept to the point that I was trying to make in the House that there were rip-offs in Hong Kong and because of the uneasiness there a lot of lawyers, including Mr. Atkey, had flocked to Hong Kong. I did not want to convey the impression and I do not want to convey the impression that Mr. Atkey is in any way a shark. I want to clarify that and to withdraw that remark. I do not think it has caused Mr. Atkey any problem, but if it has I apologize to him.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Just look at the newspapers.

Mr. Waddell: I think that clears up the matter and I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to do so.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's point is not a question of privilege, but he has made his point.

MR. SARGEANT—ALLEGED LEAK OF REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INDIAN SELF-GOVERNMENT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has also received notice of a question of privilege from the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant). The Chair would like to make one observation. The Chair will hear the Hon. Member but his point of privilege apparently relates to a report of a committee that has not yet been laid before this House and it is impossible for the Chair to decide the Hon. Member's question of privilege until such time as such report will have been laid before this House.

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, it is exactly because that report has not been laid before the House that I feel my privileges as a Member of this House have been violated. I refer specifically to the report on Indian Self-Gov-

ernment, the contents of which have been widely covered in much of today's press.

First I shall read Citation 647 of Beauchesne, which states in part:

The publication of proceedings of committees conducted with closed doors or of reports of committees before they are available to Members will, however, constitute a breach of privilege.

Let me elaborate briefly on my personal concern. I consider the subject matter of this report to be of great importance to all Canadian natives. I sat on this committee very briefly last spring and I have been looking forward for some months now to the final report of that Committee.

I would point out that in my constituency there are 11 reserves. The chiefs of all of these reserves have been following this exercise, this study of self-government, very closely. In recent weeks a number of those chiefs have asked me if they could get copies of this report. I had to inform them that the report was confidential until such time as it was tabled in the House. I promised to make this report available to them as soon as it was tabled in the House.

I have been told by our caucus representative on that Committee, the Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly), that the report will not now be tabled until at least November 14.

I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, that next week during the break I have already scheduled a number of meetings with chiefs in my constituency to discuss any number of concerns. You can well imagine that the first question will be: Why can we not have copies of this report when it is now widely circulated? To say the least, Mr. Speaker, I will be a touch embarrassed to have to admit to them that even Members of Parliament cannot get their hands on this report while much of the press have seen it. Given that this report has been so widely covered, I am not sure what kind of credibility they will attach to my disclaimer. According to one rumour I picked up this morning—I stress it is only a rumour—there are now 150 copies of this report circulating outside the House of Commons. I do not want to be critical at all of the press for the role it has played in this matter. After all, the press was only doing its job in reporting this leak. But I must be critical of some unnamed and indeed unknown member of that Committee—the only possible source of that leak would be somebody on the committee—who showed no concern for the rights and privileges of all Members of this House by leaking the report.

From my own personal point of view, the only possible solution would be for the chairman of that Committee to table that report in this House right now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sargeant: Not to do so will continue to violate the privileges of all Members of this House.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the following motion:

Whereas the publication of the report of the Special Committee on Indian Self-Government before it has been reported—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I call to the attention of the Hon. Member that before he can move a motion the Chair has to find a prima facie question of privilege. The Chair indicated at the beginning its concern that, not being in possession of the report of the Committee, it is quite impossible for the Chair to determine whether or not there was a leak. The Chair is quite prepared to listen to the Hon. Member's statement. If the Hon. Member wants to say that if a prima facie question of privilege were found he would then be prepared to move such a motion, that would be in order.

Mr. Sargeant: Thank you for your advice on this matter, Mr. Speaker. Given the fact that it has been so widely reported in today's press and will continue to be reported over the next day or two, I do not think there is any doubt that the report has been leaked. If you do find there has been a prima facie case of a breach of privilege I would at that time like to move the following motion:

Whereas the publication of the report of the Special Committee on Indian Self-Government before it has been reported to the House breaches the privileges of Members of this House;

I move that this matter be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for investigation to discern how and why this document was released before it had been reported to the House.

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane-Superior): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege raised by the Hon. Member opposite. I would like to respond briefly as chairman of the Special Committee on Indian Self-Government. It is regrettably true that not the report but an early version of the report has come to the public's attention. Anyone who has been here for any length of time at all knows that we live in a very leaky ship. I am surprised that the whole system has not sunk by now.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: You are on the *Titanic*.

Mr. Penner: Despite that, it seems to be more or less afloat. Who leaked the report or for what reasons, it is impossible to say. I do not think it really much matters at this point.

Mr. McDermid: You know what reasons.

Mr. Penner: However, I do think a couple of points should be made. First, the effect of leaking a copy of a report prior to the final version is unfortunate, not for Members of this House but for the Indian people of Canada. The positive impact of that report is certainly blunted to a considerable extent.

This was a serious attempt by Parliamentarians from all political parties, plus some very dedicated and enlightened Indian leaders, to make a positive contribution to Indian policy in this country and move us out of the current situation which is unacceptable to everyone. It is regrettable that this leak took place and that the Indian people themselves are adversely affected.

I do want to say to the Hon. Member who asked the chairman to rise in his place immediately and table the report that I regret that I am unable to do that for the simple reason

that I act on the authority of the Committee itself. The committee met and by way of motion it was agreed that on November 14 that report would be tabled in the House.

● (1530)

I recognize that the passage of one week will be difficult for Indian leaders and for some Members of Parliament who are anxious to engage in dialogue on this report. I also know that when it is tabled next Monday it will no longer be current and much of the news media will no longer have interest in it.

Mr. Nielsen: A week Monday?

Mr. Penner: Of course the serious press will continue to take some interest in it. However, I want to say that this report was never intended to be just a one-day flash in the pan, anyway. This report was designed by Hon. Members to make a lasting contribution to Indian policy in the country. Although there is a one-week delay, I think it will stand the test of time and prove to be a very notable contribution to Indian policy in Canada.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, there is an outstanding question of privilege which has to be decided by the Chair. I wish very briefly to add my submission with respect to that matter so that it might be considered thoroughly by the Chair before rendering a decision on the question of privilege raised. We now have not simply an allegation of the leakage of a confidential committee report; we have an admission by the Chairman of that committee that indeed there was a leak of an official confidential report of the committee. We just cannot let the matter die there. There is no authority in the Chair, I respectfully submit, to order any production, but there is certainly authority in the Chair to refer the circumstances, as set out in the motion of the Hon. Member who raised the matter, to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

If that is not done, then there is a cloud which hangs over every single Member who worked on that committee. At least the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections should have the opportunity to come to the conclusion, to which it may well come, namely, that no Member of Parliament sitting on that committee had anything to do with the leakage of that report. At least that much should be the subject of inquiry.

I listened carefully to the terms of reference which the Hon. Member set out. I suggest that the Chair take them under very serious consideration before coming to any conclusion. If there is a prima facie breach, which seems to be quite evident on the basis of the admission of the Chairman himself, then the matter should be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections in the form that was presented by the hon. gentleman who raised the question.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same question of privilege. The Chairman of the committee said that he could not release the report because of a motion which took place within the committee. The Chairman is aware that there was a division of opinion within the committee on the date of release for the report. I would ask if the Chairman would consider calling an emergency meeting of the special committee to reconsider the question of the date of the release of the report.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will hear interventions and has one or two observations to make.

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Mr. Speaker, clearly we have a report here that is of vital interest to the Indian community of the country. It is now admitted that it has been made public and that it is not available to other Members of Parliament. Mr. Speaker, perhaps between the time when you make your ruling as to whether or not this matter needs to be referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Members of the House who are on that committee could hold a brief and expeditious meeting and release the report today before the earlier report becomes too widely circulated, so that accurate information could be made available to Members of Parliament and to the Indian community.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has two difficulties at this point; it will hear the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish).

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief on the same question of privilege. I sat for a short period of time on that committee, and I do not have access to a copy of the report. I am in a similar situation as the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant) who raised the question of privilege, in that I have meetings arranged for the November break with some of the 17 Indian bands within my riding. It is very embarrassing. There is a breach of privilege in the fact that we do not have access—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant) made that point very clearly. Does the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) have anything to add at this point? The Chair has one or two concerns it wishes to express.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have an observation and then a submission to make to the Chair as a result of the submissions made after mine. First, the suggestions I have heard with respect to the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner), as Chairman of that standing committee, convening another meeting to review the situation sounds eminently sensible. That still does not absolve the Chair of the responsibility of making a decision on the question of privilege which has been raised. Whatever the committee now does is up to the committee, but certainly the question remains outstanding. I submit that there has been a breach of privilege, and that the motion should be referred.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will hear Hon. Members if they have anything additional to add, but I do not like to hear a mere repetition of argument.

Mr. Nielsen: It is not a repetition.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Quite briefly, Mr. Speaker, I will say that we on this side of the House do not feel that there has been a breach of privilege. These questions of privilege are quite limited and must lead you to conclude that there has been a *prima facie* case of a breach of privilege. That essentially is the basis for a question of privilege. As to the issue raised in the House, I suggest there is absolutely nothing to support the allegation that Hon. Members have been prevented from carrying out their duties; we submit, therefore, that you cannot rule that there is a *prima facie* case of a breach of privilege. Whatever you decide, we will act accordingly.

[*English*]

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair invites the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake not to repeat the arguments of the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to you and the Chair, I did not feel I was repeating the arguments of the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake. I also feel there has been a breach of privilege, which I was trying to voice. I would have appreciated you hearing me out until the conclusion of my remarks and showing me the respect that I show for the Chair.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has to show respect to the Chair. If the Hon. Member has an additional point to raise, the Chair requests him to get to it. The Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake very explicitly indicated the position he was in through not having access to the report, and the Hon. Member says that he is in the identical position. Fine, now what else does he have to add to that?

Some Hon. Members: Nothing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In that case the Chair will make two observations. First, the Chair is not in any way attempting to avoid its responsibilities, but the Chair very appropriately must seek counsel and defer at this point.

The second concern of the Chair is a very real one of having one committee of the House investigate the work of another committee of the House, moving something to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate what took place in the committee chaired by the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner). The suggestion of the Hon. Member for Yukon is an eminently good suggestion, that the Chairman could call members of his committee together to see what they can agree to do in these circumstances. The Chair makes the suggestion to the Chairman, the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior, that he seriously consider such a request. The Chair is not in a position to direct committees. The Chair is only in a position to decide matters placed before it, and the Chair at this point will defer.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Spekaer, I rise on a point of order. I think if you will check the record you will see that the suggestion to which you referred as coming from the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) did not in fact come from him but, rather came from the Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly) also made the suggestion very clearly, and the Chair in no way wishes to detract from the eminently sensible and precise contribution of the Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands.

● (1540)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B), 1983-84

REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEES

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting Supplementary Estimates (B) of sums required for the service of Canada for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, and in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution Act, 1867, was presented by the Hon. Herb Gray, President of the Treasury Board and read by Mr. Deputy Speaker to the House.

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of Standing Order 63 I move:

That the Supplementary Estimates (B), 1983-84, tabled this day, be referred to the several standing committees of the House as follows:

Mr. Speaker, since the list is rather long, I believe there is unanimous consent that it be printed in *Hansard* as if it had been read.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: List referred to above is as follows:*]

That the Supplementary Estimates (B), 1983-1984, tabled this day, be referred to the several Standing Committees as follows:

To the Standing Committee on Agriculture

Agriculture Votes 1b, 5b, 15b, L16b and 20b

To the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture

Communications Votes 5b, 10b, 15b, 20b, 40b and 55b

Secretary of State Votes 5b, 10b, 15b, 20b, 25b, 30b and 40b

To the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence

External Affairs Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b and 16b

National Defence Vote 5b

To the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs

Economic Development Vote 1b

Finance Votes 11b, L15b and 25b

Industry, Trade and Commerce Votes 1b, 10b, L41b, 45b, 50b and 65b

National Revenue Vote 1b

To the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry

Environment Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b and 25b

Fisheries and Oceans Votes 1b, 2b, 5b and 10b

To the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs

Consumer and Corporate Affairs Votes 1b, 5b and 6b

National Health and Welfare Votes 1b, 10b, 15b, 25b, 30b, 35b, 45b, 50b and 55b

Social Development Vote 1b

To the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development

Indian Affairs and Northern Development Votes 1b, 5b, 15b, 20b, 30b, 35b, 40b, 45b and 58b

To the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs

Justice Votes 1b, 5b, 15b, 30b and 50b

Solicitor General Vote 1b

To the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration

Employment and Immigration Votes 5b, 10b, 15b and 35b

Labour Votes 1b and 5b

To the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates

Governor General Vote 1b

Privy Council Votes 1b and 2b

Science and Technology Votes 1b, 5b, 10b, 15b, 25b and 30b

Secretary of State Vote 35b

Supply and Services Vote 10b

Treasury Board Votes 1b and 10b

To the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works

Energy, Mines and Resources Votes 1b, 25b, 26b, L31b, 35b, 40b, 50b, 55b and 76b

Public Works Votes 6b, 20b, 40b, 55b, 56b, 57b, 70b and L75b

To the Standing Committee on Regional Development

Regional Economic Expansion Votes 20b and 30b

To the Standing Committee on Transport

Transport Votes 1b, 10b, 45b, 46b, 55b, 60b, 65b, 75b and L95b

To the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs

Veterans Affairs Vote 1b

* * *

[*Translation*]

COMMUNICATIONS AND CULTURE

TABLING OF FOURTH, FIFTH AND SIXTH REPORTS

Mr. Robert Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau): Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct honour to table the fourth, fifth and sixth reports of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture, in both official languages.

[*Editor's Note: For above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

PETITIONS

MR. BLAIKIE—REPAYMENT OF CMHC INTEREST REDUCTION LOANS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by my constituents who are concerned that the repayment of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation assistance for mortgage payment in the form of interest reduction loans, they will be in a situation where the homes that they live in will be mortgaged for more than the original mortgage five years previous. They are concerned that in order to satisfy repayment of the interest reduction loan with current interest rates and other economic conditions, they will experience additional severe financial and emotional stress. Finally, they know that since the existing policy recognizes that need for assistance in the form of "grants" as opposed to "interest reduction loans", they, the undersigned, call upon Parliament to enact legislation that will forgive repayment of Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation assistance for mortgage payments in the form of interest reduction loans. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. WENMAN—CANADA'S DEFENCE COMMITMENTS

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I have the duty and honour to present a petition on behalf of constituents of Fraser Valley West, expressing support for Canada's full participation in the NATO and NORAD alliances and requesting that Canada honour its obligations toward the defence of the free world and take all necessary action, including the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada to achieve these goals. The nature of the petition is to indicate that in the face of Soviet conventional and nuclear military superiority and intransigence in seriously negotiating at the START INF and MBFR talks that unilateral disarmament initiatives would have a destabilizing and regressive effect on the reduction of weapons. The purpose of this petition is, therefore, to support the concept of the balance of power and negotiating from a position of mutual strength as the foundation of pursuing both security and disarmament to lower levels of armaments through mutual balanced and verifiable reductions.

MR. TOBIN—CONSTRUCTION OF FORESTRY RESEARCH CENTRE IN CORNER BROOK

Mr. Brian Tobin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to present a petition to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned 14,000 residents of the area of Corner Brook, Newfoundland, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the Government of Canada proposed to construct a forestry research centre in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and that preliminary funds for this purpose were allocated in the federal budget and that the Ministry of the Environment and Mr. Brian Tobin, M.P., indicated publicly that the Government of Canada would construct the forestry research centre in Corner Brook if the Government of Newfoundland agreed to relocate the provincial forestry service from St. John's to Corner Brook, which has been accomplished and that

a sight selection committee was appointed by the Government of Canada to find a suitable location and the provincial Government has offered the preferred sight in Corner Brook free of charge.

Wherefore, we the undersigned, the petitioners, being of the full age of 18 years and being residents of the city of Corner Brook, 14,000 Humber Valley, the Bay of Islands, hereby petition the Government of Canada to proceed immediately with the construction of a federal forestry research centre in the city of Corner Brook. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition regarding the Crow rate, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance common to your petitioners, humbly sheweth that western Canadian farmers paid $131 million to move export grain under the Crow freight rate in the 1981-82 crop year. This grain in turn contributed $6.3 billion to the balance of trade. The undersigned believe that this is the farmers' fair contribution to the Canadian economy and that western farmers will pay one times Crow, that is, no change. Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory Crow rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have a few petitions to present this afternoon. All of them are with regard to the Crow rate. The first petition I have is signed by residents of Conquest and Bounty, Saskatchewan. They have addressed this petition to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternate plan presented by the New Democratic Party and that the Crow rate must be maintained. In addition, the railways of all Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system.

The undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternate plan, which will not change the Crowsnest freight rate agreement. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is from residents of Eston; all farmers from Eston, Saskatchewan. They present a petition to the honourable the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The residents state that they have paid their fair share in terms of Canada's economy. They view their right to the maintaining of the statutory Crowsnest Pass Agreement as their constitutional right, and that without this provision to have their preferential rates for shipping their products to the ports of Canada and to the export markets they will be adversely effected. They fear that many farmers in Saskatchewan will be jeopardized if this Government puts through its planned changes to kill the Crow rate in Canada. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

The next petition I have is from residents of Biggar, Saskatchewan. The residents of Biggar have also asked that I express their concern through this petition to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The undersigned residents, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that they are concerned, like the people from Eston, and that the undersigned carefully considered the alternate plan of the New Democratic Party. They want the Crowsnest freight rate maintained. The railways of all of Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system which in their particular instance would allow for better movement of the grains that they produce in western Canada.

● (1550)

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the position of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

This petition is from farmers in the Lashburn area. These farmers are concerned that the dismantling of the statutory Crow rate will adversely affect the farms that they presently occupy in the Lashburn area. This will have a very adverse effect on the economy, not only of the farmers but also on the small businesses. They fear that if branch lines are abandoned because of Bill C-155, the communities will also suffer. If you look at the community of Lashburn they point out it will cost hundreds of thousands of dollars more within the next seven years if in fact Bill C-155 passes.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

There are signatures on this petition from Biggar, Saskatchewan, and Landis. The petitioners have asked me to present this petition to the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition is from the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. The undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan of the New Democratic Party. They state very clearly that they want the Crowsnest Pass Agreement to be maintained and the rail

system that presently moves their grain to market to be upgraded into a modern and efficient transportation system.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

This petition has been sent to me by constituents of the Kindersley-Lloydminster riding, all of whom are people involved in the agricultural sector in the Unity area. They are concerned that this Government wants to push through Bill C-155 which has become known as an Act to change the Crowsnest Pass agreement. They want this agreement to be maintained. They are asking that Bill C-155 not be passed by this Parliament. They want the representatives here to act in the best interests of the people involved in agriculture in Canada.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

This petition comes from residents of Marshall and Lloydminster areas. They have personally written to me and asked that I present their petition today in the House of Commons. The petition is from the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy. They are concerned that the Crow rate must be maintained, and they do not want the passage of Bill C-155 as it is now before the House. They prefer to see the Bill split into three distinctive and separate areas, first dealing—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I presume the Hon. Member is reading distinctly from the document—a perusal of the document he put on the Table will verify that—and is not making a speech or ad-libbing at this point. Otherwise, I invite him to confine himself to the petitions.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to confine myself to the petitions. I am going through them as expeditiously as possible. With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I am trying to give the title of the petition, what it represents, a very brief description and the prayer, as has been ruled previously in this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will draw to the Hon. Member's attention that he appears to be going a little beyond the usual format, and I invite him to conform to it.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the Hon. Member presenting his petitions that what he is in effect doing is denying the rights of Members of the House of Commons to debate the Crow legislation. The longer they go on with those petitions, the less time we still have under time allocation for debating the Crow legislation. We have to finish at six o'clock tonight. That leaves us two hours and five minutes to debate the final stages of the report stage of this legislation. The longer he goes on with petitions, the more it eats into that debating time of Members of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's point is well taken. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleague has only two other petitions to present. I wish the Conservatives had thought of that on the day the Minister moved time allocation when they purposely kept us from having a chance to speak.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I will respect your call to go more precisely to the point on the petitions. I also respect the intervention of the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). I did learn about the thrust of presenting petitions when their own Party delayed for an entire afternoon in the House by presenting petitions of a much less relevant nature.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would appreciate the Hon. Member getting to the point. Would he please state his position?

Mr. Anguish: I cannot really remember where I was on this petition, Mr. Speaker.

The thrust of the petition is—

Mr. Nielsen: Do you remember where you are?

Mr. Anguish: —that the constituents of the Province of Saskatchewan who sent this have asked that the Crow rate be maintained and that Bill C-155 not pass and they support the alternative plan of the New Democratic Party.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Speaker, I do have several other petitions, but I will not take up the time of the House today. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) has indicated that I would present one more petition, and I will do that and resume my seat.

This petition is signed by people in the Province of Saskatchewan and also the Province of Ontario. The undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party. They feel that the Crow rate must be maintained and Bill C-155 must not go through in its present form. They also want the railways of all of Canada, not only in their own areas, to be upgraded into an efficient and modern transportation system.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass Agreement. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for indulging me the time to present these petitions.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and duty, seeing there are only a few more days of Crow debate, to present a petition on behalf of the undersigned petitioners from the region of Prince Albert. We, the undersigned, do hereby signify our objection to changes to Crow rate rail freight rates as proposed in Bill C-155. We pray the Parliament of Canada to defeat this Bill on the grounds that it guarantees economic hardship for Canadian agriculture while assumingly proposing benefits.

And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

• (1600)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions. Could I have the unanimous consent of the House to dispense with the reading of a fairly lengthy list of motions standing in the name of various Members?

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, we would be quite pleased to grant unanimous consent with respect to that, with the reservation that it be for this day only.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have taken the time since this morning to look over the motions standing on the Notice Paper, particularly in the light of what unanimous consent means. I must tell you that I came to the conclusion that perhaps they should be read. With the benefit of hindsight, however, I have decided that today might not be the best day. We will give unanimous consent for this final day.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,822 and 4,892.

[*Text*]

RCMP RECRUITS

Question No. 4,822—**Mr. McKenzie:**

1. In (*a*) 1980 (*b*) 1981 (*c*) 1982, what percentage of RCMP recruits who completed basic training in Regina were (i) Anglophone (ii) Francophone?

2. What percentage of RCMP recruits who will be completing basic training in Regina in the calendar year 1983 are (*a*) Anglophone (*b*) Francophone?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): In so far as the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are concerned: Comparative statistics are recorded only by fiscal year and by First Official Language French (FOLF) or English (FOLE).

1. (a) to (c)

1980/81	FOLF 8 per cent	
	FOLE 92 per cent	
		Total 921
1981/82	FOLF 25 per cent	
	FOLE 75 per cent	
		Total 877
1982/83	FOLF 30 per cent	
	FOLE 70 per cent	
		Total 273
1983/84	FOLF 75 per cent	(anticipated)
	FOLE 25 per cent	(anticipated)
		Total 24

2. Only 24 recruits are expected to engage in the fiscal year 1983/84 and will graduate in March 1984. Twelve of these recruits are F.O.L.F. and were engaged in April, 1983 to undertake English language training at the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Academy in Regina. Twelve more recruits are to be engaged in September, 1983 to join the first group engaged in April. Selection of the 12 recruits for the September group has not been made as yet but it is anticipated that both official language groups will be equally represented.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN KOOTENAY EAST-REVELSTOKE CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 4,892—**Mr. Parker:**

How many persons in the constituency of Kootenay East-Revelstoke were unemployed in the first quarter of 1983?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): The number of persons on U.I. (regular and fishing only) in the constituency of Kootenay East-Revelstoke for the months of January, February and March, 1983, amounted to 4,608, 5,535 and 5,675 respectively. These statistics do not include special benefits such as sick leave, maternity leave and retirement which are not recorded by constituency office.

[*English*]

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Once again I rise to make an inquiry with respect to the response to a question which has been on the Order Paper for some time. I have raised it on a number of occasions. It is a starred question. I do not want this Parliament or the distinguished Parliamentary Secretary to forget for one moment that, notwithstanding the attitude of the Government with respect to positions in this House, we still believe that starred questions should be responded to orally and quite rapidly.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, we obviously have an argument with that and we have raised it before, with regard to the timing of answers to starred questions. I can certainly not forget the starred question that the Hon. Member has in mind, with all the respect that I have for the Hon. Member and the request that he has made before.

Mr. Parker: Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary. He has notified us today that Question No. 4,892, which is standing in my name, is being answered today. In fact, it was answered last week.

Last week I asked that Question No. 4,894 be answered. I hope that it was his intention to answer Question No. 4,894, because those coal lands are very important to me. I wish to have the question answered that I asked last May.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that there is a mistake. I will check and make sure that Question No. 4,892 was answered and not Question No. 4,894, to make sure that the Hon. Member's question is answered as promptly as possible.

Mr. Parker: Mr. Speaker, not only is there a mistake, but the number is also wrong. The information I have is that the answer to this question today is in the name of the Hon. Member for McKenzie (Mr. Korchinski) who was asking a question with regard to the RCMP. That has nothing to do with the question I asked. The question I asked is in the name of the Hon. Member for Mackenzie. There certainly is a mix-up.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I brought it to the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary several days ago that some of my questions had not been answered. They referred to the guest list for the state dinner held in honour of Her Majesty in Victoria and Vancouver earlier this year.

I know it is the perogative of the Government to invite whomever it wishes, but the list is public property. I just want to determine whether admittance to state dinners was gained by flashing a Liberal membership card or if there was some other way of getting to the dinner.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that flashing a Liberal membership card would not get you through the door.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motion No. 58 (Mr. McKnight).

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I will try to continue my remarks on the Conservative Motion No. 58. When I was speaking before lunch I was interrupted several times.

I should like to recap some of my comments. I was trying to put forward several arguments. First, the Government does not like to listen to opposition, regardless where it comes from. That is an erosion of democracy in the country. Second, there is no difference between the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party. Had the Conservative Party been the Government or should it become the Government, or had the Liberals not tried to force the Bill through—I would remind Hon. Members that it is not through yet—then the Conservative Party would have brought it in. The Conservatives should realize the negative impact of the legislation on many communities along small branch lines in western Canada.

The Conservatives often say that the NDP Members are not very knowledgeable on this subject as not many Members of this Party hold permit books. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that some Members of the New Democratic Party who sit in the House are permit book holders. They know as much about grain transportation as anyone in the House; in fact, in most cases they know more about it.

The Conservative Party has put forth many arguments which do not relate to grain transportation. They have asserted that the NDP does not want the Crow rate to be maintained. I say that we do; we have always stood behind the statutory rate and we will always voice our concern.. We want the Crow rate maintained.

The Conservatives started out wanting the Crow rate to be dismantled. Now they claim that they want the Crow rate to be maintained and that Motion No. 58 in the name of one of their Members is designed to put pressure on the rail companies to give better service.

I do not know if those Conservatives who claim to be permit book holders are talking as grain shippers; I think the term is "bull shippers". The things they have said did not have a lot to do with the transportation of grain. The only other agricultural commodity involved would be livestock, so I think "bull shippers" would be more appropriate than grain shippers when applied to Members of the Conservative Party.

The change in the Conservative position is phenomenal. Just let us look at the effects of this in western Canada. They claim that Motion No. 58 will ensure that grain companies provide better movement for grain. I say that that is a false contention. The same thing appears in Section 262 of the Railway Act. In the Battlefords-Meadowlake we have not had good movement of grain or good rail transportation for many years.

My constituency contains about 70,000 square miles and not one passenger train moves through that entire section of Canada. There are branch lines going into such places as Meadow Lake where you cannot take a hopper car in. If you rode a hopper car in you could not haul it out because the rail is so light the track would buckle under the weight of a fully loaded car.

If Bill C-155, the concoction of Liberals and Conservatives, goes through, it will cost the people who haul to the Meadow Lake delivery point, $1,438,000 more per year than they are paying at the present time.

Look at the situation in the city of North Battleford. I am not referring to the town. It will cost the city $1,155,000 more per year for the delivery point at North Battleford. Battleford, which is often referred to as The Battlefords-Meadow Lake, because there is a town on one side of the river named Battleford and on the north side of the river there is the city of North Battleford, is a delivery point which will cost the producers who haul there each year, $917,000 a year more to haul their grain to the market. We feel that is unfair. Hon. Members criticized the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) when he said the legislation was a piece of fluff. But the legislation is a piece of fluff. There is no protection for the producers. There are all kinds of written in protection for the rail companies. Motion No. 58, as presented by the Conservative Party, should in fact say at the conclusion that if that performance is not met by the rail companies in Canada, they do not get any return; their investment is guaranteed by the Government of Canada. If they do not provide the service, they can suffer the loss. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that at certain times the rail companies do give good service, but we are dependent upon their inclination as to whether they want to move the grain from The Battlefords-Meadow Lake constituency or whether they do not want to move the grain. It is not working, Mr. Speaker. You cannot whitewash the rail companies to the people and farmers in The Battlefords-Meadow Lake who rely on agriculture. They not only know that this legislation is not in their best interests, they also know that the Conservative Party of Canada and the Liberals certainly do not represent their best interests. Otherwise this piece of legislation would not be before Parliament.

● (1610)

If the Conservative Party really wanted to protect the best interests of the farmers, it could have broken this Bill into the three sections, which the New Democratic Party recommended. Because of the complexities of this legislation, we wanted the Bill broken up into three distinct areas: first, an area dealing with the statutory rate for the movement of grain in western Canada; second, a section dealing with the upgrading and improvement of the rail transportation system; and third, a section dealing with the Dominion coal blocks. If the Conservative Party had the best interests of our producers at heart it would have supported us in this intent. The Conservative Party did that when there was a Bill for the oil companies before the House. It let the bells ring for 14 days in the House of Commons, holding Parliament to ransom. Those Hon. Members did it for the oil companies, but they sure will not do it for the farmers of western Canada, Mr. Speaker. They backed down. They know they would do exactly the same thing that the Liberals are doing today.

What motivates that Party to do that? I do not know for sure. Is it the $50,000 a year which CPR gives not only to the Liberal Party, but to the Conservative Party of Canada as well? Regardless of which of the major political Parties gets elected in Canada, the best interests of CPR are protected.

Mr. Murta: Talk about how much CN gives the two political Parties. Tell us about the CNR.

Mr. Anguish: Some Tory Members are asking about the CNR. The CNR came about back in the 1920s because of Liberal and Conservative administrations which had allowed a number of rail companies to develop in Canada, which all became bankrupt. The Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce was about to go under because of the heavy loans it had made to bankrupt rail companies which had received patronage from Liberals and Conservatives. Finally, the Government at that time decided to save the Liberals, Conservatives and the banks of Canada and form one national railway company. As the Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly) said, "Socialism for the wealthy". When the CNR finally came about, it was at a bit of a disadvantage as a national transportation company, a Crown corporation, because as we all know—at least we all should know—it came into being with a debt in excess of $1 billion.

That is not much in terms of Government spending today, Mr. Speaker, but back in 1923, $1 billion was a lot of money to be handed over to a railway company which was not even expected to succeed. Some people still question whether the CNR has succeeded. I believe is has done amazingly well with the debt load it had when it started out back in the 1920s. That is the story of the CNR, Mr. Speaker. It has never been on as favourable a footing with a government—whether Liberal or Conservative—as Canadian Pacific Railway has.

Before I conclude my remarks I think I should also mention the windfall which has been given to CPR. It was supposed to receive, over its period of existence, some 43 million acres of land and several hundred millions of dollars. In fact, if you take all the benefits which have been given to CPR since its beginning, added on to present day dollars, its entire assets have been paid for by the Canadian people. Of course, it should give good service from time to time. However, I maintain it could have done a little better in terms of taking branch lines, like the one in Meadow Lake, and making sure one could haul a fully loaded hopper car out over that CP line. It should also have made sure that its sidings in such places as Denholm and Brada are sufficient to unload enough boxcars so that the elevators are not plugged for a good portion of the year.

There have been some problems with the movement of grain. I would not want to say it is all because of Canadian Pacific or Canadian National. The root of the problem lies here in this House, Mr. Speaker, with Hon. Members who have an ignorance of the grain transportation system in this country. Hon. Members from the Conservative and Liberal Parties have continually propped up the rail system of grain transportation in this country. So I do not blame the rail companies, Mr. Speaker. I blame the inadequate administration of Conservative and Liberal Governments which have ruled this country since 1867. Hon. Members should not try to lay the blame on the New Democratic Party. They should not

try to lay the blame on the producers of western Canada. The blame lies here with inept Governments which have led this country into the state it is in right now.

If this Bill goes through, even with motion No. 58, we will find ourselves in a situation where the farmers of western Canada cannot compete in the international markets. Once that happens we will be working for legislation a few Parliaments from now—

Mr. Murta: Order.

Mr. Anguish: —asking for help for the farmers of western Canada because they cannot meet the financial obligations which have been placed on them by these Governments over so many years.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to clear up a couple of points before I deal with the particular motion. These were points made by two or three former speakers. The Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish), in spite of the fact that the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) challenged him this morning to give proof that the Progressive Conservative Party would bring in this Bill if we were in power, continued that allegation this afternoon. The NDP is pretty devoid of arguments which are sound if it has to dream things up for which it has no proof. The Hon. Member is having a hallucination. In no way would a Progressive Conservative Government ever present this Bill the way it is today. The Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake should accept that. He has no proof that we would do it because no proof exists. The very fact that we have opposed this Bill indicates that we would not bring in this type of legislation. I will not spend any more time on this because it is a hallucination and the people out there will know it.

The Hon. Member for Duvernay (Mr. Demers) said that the Progressive Conservative Party did not know what it stood for, or words to that effect. I believe the people of Canada know where we stand. I would just like to reiterate where we stand. We have not waffled at all on this matter. We supported the former Minister of Transport in setting up a commission to study the anomalies which existed for western Canada and try to solve them. We spent $400,000 of the taxpayers' money on a report. The various grain, cattle, hog and processing people spent probably close to $1 million in arriving at a consensus. Then, when Gilson reported that he wanted the money to be divided 81/19 to start with and then gradually reverse it so that eventually the producer got most of the money, we supported that stand. That would have been sensible. As Gilson said, in no way should you give all that money to the railways, but we would give the increased freight to the railways so they could have a paying proposition. The shortfall would go into the pockets of the producers to help pay for the increased freight. That was a sensible arrangement. But then what happened? The Liberals waffled. Then they went 50/50. They said we will give half to the producers and half to the railways. That was not as good as the Gilson report but it was better than nothing. It would have helped to eliminate the anomalies in the cattle, hog and processing industries. It would have given the West half a chance to reach its potential in agriculture.

• (1620)

What happened after that? The Government eliminated the Gilson report, and this number one item was out, no longer could it be discussed. So then came the number two alternative; the 50/50 came up. We generally supported that because some of the money would go into the pockets of the producers who are now on a reduced income. Their income is 25 per cent or 29 per cent lower this year than it was last year, and last year was lower than the year before. As the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) has said time and again, where is the producer going to get this money for the increased freight? Well, that shortfall would have done it.

Then the Government changed its mind again. It said it was going to give not only the increased freight rates to the railway, but the shortfall as well. We objected to that and we still object to it. It is not fair at all. It is completely contrary to what Gilson said. It was the very thing Gilson said not to do. In other words, we wasted $400,000 of the people's money. The industry wasted all the money they spent in trying to reach an equitable and sensible solution to this problem. Then Government said Gilson was no longer negotiable, and the 50/50 was no longer negotiable.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Vegreville suggested another solution. He said, leave it up to the producers, let them have freedom of choice. That suggestion spread like wildfire across western Canada. That proposal would give each producer the chance to participate in Government, and it would have given the Government the chance to reflect the thinking of the people. But no, the Government would not accept that proposition. It said this is not acceptable, and it would not even include it for discussion. The Government said, "We have to give it whole hog to the railway, all of the shortfall and all of the increased freight rates". So what could this Party do then? Freedom of choice was gone and the Government was not even going to talk about it. Gilson was not negotiable, the 50/50 was not negotiable, the freedom of choice would not be considered, according to the Government. So what did we say? Well, freeze the freight rates. Put a three-year freeze on so the railway will not get those increased freight rates. They would still get the shortfall, the Government said. They could go ahead with their improvements but there would be no increase for the producer. But the NDP Members would not support that. They are the ones who waffled. They wanted to do something else. Under our proposal, at the end of the third year—at which time I would hope the PC Party would be in power—we could then do something to reflect the thinking of the people. But no, that was opposed by the Government and the NDP. It was in the interests of the producers of western Canada. It would have given us the opportunity to do something at the end of three years. In the meantime they would not have been stuck with these increased freight rates which they do not have the money to pay for.

No wonder, as the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) said this morning, every organization opposes this legislation. We are giving it all to the railways and doing nothing for the producer. We are destroying the potential of our cattle, hogs and processing industry.

During the term of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) we have seen our packing plants move east. We have seen our hog production in the West go down and down and it moved east. Now the Government is going to do the same thing to our cattle industry. No wonder the people in the West are saying we will never have a chance to play our part in building this country.

That is where we stand, Mr. Speaker. We have not waffled a bit. We have stood firmly to help the producer from square one, and he will be there at square "z" if it goes that far.

The Government says that the amendments introduced by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) are just a repetition of the Transport Act and Railway Act. They are not. They put some teeth into this Bill. They put the Administrator in the place of the shipper. The shipper does not have money to pay for litigation. Lawyers are expensive these days, they cost hundreds of dollars. So what did we say? We will take the part of the producer. The Administrator will become the shipper and he will fight the case in court. The benefits will accrue to all producers. Let the Liberals and the NDP put that in their pipe and smoke it. All the benefits would accrue to all the producers in western Canada. We have not waffled, Mr. Speaker. We have stood for the producer, we stand now for the producer, and we will do so until the very end.

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join my colleagues in debating the closing stages of what has been a long, protracted and bitter debate over one of the most important changes to take place in western Canada possibly since Confederation. That, of course, is the whole question of the transportation system and where we go in terms not only of how it impacts on the grain farmer but also how the transportation system in western Canada impacts on the cattle producer, the coal, potash, sulphur and lumber industries and all of the commodities that are exported out of western Canada, and consequently how that impacts on the rest of Canada. Of course, as we all know, the impact will be substantial.

● (1630)

From a western point of view, it is certaintly with a good deal of sadness that we arrive at the voting stage on a Bill to which we on the Conservative side of the House have been opposed fairly substantially since it was first brought in. Previous speakers have indicated our feelings about where we as a Party would have liked to have gone in terms of the concept of this legislation, but the Bill itself has never been acceptable to our Party. In fact, the legislation itself is not acceptable to western Canada, the area in which it will have the greatest impact.

The various organizations that have come before the Standing Committee on Agriculture have indicated to Government and Opposition Members alike their concern for the legislation. Those concerns are virtually unanimous. At this stage of the legislation, the opposition to the legislation is almost unanimous in western Canada.

All of the grain companies in western Canada, including the pools, have grave concerns with and are very worried about the legislation. The United Grain Growers, for example, another very large grain company in western Canada, is against the legislation. The commodity groups are against the legislation. In fact, many commodity groups tell us they would sooner not see the Bill passed at all. Livestock interests are against the legislation. Truckers are not happy with the legislation. The railways, while they will obviously get more money, are not happy with the legislation. Individual farm groups are not happy with the legislation. Most Hon. Members of the House receive very few letters written by people who in any way at all congratulate the Government for what it is doing.

When the Government flies in the face of that kind of opposition, Mr. Speaker, there must be a substantial fall-out, not only politically for the Party but also for the country itself. We are getting this legislation that we do not want rammed down our throats through closure. The changes that will have to be made to this legislation because it is so unpalatable could very well be substantial and could take a number of years to bring about.

There is no question in the minds of any Hon. Members, except perhaps a few Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party, that Canada needs a better and more efficient grain handling system. There is no question at all about that, Mr. Speaker, because, as we look into the future, we know that the life blood of the country will flow as a result of the exports that are generated primarily in western Canada. We all know that those exports consist basically of raw materials and hopefully at some stage will include processed materials. Initially those exports include raw materials like grain, oilseeds, coal, potash, lumber, sulphur, etc. We do need a better system. We do not have that system at the present time.

The crux of the debate, Mr. Speaker, is surely the kind of system into which we evolve and whether that system treats all areas of interest on an equal basis. In effect, we do not need to have distortions. This is the key question that we have tried to work around throughout the entire debate. How can we best serve not only western Canadian interests but how can we best serve Canadian interests as a whole with a minimum of distortion taking place?

Many people in the country feel that a small step could have been made if we had listened more closely to the recommendations of the Gilson report. A number of Canadians, and probably a number of Members of the House of Commons, have agreed that even if we had taken more seriously the Pepin proposal of method of payment, which was 50 per cent to the railways and 50 per cent to the producers, we would have taken another more positive step down the road to some kind of fairness and equity. What we will have is something that

could only be described as a totally botched piece of legislation that satisfies no one because it will be implemented for all of the wrong reasons.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You were in the Chair when I spoke this morning on Motion No. 58. At that time, four Conservative Members drew to your attention, Mr. Speaker, by points of order, that I was not being relevant even though I was speaking on Motion No. 58. I have listened to the Hon. Member for five minutes now. Not once has he addressed himself to Motion No. 58. I enjoy listening to the Hon. Member because he makes good sense, but I think he should save that speech for third reading since it would be more relevant to third reading than it is to Motion No. 58.

Mr. Murta: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member, who is a good friend of mine, knows that Motion No. 58 is so broad that a number of topics may be debated. I suggest to him that my train of thought is very relevant to the debate on Motion No. 58 and to what other Members of the House have been talking about.

I was basically indicating, Mr. Speaker, that in working toward the answer to the question of where we will go, we have come up with the worst possible piece of legislation. As has been mentioned before by a previous speaker, Hon. Members of the Conservative Party have indicated the general position that we would like to take.

The general position taken by the Conservative Party has been stated many times and is basically that the Conservative Party believes that the producer payment in the context of the Bill should be withheld for the next three years. There are three reasons for that position. First, the railways will receive enough money so that over the next three years or so the very necessary rebuilding program will in fact take place. We are assured of that. We feel comfortable that that will be the case. Capacity will not be cut back or curtailed because of a lack of funds.

As the Government has indicated, there will be a committee formed to study the method of payment. That committee will look basically at two methods of payment, one being the Alberta method and the other being the Manitoba Farm Bureau method, and hopefully some kind of equity can be introduced through that study. There is some uncertainty surrounding the method of payment.

Another reason for the position taken by the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, is that the farmer himself does not feel that he can pay that amount at the present time.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Mégantic-Compton-Stanstead rises on a point of order.

Mr. Tessier: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Hon. Member when he says he is a friend of my colleague the Parliamentary Secretary, but I should like him to explain to us the relevance of this Motion No. 58 he is supposed to be dealing with.

[*English*]

Mr. Murta: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that I have only a minute and a half left. I would urge the Hon. Member to listen to what I am saying. What I am trying to describe is the general direction taken in the last few months not only by the House of Commons and the country itself but particularly by the Conservative Party in terms of this particular debate.

● (1640)

If I could be allowed, I should like to conclude my remarks by saying that the farmers themselves on the Prairies do not feel they should be paying any more money. When you look at the cash flow charts or sheets which the farmers produce, you find the highest cost they have is interest at the present time. So they feel, and I think rightly so, that there should not be an additional burden at this time. If you take those three elements, the uncertainty, the fact there is going to be a revision, the fact that the farmers do not feel that they should pay, there is every reason to wait until after this crucial review of the method of payment is over before payment should start. That is the direction we should be taking in the House of Commons. It is logical, it is rational, and it makes common sense to most producers in this country, and after that period of time, after the three years are up, we can decide with the producers in this country, and after that period of time, after the three years are up, we can decide with the producers and their organizations the direction in which the grain handling industry should proceed.

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the Hon. Member for Lisgar (Mr. Murta). He put on the record a great speech on behalf of his constituents and the people of western Canada. The Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) moved Motion No. 58. This motion is one the Government ought to consider seriously. It puts in place in this Bill the opportunity for the producer to have the benefit of having the railways deliver his grain. If the railways do not, the producer within these number of sections of Motion No. 58 has the ability to question that railway or railways and, through the Administrator, to take the railways to task if the producer feels he has lost money in any way as a result of the way the railways acted. This has always been a concern of mine. In this Bill we have very little in the way of being able to take the railways to task if they do not perform in the way we think they should perform given the subsidy that is being put forward. This motion which takes the good wording from the National Transportation Act and adds to it the shipper, adds to it the ability of the Grain Transport co-ordinator to act on behalf of the shipper in the courts. It makes eminent good sense and should be in the Bill.

We all know it is very difficult for an individual to go before the courts and discuss his case. Why is it difficult? Because in today's system it often costs a lot of money to do that. Very few farmers at the far end of a branch line have the ability to take a railway to task if it does not provide the service. In this motion which is being proposed, the farmer could complain to

the Grain Transport Administrator and he could act on the farmer's behalf and take the railway to task either through the Canadian Transport Commission or, I suspect, even as far as to the courts and say that the railways are not providing the service they ought to be providing under this legislation. That is why this motion is being proposed. The intention of putting this motion in the Bill is to give farmers in western Canada the opportunity to take the railways to task if they do not provide service.

It costs farmers a lot of money to have the railroads take those very efficient and huge locomotives and run them down branch lines. Neither company has ever proposed building a small locomotive capable of pulling four or five cars down a branch line. They run those huge heavy machines down branch lines and immediately the cost of the maintenance of the branch lines goes up. If in western Canada they had machines built to deliver cars to the mainlines in an efficient manner with very little expenditure attached, I am sure efficiency would go up tremendously. It would seem to me that that would be an interesting concept to look at. I believe Mr. Justice Hall in his report suggested a similar concept to that through the prairie rail authority. That suggestion did not go very far. It is not even looked at in this Bill. There is nothing in this Bill that says the railways need to provide an efficient service to the farmer to move his grain. Yet we are providing over $600 million a year, and over the next three years we are providing over $1 billion to the railroads. We have very little in this Bill to compel the railways to do anything as far as the producers of grain are concerned.

What does the Government say? What is the Government going to do to protect the producer? The Government has brought something forward called a safety net. It is a good idea. It is good protection. In fact, that is what the Crow rate was to the farmer. He would never pay more than one-half a cent per tonne mile. The new idea comes forward that the farmer would pay 4 per cent this year on an increasing rate to 10 per cent in 1988. That is the least he would pay to move his grain. But here is the catch. The catch is that it is an average of six grains moved. When you add up those six grains: rye, wheat, rapeseed, flax, barley and oats, it does not take much calculation to figure out that it would be impossible in five years, given that present grain prices stay reasonably the same, for any prairie farmer to ship barley or oats into the export market. Why do I say that? Look at the present prices—$9 approximately for canola, it is called rapeseed in the Bill; I am not sure of the price of rye, but it is about $2.84 a bushel; flax is in the neighbourhood of $8 per bushel; wheat by the end of this year will probably be in the neighbourhood of $6 a bushel; and then you come to oats and barley, barley being $2.30 a bushel and oats about $1.40.

When you average all of those together and besides put in the calculation for the number of tonnes moved to port, you will find that the average will probably be based at a little higher than the price of wheat. That means that in today's market, if this safety net is in place, the farmer would pay approximately 60 cents a bushel to move his oats and barley to market. Given that price, it would be impossible for him to even take them out of his bin.

This safety net does not protect the farmers in western Canada who produce feed grains. It is only a proper safety net for those grains that are at the top of the price scale, namely wheat, rapeseed and flax. In the northern parts of our prairie Provinces there are very few farms capable of producing those grains. I suggest that if this is the answer the Government is proposing, it ought to take a very serious look at it.

This Bill as presented to us now under closure of debate needs substantial amendment or else the farmers' ability to pay to move grain to ports will be severely damaged. If we look at the desperate situation of most farmers today, we find they simply cannot, given present prices and cost of production, produce and move grain to export markets in the next few years if we do not have the freeze on the transportation of grain or if we do not have a proper safety net.

As the Members have said previously, if at least the money were paid to the producer he would have a chance to get his grain into the domestic market from the northern parts of the Provinces, to the feedlots, to the manufacturers of feed or food on the Prairies, he would have the money in his hands to transport by either rail or truck to those markets. But he does not even have that under this system. This Bill without the motion we are now debating, Motion No. 58, does not provide any protection to the producer at all. The Bill as it stands now without Motion No. 58 provides no protection to producers; it is a beautiful Bill for the railroads. They will be obtaining a substantial subsidy from Canadian taxpayers. If this Bill is not amended, western grain producers will be placed in serious jeopardy. If the amendments about which I have talked are not passed later tonight, there will be nothing in the legislation to assist livestock farmers, given the hurt which will result from the subsidy going directly to the railroads.

● (1650)

I have suggested that if the Government had not accepted the freeze, if it did not come forward with an adequate safety net it ought to have used the agricultural adjustment fund suggested by Mr. Gilson in his report. That $204 million, which the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) says is still in the envelope, could be used to assist prairie livestock farmers until the review process is completed. This is just a last-minute desperate plea. We should not have to make such a plea to the Government. It ought to accept eminently sensible amendments which this Party has put forward in an attempt to improve the Bill, but that does not seem to be what the Government is intending. After this Bill is passed there is nothing in the way of the Government to prevent it from taking that agricultural adjustment fund, moneys which are supposedly in the envelope, to attempt to assist livestock farmers until we can put some reasonable sense in the legislation after the review process.

At present we are talking about Motion No. 58. Our Party has put forward many amendments which would improve the Bill; even the New Democratic Party has put forward one or

two amendments which would make it somewhat better. When we vote on the motions tonight, I ask Government Members to consider a number of them—and I am not referring to all of them—which will make the Bill even better, given that they have not accepted some of the very important amendments which were put forward. I hope the Government will do that and will look seriously at Motion No. 58.

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, in the history of our country there are certain pieces of legislation which stand out as having been directives in terms of creating an economic climate in a given region or on a national basis which have had long-term effects. For example, we had the national policy of Sir John A. Macdonald. It was based on the principle that a fledgling country, largely separated by unsettled areas and an area which was getting a rudimentary transportation system, needed a national policy that would create in the heartland of Canada an industrial base which could serve the rest of the country. I do not have to tell Hon. Members what has been the effect of that legislation on the development of Canada's economic structure.

Transportation and land settlement through the Homestead Act have been a vital and integral part of the development of western Canada. It is important that this legislation was always regarded as a legislative framework which allowed western Canada to develop into the agricultural basin it has become. Having said that, it is important to note that the transportation system can in fact be improved. The status quo does not have to remain untouched.

However, when I look at the legislation before us, I have no doubt that it will hurt western Canada. I have no doubt in my mind that it will hurt the farmers I represent. I have no doubt that the farmers in my area will have less ability to determine how they want to conduct their farming operations. I have no doubt that they will have greater difficulty meeting their expenses and costs. I have absolutely no question in my mind that a number of them will not be able to maintain their farming operations as they are today.

I want to show in a very practical way why the proposals of the Government will simply not have the positive impact which it suggests. Motion No. 58 is another attempt to put into place a provision which will avoid what I think is not only a mistake but could have financially disastrous effect on farmers. This point was already begun by the Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger). There is the argument that a 10 per cent safety net is eminently reasonable. According to the Government's argument, 10 per cent of the price of the product is a valid amount of money to charge for the movement of a commidity. In a very practical sense, it has a very determining effect upon the manner of farming in many areas. Let me be very specific as it relates to my riding.

The riding of Provencher, unlike most Prairie ridings which have an east-west elongation, has a north-south elongation. In the southern part of my riding farmers have made tremendous strides in changing to higher return crops, almost always with concomitant higher risks. However, their return per acre has been enhanced by these new crops. For instance, for years it was not regarded as possible in certain parts of my area to grow dry corn. They are now doing it. We were always importing corn from the Iowa area. Now some of it is produced where we live. That is not where the problem is. The problem develops as we go further north and the different crops which can be grown become more limited. Eventually we reach an area where basically it is oats and barley or coarse grains. When we take a look at the weighted average and at the 10 per cent safety net, the weighted average of those crops, for the purpose of discussion today, would be approximately $5 to $6, and a 10 per cent safety net would result in a 50 cent to 60 cent cost be bushel. It is one thing to apply that amount of transportation cost against a grain which receives a relatively high return, but in an area where farmers are largely restricted to growing coarse grains, where barley might be going at $1.65 and oats at $1.90, we can see that the percentage of the cost of transportation rises well beyond 10 per cent because it is the weighted average. Therefore, when we make this plea to the Government today in the last hours before the voting is to be held, it is a very sincere one.

• (1700)

Day after day the Government says that this legislation must be passed because it will create more jobs. I am not arguing that it sincerely holds that point of view. However, if that argument is valid, surely the argument should apply and be valid that farmers who are now farming should be able to continue farming. That makes reasonably good sense. I can argue with the NDP Members about specifics, they can argue with me; I can argue with the Liberals and they can argue with me. The point I am trying to make is that under these provisions, some people will not be able to farm. I am saying that it might just be impossible. That is true for the parkland area of the Prairies. The Government is reducing the options which the farmers are going to have.

An Hon. Member: No.

Mr. Epp: The Hon. Member says no. When he says no, I hope that he understands the Prairies. The fact remains that there is no better expert in this House with regard to the livestock industry than the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave). I refer not only to his expertise but also his experience. Listen to a gentleman like that and what he says this means to the livestock industry. Members do not have to listen to me. They should listen to him.

When that Hon. Member speaks in the House about the livestock industry and the effect this legislation will have on it, he is not doing that simply from a self interest. If there is any plea I make to the House, it is that the Government look at some of the amendments and consider them seriously. If it is sincere about wanting to create jobs, by the same token this Bill should not reduce the ability to farm or restrict the ability of livestock producers to survive.

I have not had a chance to touch on other areas such as poultry. However, at 6 o'clock today when Government Members stand up, I ask them to consider that many of these

amendments are not Conservative amendments. The only way that farmers will be able to survive in parts of the Prairies is if the Government accepts these amendments.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to Motion No. 58. This motion cannot be considered a substantive motion because it is already in the National Transportation Act and the Railway Act. However, the fact that it is transferred to this Act may have some value. Consequently, we cannot say too much about having it here.

We have a few problems with the Bill. One is the designation of the Administrator as a shipper. Within the last year or so, the National Farmers Union took the railways to court. The case was thrown out. The court said the farmer could not be considered a shipper because the shipper was the Canadian Wheat Board.

In this Bill we have the definition of a shipper. It does not go with this amendment. This Bill is badly enough worded without creating further problems, such as the definition of a shipper. That will not help very much. We will probably accept this amendment. We support it because it may do something to strengthen the position of the farmers.

I very much agree with the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) in his analysis of what happens when you increase the freight. A large portion of the crop grown in my area is barley. It is a fairly major crop. We get 100 bushels to the acre and sell it very quickly in most cases. Therefore, it is a very important crop. If we receive $1.90 a bushel and have to pay 80 cents a bushel to ship it, there is no way that the producers in my area will go on producing barley. Therefore, barley will become less and less available. Who will be most affected?

The barley producers in my area will replace the barley with another crop such as canola, wheat, or flax. Therefore, hog producers in the Province of Quebec who depend on western barley will have to pay higher prices for feed from the United States or pay more for western barley. We will not grow it unless we get approximately $2 a bushel. That is what it costs to grow under almost all circumstances.

The Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) mentioned the Gilson report. The Gilson report did play some part in this whole operation. Even though it may have been a very bad part, we have to look at it thoroughly.

At a cost to the Government, and therefore, the taxpayers of Canada, of $400,000, Mr. Gilson regurgitated almost exactly the instructions he was given by the then Minister of Transport. If you look at the terms of reference he was given and his final report in summary form, and it included a lot of pages, you find that they are almost identical. Therefore, he merely regurgitated the instructions he was given at a cost to the taxpayers of $400,000. It ended up being of very little value because it did not change the position the Government had taken previously, obviously because it was the decision of the Government.

As I said earlier, the amendment established the Administrator as a shipper. The courts have defined the shipper as the Canadian Wheat Board. If you take away the responsibility of a shipper from the Board, you weaken the Board. Consequently, it does not make sense.

In the last couple of weeks we have received a number of presentations from numerous farm related groups. Just today the Canadian Wheat Board issued a press release in which it suggests that a motion like Motion No. 58, which attempts to put some teeth into the Bill, does not do that. This motion does not do enough to assure the Board that we in this Parliament should support or pass this Bill.

The advisory committee to the Canadian Wheat Board identifies three or four areas in the Bill which should be changed before the Bill is passed. The Board states that the rates should reflect the grain producers' ability to pay and to remain competitive in world markets. It should exclude variable rates. It should guarantee branch line rehabilitation. It should eliminate the volume cap and it should not affect the Canadian Wheat Board's power to purchase and transport grain. It affects all those matters. Therefore, the advisory committee to the Canadian Wheat Board suggests that we should stop this Bill right now because if we leave those things it will do harm to the agriculture industry in the West.

• (1710)

There is no group in Canada that better represents the farmers or the grain producers than an elected group of representatives who are the advisers to the Canadian Wheat Board. Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Pool has made an almost identical appeal to this Government to stop this Bill. They say: "The transportation Bill does not contain the amendments we require with respect to safety net, volume caps, producers' share of cost and variable rates". Therefore, we can only conclude that this Bill should be thrown out.

It is very important in these last few hours of debate at report stage of the Bill that we look very carefully at the Bill and know how it is going to affect the grain producers. It is going to affect the grain producers, and the cattle and hog producers, not only in the West, but the hog producers in Ontario because Quebec hog producers will be competing for their feed. When that happens every organization related to agriculture will feel its effect. I assure you that not one Member on the Government side, in fact not one Member in this House, can really put his finger on exactly what the results of this Bill are going to be. We know it is going to be disastrous in certain areas for certain parts of the agricultural industry, such as the grain producers. It is going to eliminate the marginal producer. It is going to change the crop structure and the delivery structure. People who now depend on grain crops from the West are not going to get those grain crops because the producers cannot afford to grow them, let alone ship them. If that happens it will change the basic understanding and the relative relationship between the agriculture and processing industries in Canada. We do not know, and the Government does not know, what is going to happen. We do know that for a major group of people in this country this Bill is going to be a disaster. Western farmers now contribute $6

billion in foreign exchange every year. This contribution is going to be affected in a major way by changes in this Bill. They cannot afford to pay the freight rates that are being suggested here, and the safety net will not make any difference.

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity to speak on Motion No. 58. This is a motion proposed by our Party and sponsored by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight).

It is a sad commentary on the makeup of the House of Commons when we look at the legislation that is before us and recognize the impact this is going to have on individual farmers. I am talking about the farmers in western Canada. It is a sad commentary on the makeup of this House of Commons when we find there is not one Member sitting on the Government side who directly represents farmers in western Canada. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) is from Winnipeg-Fort Garry, an urban centre. The Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael) represents an urban centre. There is not one Member of this House of Commons sitting on the Government side who represents the farmers in western Canada.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the eloquence of the Hon. Member, but I would not want him to continue in his assertion without knowing the fact that in the riding of Winnipeg-Fort Garry there are at least seven or eight farms, and even more important, a UGG grain elevator. To suggest that there is no representation is not exact.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. That is obviously a debate.

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the Minister of Transport represents six or seven farmers. I am also happy that he represents the elevator companies. Certainly the legislation that is before the House is favourable to the elevator companies, as we on this side of the House have pointed out in committee time and time again. They were one of the biggest opponents to the freedom of choice payment where the producer, the little farmer, the farmer with 160 acres who is growing the crop, has the choice of deciding whether the money will go to the railroad or whether he gets it, which in turn protects the cattle industry and some of the processing industries in western Canada. Of course, this flew directly in the face of the elevator companies and their self-protection and self-interest.

When the committee travelled across the country, our Members put an awful lot of effort into this. The Opposition has been constantly barraged with press releases and statements by Members on the Government side saying that we are being obstructionist and are acting childishly and foolishly in holding up this Bill and trying to work on it.

During committee stage, 89 amendments were accepted on this very poorly drafted legislation. We have on the paper a further 80. This over-all legislation was so badly drafted that an unprecedented number of amendments were accepted by the committee which, because of the makeup in numbers, is controlled by the Government.

I submit that Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, through our Members on that committee, were doing an exceptionally fine job in trying to make this Bill acceptable to the farmers in western Canada.

Mr. Speaker, let us not oppose Motion No. 58 because it is presented by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster or because it is presented by Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in this House. Let us look at it and see what it really means. This is a long Bill but all it does is to incorporate Section 262 of the Railway Act. That is exactly what the Government wanted in the motion. We carry it slightly further and give it a little more teeth. We add paragraph 10 which says that the Administrator is deemed to be a shipper under Section 262. That means that because the Administrator is a shipper he is in a stronger position and is able to go to the railroads and force them to move grain at the toll imposed by this Act. All we are saying is that we should give the Administrator more power to act on behalf of those small farmers who need to ship their grain in order to earn a livelihood. We should give him the power to ensure that the tarrifs are correct, through the courts if necessary, and to force the railroads to move the grain. That is fair and it is a protection for the farmers.

• (1720)

Our amendment would provide that the railways must move the grain at the toll imposed by the Act. We would leave the rate structure where it is for three years. I have talked to many farmers at meetings in communities in my constituency such as Lac La Biche which some Hon. Members may never have heard of, and St. Lina, Bonnyville and Iron River. The farmers stated emphatically, and in most cases without opposition, that they are prepared to pay more to ship their grain but they cannot afford it now because their costs have increased so drastically. In some cases they have doubled and tripled. The cost of farm fuel has the federal tax in place, and so does the fertilizer costs because all of these are derived from petroleum products and so the petroleum gas revenue tax is included.

Mr. Dion: No, no.

Mr. Shields: Mr. Speaker, I am not ready to hear an interjection from the Hon. Member opposite. He does not represent the farmers of western Canada and he does not have a sense of what I am talking about.

Farmers are hurting out there. They phone every week to ask how they can hang on. Many of them have loans with the Farm Credit Corporation and with the banks and those institutions are coming down on their backs and threatening foreclosure.

How can we in the House justify putting another burden on the producer when grain prices are at an all-time low? Yet we are proposing another burden for the farmers. The effect of this Bill will be to take $400 million per year from western grain producers and transfer it to the railroads.

Time and time again over the last 18 months I have seen the Government give that much money and double that much money to industries in central Canada, in Ontario and Quebec, without a qualm, because it claimed that this would save jobs. It is not saving jobs in western Canada; it is killing the farmers, Mr. Speaker. The Government will rue the day it brought this legislation forward. I implore the Government to institute the three-year freeze and give the farmer a little clout by passing Motion No. 58.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Earlier today following Question Period a question of privilege was raised regarding the leaking of a draft copy of a report of the Special Committee on Indian Self-Government. Following that, the Speaker had conversations with me, as Chairman, and advised that the Committee should be reconvened to consider whether it would be wise for the Committee to table the report immediately rather than on November 14, in light of the fact that a draft copy had been leaked. Accordingly, we have met and, if the House agrees, I will table that report.

I seek the unanimous consent of the House to revert to the presentation of reports of standing and special committees.

Mr. Schellenberger: Mr. Speaker, in this Party we are prepared to give unanimous consent to revert to motions.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate the Committee on the move it has taken. On behalf of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Selkirk-Interlake (Mr. Sargeant) who raised this important matter earlier today, and asked that the report be tabled, and the Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly), who prompted the Committee action. We hope the tabling will forestall a very difficult situation that was about to arise.

The Committee has worked hard and it would have been a shame to have seen all that work undermined as a result of an inadvertence on the part of someone, whether a member of the Committee or otherwise. We are pleased to give unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Does the House agree to revert to the presentation of reports from standing and special committees?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Penner: Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its courtesy in altering the order temporarily.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

INDIAN SELF-GOVERNMENT

PRESENTATION OF SECOND REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane-Superior): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the second report of the Special Committee on Indian Self-Government to which, pursuant to Standing Order 69(13), the Committee requests a comprehensive response. I submit this report in the two official languages of Canada.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Transport; and Motion No. 58 (Mr. McKnight).

Mr. Robert Bockstael (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I am quite pleased to deal with Motion No. 58 which was moved by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight).

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity of serving on the Special Committee on the resolution of the Crow rate all through the months we were discussing it. I want to tell Hon. Members that although I do not have any farms in my constituency, the first time I ran in St. Boniface it included quite a large agricultural sector. In 30 years in the construction industry, I built a lot of farms, granaries, silos and storage facilities for people in the grain producing business. I learned a great deal from those producers and I still have contact with producers in and around the city of Winnipeg and throughout Manitoba. I feel qualified to speak about what producers have to face in supplying grain to the Canadian Wheat Board, which has its headquarters in Winnipeg.

I served as Parliamentary Secretary when the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin) was Minister of Transport and initiated the Gilson report. That report took into consideration the role and functions of the railways.

The Opposition makes a great deal of the number of amendments proposed in the Transport Committee hearings on the Crow rate. The Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Shields) spoke of the numerous amendments that were proposed and accepted. I think it is important to point out that some of those

amendments covered such things as the inclusion of the word "reliable" after the words "efficient and proper service". I think that this insignificant amendment occurred three times.

It was evident in the hearings that the Conservative Party wanted the Liberals to pass the Bill so that at the next election they could claim that the Liberals were responsible and that they would have done things differently. They could have pointed to the changes that they had proposed and claimed that the Bill was being foisted on producers by the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party has the interests of the transportation system in Canada at heart, Mr. Speaker.

Members of the NDP had their say at the hearings of the Transport Committee across the country. The Committee heard evidence about the things that the railroads must do and their role in improving the system—to double-track, to build the infrastructure needed to move grain to export. In another context in this House, the moment we talk about a lay-off at the CNR shops in Transcona or the western shops in Winnipeg, the NDP says we cannot do that to railroad workers. On the one hand we do not want the deficit of Canada to rise. But what is the difference if the CNR has another deficit? The taxpayers of Canada will pay for it. We must keep those railroad workers working. We have to repair cars and build new cars and new facilities for the rail transportation of grain. When we go to public hearings we are told, "No, no, we cannot have the producers pay for any of that, but make sure the railway workers have jobs". This entire Bill is designed to create work, to improve the economy of western Canada, to build better railway systems, to supply all the electrification, signs, road-building and tunnel-building that is needed, so that the grain will move efficiently and so that the commitment which the Canadian Wheat Board makes to the producers to deliver the grain on time will be met.

• (1730)

Mr. Blaikie: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael) actually believes that the tunnel-building will take place at the Transcona shops in Winnipeg.

An Hon. Member: That is what he said.

Mr. Bockstael: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is taking things out of context. The tunnel-building system, the rails are going to be made in other parts of Canada, but the concrete ties are going to be made in Alberta. Other things will me made all over the West. There will be $75 million spent in the West. It will enhance the economy. What I was trying to point out to the Hon. Member—

Mr. Blaikie: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member still has not said what will be built at the Transcona shops. The only—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): That is hardly a point of order. The Hon. Member is seeking to put a question to the Hon. Member who has the floor. He may or may not accept a question at this time. He has the floor to make a speech.

Mr. Bockstael: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The rolling stock will be maintained and will be rehabilitated to make it possible to take the grain to Churchill, to Thunder Bay, to Prince Rupert and to Vancouver. This means that there will be a lot of maintenance work done in the shops. It is going to mean employment. You cannot have it one way and say, "Look, when there is unemployment at the railway shops you must make sure they have work. It does not matter if it adds to the deficit". On the other hand, if we are to improve the capacity of the railways, it has to be borne by the producer. Actually, I must correct a myth. The Crow rate is statutory. The former Minister of Transport identified that at some time there had to be a datum set. When the Crow rate was started, there were 289 loading points and 2,915 miles of railway track. It went way beyond that in the 1920s. In 1929 and 1930 it went way above that. However, even after rail line abandonment and the number of shipping points has been decreased, there are still 1,245 shipping points and 16,500 miles of railway track to be maintained. That sets a certain datum about the perpetuity of the Crow rate. The Crow benefit is being perpetuated by the Government of Canada, by the people of Canada.

When the Hon. Mr. Pepin determined—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): No, the Hon. Member should refer to his colleagues in the House by their Ministry or by their riding. He is obviously referring to the former Minister of Transport.

Mr. Bockstael: I was referring to the present Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin) who was the former Minister of Transport. He set a datum. They took a benchmark, a record delivery of 31 million tonnes in 1981-82, and the cost to transport that grain was $651 million. They established that as a datum, and the Government of Canada, the people of Canada, are going to provide that $651 million subsidy to the producers of Canada in perpetuity. The New Democratic Party wants no change to the Crow, yet it turns around and wants to add more products. The NDP wants to add 25 additional products to the list. That Party cannot have it both ways.

There is a terrible myth about the Crow rate. The railways have been doing their job. They are delivering, but they cannot just keep absorbing the additional costs at today's prices.

Mr. Blaikie: That is a nice joke about the railways doing their job. I like that.

Mr. Bockstael: We went through a period when records were set only because other products were not competing with wheat and grain to be delivered to ports for export.

Mr. Shields: Also because others supplied the grain cars, not the federal Government.

Mr. Bockstael: Everything has gone up and people accept that. I would like to remind Hon. Members that in 1935 a loaf of bread sold for 5 cents. Wheat was selling for 60 cents a bushel. One could buy a beer for 10 cents and a chocolate bar

or a coke for a nickel. I can recall in 1940 buying an automobile, a de luxe Chevrolet, for $1,060.

Mr. Benjamin: What the hell has that to do with the motion?

Mr. Nystrom: How about the rule of relevance?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The Hon. Member has 30 seconds left.

Mr. Bockstael: Everything else has gone up proportionately, Mr. Speaker. The producer should not pay any more, yet he pays more for everything else. Hon. Members have identified all the items for which they pay more money today than they used to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

Mr. Malone: He has expired.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, I must say I did enjoy the speech of the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael). I enjoyed it not so much for the content but because it is the first time in the four years in which I have heard him speak that he has not read a text. He was flying very well today.

Mr. Flis: That is cheap.

An Hon. Member: Next time you read a speech, I will tell you about it.

Mr. Bockstael: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta is challenging me for always reading my texts. I have referred to notes in previous talks, but he cannot say truthfully that I have always read my speeches.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

Mr. Friesen: The next time I read a text, you will not catch me at it.

An Hon. Member: You have one there.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

Mr. Friesen: I do not know why Hon. Members are so upset over there, Mr. Speaker, with that oblique remark.

An Hon. Member: It was a cheap shot.

Mr. Friesen: I did not think it was that cheap.

I am glad for the opportunity to speak to this particular motion in the name of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan, which calls for the Government to provide in the legislation security that the railways will provide service to the producers. That is imperative, Mr. Speaker, because we know that in the competitive world in which we live there is a continual move to squeeze out the competition. It does not matter at what industry one is looking. It does not matter what the conditions are. Sooner or later the large corporations are going to squeeze out the little man. Right now Hon. Members may wonder why we need the kind of provision to make it obligatory that the railways provide service to the producers. I know that Hon. Members will say, "Well, the CTC already provides that kind of security". Those Hon. Members ought to know that it is just not working. As my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave) has pointed out, every time one calls the railway companies to account with respect to the transport of cattle and say they must provide service, the railways say, "Yes, but just make sure the cattle are ready at the right time. Then we will have all the box cars you need". It is as though the farmers could now control the gestation period of cattle along with everything else. It is imperative that the Government provide assurance to the producers that there will be modes of transportation.

Government Members from Ontario and Quebec may not realize what is happening out there in industry. Right now Smith Transport is undercutting the trucking industry to the point at which it could drive them into oblivion. I think those who understand the industry know there are two plans for providing piggyback service for the producer to market. There is a range of charges for plan one which is very expensive because it calls for more equipment. Plan two is cheaper for the producer because there is less equipment called for. At the present time, Smith Transport, a subsidiary of CPR, is providing plan one service to the producer below the cost of plan two. In other words, they are losing millions. Why are they willing to do that? Because in the process they will drive all the trucking companies into bankruptcy. Once that happens, they have the entire industry to themselves. Once that happens, there is no way we can make it obligatory to provide service.

• (1740)

It is imperative that the Government listen to a very reasonable request for a very vulnerable industry, and make this amendment part of the legislation so the producer will have some security. In 1967 this House passed the Railway Transportation Act. In the debate the Government at that time and the Minister of Transport, I think it was Mr. Pickersgill, conceded that you could not in fairness give a grant to one mode of transportation and not to others. You could not give a grant to the railways and not the trucking industry. As much as Mr. Pickersgill emphasized that point in 1967 and made sure the principle was incorporated in the legislation, the Government is now backing down on that provision, denying the principle, and giving grants to only one mode of transportation. That is like giving a credit card to the CPR and letting them run that operation as they wish. With that endless supply of money to the one industry, the competition has absolutely no way of competing. I am asking the Government to reconsider its adamant position on the grant system because it is giving a competitive edge to only one industry.

We and the producers of western Canada are going to rue the day that the Government did not listen to representation in this House regarding this provision. The only thing the producer has going for him at this point is that grain is not an

immediately perishable product. But what will we do if we are talking about perishables such as eggs, vegetables or fruit? It seems to me that when the Government considers the $600 million it is providing to the railways this year alone, when it is receiving hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes by way of the fuel tax which applies to the trucking industry, let alone the licencing and all other revenue sources from that industry, it is acting in an incredibly prejudicial way in favour of the railway system. It is not the railway system which is going to keep this country together, it is the producer. If the Government insists on providing for only one form of transportation, there is no way they can ensure that the railways will market the crops in the future.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to interrupt the Hon. Member in his last speech on this issue, but there is a matter of some urgency before the vote at report stage can be taken, and I wonder if I might have the consent of the House to move some consequential amendments?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Minister seek consent to move the amendments one at a time.

Mr. Axworthy: That is understood, Mr. Speaker. I will be moving them seriatim. Therefore, I move:

That Bill C-155 be amended in clause 54 by striking out lines 17 to 26 at page 31, and substituting the following therefor:

"(*a*) in respect of the 1982-83 crop year, $22.05,

(*b*) in respect of the 1983-84 crop year, $22.99,

(*c*) in respect of the 1984-85 crop year, $23.93,

(*d*) in respect of the 1985-86 crop year, $24.86, and

(*e*) in respect of the 1986-87 and subsequent crop years, $25.80."

These changes are consequential to the increase in the volume ceiling of 31.1 to 31.5, and result from line-related costs being spread over a greater volume. I would appreciate having it put on the Order Paper as part of the grouping for the vote.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, since the effect of this amendment will be to reduce the cost of shipping to the grain producer in the West, we of course give consent. But it is one more example, after 80 amendments in committee and 84 in the House of Commons, of how ill-prepared the Government was. It is still trying to clean up a very badly prepared Bill.

Mr. Deans: I agree this is clear evidence that we ought not to be voting on the amendments today since the Government, even at this late minute, is still introducing amendments. However, on this particular one we will give consent.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, it just shows the Government is ever alert, to the very last moment, to possible changes it might make to improve the Bill. I do have a second technical amendment which really is a consequence of the time that has elapsed since the Bill was drafted. It has nothing to do with matters of technical competence, but more to ensure the Bill is in concurrence with the time frame. We would like to withdraw Motion No. 167 and substitute the following motion. I will not read it because I have submitted copies, but in effect it is that every railway company, on or before November 1, 1983, shall file and publish a tariff respecting the period beginning January 1, 1984 and ending on July 31, 1984. We would like to change the word "November" to "December", 1983. We ask for unanimous consent to take into account it is now November 5, and it is a little rough to establish a tariff until the legislation is passed. This is simply to take into account the elapsed time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Minister have unanimous consent—The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans).

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, as I read the Bill at the moment, the tariff which would have to have been filed on November 1 is the existing Crowsnest Pass freight rate. We certainly do not give consent to alter it to December 1.

• (1750)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) does not have the unanimous consent of the House and therefore the amendment cannot be introduced. Does the Minister have any further amendments he wishes to introduce at this point?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, considering that we are batting 500, now is a pretty good time to stop.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being 5.50 p.m., pursuant to order made Wednesday, October 26, 1983, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the report stage of the Bill.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 10A

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 7 to 9 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

" "export", in respect of grain, means shipment by vessel within the meaning of the *Canada Shipping Act* to any destination outside Canada and shipment by any other mode of transport to the United States for use of the grain in that country and not for shipment out of that country;".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions about the procedure that is being adopted. You have before you, Mr. Speaker, a grouping of motions to be voted upon in order to save time in the voting process, because we do not want to be here into the wee hours of tomorrow voting on 84 motions. However, there is a residual procedural problem and that is the calling of the yeas and the nays in each of the groups upon which the yeas and the nays have not yet been heard. I would suggest that that process is a prior process and should be proceeded with before putting the votes on the various groups.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair would inform the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) that that is exactly what the Chair is proposing to do.

Mr. Nielsen: It was not so stated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have called Motion No. 10A, which has not previously been put before the House. I intend to go seriatim through the rest in accordance with the grouping indicated previously by the Speaker.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As the Hon. House Leader of the Official Opposition has indicated, we intend to vote on these by groups. Considering that, I wonder if the motion that has just been accepted by the House for unanimous consent dealing with the changes in volume would properly be grouped under group A and that that would be added to the group A category for yeas and nays.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Minister is perhaps anticipating. It is my understanding that at this stage, groups A, B, C, D and E come before the House for votes. At this stage we are dealing with the motions that have not previously been considered by the House.

The question is on Motion No. 10A. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 79(11), the recorded division on the proposed motion will be deferred.

The question is on Motion No. 14A.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that you proceed group by group and apply the yeas and nays that you have now heard on Motion No. 10A to all of the remaining motions within that group that have not yet been subject to the yeas and nays procedure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to inform the House that the Table has not had time to put all of these in the form indicated by the Hon. Member for Yukon and the Chair is bound by the limitations that it now faces. The Chair will attempt to proceed as expeditiously as possible. If the House wishes to do it that way, it will take the officers of the Table perhaps five minutes.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I have an alternate suggestion which might find acceptance from the House. Perhaps we can take a division of the yeas and nays on the first undisposed motion in each group and apply that result to each undisposed motion in the group affected without going to the trouble of enumerating them all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is in the hands of the Members of the House. One difficulty the Chair must point out is that the motions have not been put to the House. In many cases there are no seconders and it is difficult to dispense quickly of motions that have not been placed and have not been properly put and seconded. However, the Chair is open to suggestions.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, in a few moments you will have a list of the six groups we are talking about. In each group, there are some motions that have not yet been put. I agree with the suggestion made by the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) as I have consulted with the House Leaders on this question. When you call the first motion in each group that has not yet been put to the House, Mr. Speaker, we suggest that the same yeas and nays apply to the other motions in the group that have not yet been called. We are not suggesting that you do not call those motions but we are suggesting that you do not have us shout yeas and nays every time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With the permission of the House and in the interest of expediting matters, we will presume that House Leaders are seconders in every case. We will simply make that presumption and we will attempt to put the motions in an orderly way with that assumption.

The House is dealing with group B. Motion No. 24 has been deferred.

Perhaps the Hon. Member for Yukon can explain again and the Chair will attempt to interpret as best it can.

Mr. Nielsen: With respect, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet disposed of group A. We have heard the yeas and nays on Motion No. 10A. May I suggest to the House that the yeas and nays on Motion No. 10A apply to all other undisposed motions within group A? After that, we would then move on to group B in the same fashion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: For the sake of the record, the yeas and nays applying to Motion No. 10A will also apply to Motions Nos. 14A, 61, 156, 164, 168, 169 and 171. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pinard: It is agreed, Mr. Speaker, but you should add to that list the last amendment moved by consent by the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Added to this list is the last amendment introduced, by unanimous consent, by the Hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy). Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport) moved:

Motion No. 14A

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 2 by striking out lines 14 to 18 at page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

" "grain" means any grain or crop included in Schedule I that is grown in the Western Division or any product thereof included in Schedule I that is processed in the Western Division and includes any other grain or crop grown in the Western Division and any product thereof processed in the Western Division that the Governor in Council, by regulation made under paragraph 62(1)(*b*), prescribes as being included in Schedule I;".

Motion No. 61

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by striking out lines 8 to 16 page 17 and substituting the following therefor:

" "Crow Benefit', means,

(*a*) in respect of the period beginning on January 1, 1984 and ending on July, 31, 1984, $286 million,

(*b*) in respect of the 1984-85 crop year, $599.6 million,

(*c*) in respect of the 1985-86 crop year, $629.1 million, and

(*d*) in respect of the 1986-87 and subsequent crop years, $658.6 million;".

Motion No. 156

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 13 at page 34 the following:

"59.(1) Subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by regulations made by the Governor in Council, including conditions relating to the auditing of the books and records of a company, the Minister may enter into an agreement with a company that operates a railway, other than a railway company, in respect of the carriage of grain by that company over any line of railway now or hereafter constructed

(*a*) from any point on any line of railway west of Thunder Bay or Armstrong to Thunder Bay or Armstrong;

(*b*) from any point on any line or railway west of Thunder Bay or Armstrong to a port in British Columbia for export; or

(*c*) from any point on any line of railway west of Thunder Bay or Armstrong to Churchill for export.

(2) An agreement referred to in subsection (1) may provide for the payment by the Minister to a company of an amount not exceeding an amount equal to the difference between

(*a*) the amount received by the company in respect of a period for the carriage of grain; and

(*b*) the costs of carrying grain during the same period that are prescribed by regulations made by the Governor in Council.

(3) No payment in respect of a crop year may be made to a company under this section where the Minister is of the opinion that

(*a*) the rates of rail charges for the carriage of grain by the company in that year are not equivalent to the rates for the movement of grain in that crop year referred to in section 41; or

(*b*) the performance of the company in the carriage of grain in that year is not satisfactory.

(4) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the Governor in Council may by order direct that

(*a*) the Crow Benefit in respect of a crop year shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount payable under an agreement entered into pursuant to this section in respect of that crop year; or

(*b*) the payments under this section shall be paid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose in addition to any payment authorized to be made pursuant to this Act."

and by renumbering the subsequent Clauses and amending all references accordingly.

Motion No. 164

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 60

(*a*) by renumbering Clause 60 as subclause 60(1);

(*b*) by striking out lines 9 to 13 at page 35 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*a*) prescribing anything that by this Act is to be prescribed by the Governor in Council;

(*b*) prescribing any grain or crop grown in the Western Division and products thereof processed in the Western Division that shall be included in Schedule I; and

(*c*) generally for carrying out the purposes and provisions of this Act."

(*c*) by adding immediately after line 13 at page 35 the following:

"(2) Where a regulation is made under paragraph (1)(*b*), the Governor in Council may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, make regulations prescribing

(*a*) amounts on tonnage in lieu of the amounts set out in the definition "cumulative government share of the cost change" in subsection 54(1) and in subsection 54(4), and

(*b*) amounts in lieu of those set out in the definition "Crow Benefit" in subsection 34(1) and in paragraph 39(1)(*a*),

in such matter and at such levels as he considers appropriate in order to take into account the inclusion of any grain, crop or product in Schedule I effected by the regulation."

Motion No. 168

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 70 by striking out lines 15 to 17 at page 38 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) On or before April 15, 1984, the Minister may, subject to such terms and conditions as the Treasury Board may approve, pay an amount not exceeding $82 million dollars to the Canadian National Railway Company and an amount not exceeding $95 million dollars to Canadian Pacific Limited in respect of movements of grain during the period beginning on August 1, 1983 and ending on December 31, 1983.

(3) On or before April 15, 1984, the Minister may, subject to such terms and conditions as the Treasury Board may approve, pay to shippers of rapeseed or canola meal or rapeseed or canola oil or linseed meal or linseed oil processed in the Western Division from grain a sum equal to the difference between the freight rate paid by them for the movement of that commodity during the period beginning on August 1, 1983 and ending on December 31, 1983 and the freight rate that would have been paid by those shippers for shipping that commodity under the freight rates that are effective on January 1, 1984 had those rates been in force during that period."

Motion No. 169

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 17 at page 38 the following:

"Payments

71. Payments under this Act shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund from time to time as required."

Motion No. 171

That Bill C-155 be amended in Schedule I by striking out all that portion immediately after the heading "Schedule I" at page 39 and substituting the following therefor:

"(s.2, "grain")
GRAINS, CROPS AND PRODUCTS

Alfafa Meal, Pellets or Cubes, dehydrated
Barley
Barley, Crushed
Barley, Pearl
Barley, Pot
Barley Sprouts
Beans (except soybeans) including faba beans, splits and screenings
Bean (except soybean) derivatives (flour, protein, isolates, fibre)
Bran
Breakfast Foods or Cereals (uncooked) in bags, barrels or cases. Manufactured from commodities only as listed in this Schedule.
Buckwheat
Canary Seed
Corn, Cracked
Corn (not popcorn)
Feed, Animal or Poultry (not medicated or condimental), containing not more than thirty-five per cent (35%) of ingredients other than commodities as

specified in this Schedule, in bags or barrels or in bulk
Flax Seed
Flour, made from grain or malt in bags or barrels or in bulk
Grain, Feed, in sacks
Groats
Hulls,Oat
Lentils, including splits and screenings
Malt (made from grain only)
Meal, Barley
Meal, Corn
Meal, Linseed
Meal, Oat
Meal, Rapeseed or Canola
Meal, Oil Cake, Linseed
Meal, Oil Cake, Rapeseed or Canola
Meal, Oil Cake, Sunflower Seed
Meal, Rye
Meal, Wheat
Middlings
Millfeed
Mustard Seed
Oats
Oats, Crushed
Oats, Rolled
Oil Cake, Linseed
Oil Cake, Rapeseed or Canola
Oil Cake, Sunflower Seed
Oil, Linseed
Oil, Rapeseed or Canola
Oil, Sunflower Seed
Peas, including splits and screenings
Pea derivatives (flour, protein, isolates, fibre)
Rapeseed or Canola
Rye
Screenings or Screenings pellets (applicable only on Screenings from grains specified herein)
Seed Grain in Sacks
Shorts
Sunflower Seed
Triticale
Wheat
Wheat Germ
Wheat, Rolled".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now move to group B. Motion No. 24 has already been deferred. Is it the pleasure of the House to defer the votes on Motions Nos. 29, 32, 34, 36, 41, 42, 43, 47, 50, 55, 56, 60, 76, 78 and 83?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 24

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out line 35 at page 3 and substituting the following therefor:

"tion or board, the business of".

Motion No. 29

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 3 by striking out lines 19 to 22 at page 4.

Motion No. 32

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 13 by striking out lines 10 and 11 at page 7 and substituting the following therefor:

"an employee of the Canadian Wheat Board."

Motion No. 34

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 17 by striking out lines 20 to 25 at page 8.

Motion No. 36

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 18 by striking out lines 44 to 47 at page 8 and lines 1 to 41 at page 9 and substituting the following therefor:

"should be met by any railway company

(*d*) monitor the performance of the railway companies to ascertain whether or not they are meeting the performance objectives referred to in paragraph (*c*); and

(*e*) develop, for possible implementation under section 21, a scheme of sanctions applicable to railway companies and make recommendations to the Minister on the advisability of implementing that scheme."

Motion No. 41

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out lines 12 and 13 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"during the period by railway companies; and".

Motion No. 42

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out lines 14 to 24 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*b*) implement a scheme that provides for sanctions to be applied to railway companies that do not meet the performance objectives referred to in paragraph (*a*)."

Motion No. 43

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21

(*a*) by striking out line 18 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"than the railway companies and the Canadian Wheat Board, that meet".

(*b*) by striking out line 22 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"participants, other than the Canadian Wheat Board, or any classes thereof that".

Motion No. 47

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 22 by striking out line 2 at page 12 and substituting the following therefor:

"fifteen Senators or fifteen Members of the".

Motion No. 50

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by adding immediately after line 45 at page 14 the following:

"(3) A railway company shall, in a subsequent calendar year, invest in railway equipment and plant for the movement of grain an amount not less than the after tax cost of capital, after tax depreciation, and after tax constant cost portion of payments it received under section 55 for the preceeding crop year."

and by renumbering the subsequent subclauses accordingly.

Motion No. 55

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 33 by striking out lines 11 to 43 at page 16 and substituting the following therefor:

"for the purpose of moving grain and the Minister shall take every reasonable initiative to ensure that an adequate supply of rolling stock will be provided for the efficient, reliable and effective movement of grain.

(2) The Minister may enter into agreements with the owners of lessees of railway cars.

(3) The Canadian Wheat Board shall administer and control any railway cars acquired or leased by the Board or by the Minister on behalf of Her Majesty.

(4) The Canadian Wheat Board may, in respect of railway cars under its administration and control, enter into agreements with the railway companies respecting the operation of the railway cars."

Motion No. 56

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 33 by striking out lines 24 to 30 at page 16 and renumbering the subsequent subclauses accordingly.

Motion No. 60

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by striking out lines 2 to 7 at page 17.

Motion No. 76

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 38 by striking out lines 15 to 21 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"and determine, for that year, the volume-related variable costs of the railway companies for the movement of grain."

Motion No. 78

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 38 by striking out lines 31 to 36 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*b*) compute the cost of capital for the railway companies in relation to the average return on investment of grain producers in the Western Division;".

Motion No. 83

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 39 by striking out lines 22 to 45 at page 22 and lines 1 to 12 at page 23 and substituting the following therefor:

"railway companies for the movement of grain.

"(3) The variable costs referred to in subsection (2) shall be estimated by applying the railway price indices, as approved by the Commission, to the volume-related variable costs of the railway companies for the movement of grain for the most recent base year, adjusted to take into account the difference between the tonnage of grain moved in the most recent base year and the tonnage of grain that, in the estimation of the Administrator, will be moved in the next crop year."

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I am assuming, because I have not checked, that all of the motions which you have just read have not yet been disposed of by the deferral process.

● (1800)

Mr. Pinard: I assume the same thing, Mr. Speaker, that they have not been disposed of in the past.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I believe that is correct.

Mr. Nielsen: I hope you are sure of it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: They have not been disposed of by the House up to this point.

The understanding is that the following motions have been deferred in group C: Motions Nos. 33, 39, 44, 45, 48, 35, 37, 38, 40, 46, 49 and 52. Motion No. 58 is under consideration. Motion No. 33.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 33

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 17 by striking out line 6 at page 8 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*d*) promote, and shall require, if necessary, reciprocal and other arrange-".

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia) moved:

Motion No. 39

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 19 by adding immediately after line 20 at page 10 the following:

"(2) The provisions of this Part respecting the duties and functions of the Administrator do not restrict the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board under the Canadian Wheat Board Act to make available the quantities and types of grain necessary to achieve sales commitments on behalf of, and in the interests of producers."

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster) moved:

Motion No. 44

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out lines 21 to 24 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"(ii) sanctions to be aplied to system participants or any classes thereof, other than the railways, that do not meet the performance objectives referred to in paragraph (*a*), shall be non-pecuniary."

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette) moved:

Motion No. 45

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out line 32 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"the commission, is equal to 29% of the".

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 48

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 25 by deleting lines 10 to 17 at page 13 and substituting the following therefor:

"debated for not more than three sitting days and at the expiration of the three sitting days the Speaker shall forthwith without further debate or amendment put every question necessary for the disposition of the motion."

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): moved:

Motion No. 35

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 17 by striking out line 25 at page 8 and substituting the following therefor:

"the grain producers, but such agreements shall not provide for the movement of grain by motor vehicle transport from shipping points on rail lines which have not been abandoned by order of the Canadian Transport Commission."

Motion No. 37

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 18 by striking out line 18 at page 9 and substituting the following therefor:

"mented under section 21, but awards and sanctions for system participants other than the railway companies shall be non-pecuniary in nature;".

Motion No. 38

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 18 by striking out line 18 at page 9 and substittuing the following therefor:

"mented under section 21, but such awards and sanctions shall not involve the allocation of railway cars nor affect the quota system of the Canadian Wheat Board."

Motion No. 40

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 19 by striking out lines 27 to 32 at page 10 and substituting the following therefor:

"(3) The provisions of this Part respecting the duties and functions of the Administrator do not restrict the powers of the Canadian Wheat Board under section 21(*k*) of the *Canadian Wheat Board Act*, or any Orders of the Governor in Council, to make available the quantities and types of grain needed to achieve sales commitments."

Motion No. 46

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 21 by striking out lines 32 to 34 at page 11 and substituting the following therefor:

"the Commission, is equal to 20% of the volume-related variable costs of the railway company plus 100% of the cost of capital portion of the line-related variable costs for grain dependent branch lines."

Motion No. 49

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 25 by striking out lines 10 to 17 at page 13 and substituting the following therefor:

"debated and on conclusion of the debate the Speaker shall forthwith put every question necessary for the disposition of the motion."

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): moved:

Motion No. 52

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 29 by striking out lines 10 to 15 at page 15.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to defer votes on the following motions? Motions Nos. 58, 63, 68, 69, 99, 103, 115, 127, 130, 131, 133, 134A, 136, 138, 140, 143, 65, 72, 77, 79, 84, 88, 90A, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 158, 161, 162, 163, 165A, and 165B.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Western Grain Transportation Act

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 63

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by striking out lines 17 to 19 at page 17.

Motion No. 68

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by striking out lines 4 and 5 at page 18.

Motion No. 69

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by striking out lines 6 and 7 at page 18.

Motion No. 99

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 34 to 38 at page 28 and lines 1 to 7 at page 29.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 103

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 10 to 30 at page 29.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 115

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 26 to 30 at page 29.

Motion No. 127

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 31 to 43 at page 29.

Motion No. 130

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 11 to 17 at page 30.

Motion No. 131

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 18 to 31 at page 30.

Motion No. 133

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 32 to 45 at page 30.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert) moved:

Motion No. 134A

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 33 to 45 at page 30 and substituting the following therefor:

"change" means zero;"

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 136

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 46 to 49 at page 30 and lines 1 to 9 at page 31.

Motion No. 138

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 10 to 26 at page 31.

Motion No. 140

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 27 to 36 at page 31.

Motion No. 143

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 37 to 47 at page 31.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 65

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 34 by striking out lines 20 to 40 at page 17 and lines 1 to 3 at page 18.

Motion No. 72

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 36 by adding immediately after line 13 at page 19 the following:

"(2) If the transportation or handling of grain produced east of Thunder Bay or Armstrong and destined for export to an overseas country is diverted away from Canadian ports, railway lines, or handling facilities to ports, railway lines, and handling facilities in the United States, the Canadian Transport Commission shall reduce the annual rate scale by an amount so that

(*a*) rates to Thunder Bay, Armstrong, or Churchill do not exceed the cost of shipping grain from points west of Thunder Bay or Armstrong to Duluth or Superior

(*b*) the combined cost of shipping grain by rail to Thunder Bay and by water from Thunder Bay to St. Lawrence ports does not exceed the cost of shipping grain from points west of Thunder Bay or Armstrong by rail or by rail and barge to New Orleans

(*c*) rates to ports in British Columbia do not exceed the cost of shipping grain from points west of Thunder Bay or Armstrong to ports on the pacific coast of the United States."

and by renumbering subsection (2) as subsection (3).

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 77

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 38 by striking out lines 31 to 36 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*b*) compute the cost of capital in accordance with such principles as the Commission deems appropriate and adjust that cost by any amount it deems justified in light of the risks associated with the movement of grain;".

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 79

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 38 by striking out lines 37 and 38 at page 20 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*c*) exclude the cost of capital and depreciation in respect of grants and donations from the government of Canada and provincial and municipal governments and in respect of branch line".

Motion No. 84

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 39 by striking out lines 28 to 34 at page 22 and substituting the following therefor:

"(3) The costs referred to in subsection (2) do not include cost of capital and depreciation in respect of grants and donations from the government of Canada and provincial and municipal governments and in respect of branch line assets provided under the Prairie Branch Line Rehabilitation Program and in respect of railway cars that have not been funded by the railway companies."

Motion No. 88

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 41 by striking out line 17 at page 24 and substituting the following therefor:

"with the provisions of this Part the railway companies shall not impose a stop off charge for the storage, milling, or processing of grains in Canada."

Motion No. 98

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 53

(*a*) by striking out line 23 at page 28 and substituting the following therefor:

"53.(1) The rates set out in a tariff take effect";

(*b*) by adding immediately after line 27 at page 28 the following:

"(2) The railway companies shall move a quantity of grain equal to that in primary elevators as of the date of any freight rate increase after the date of such increase at the rate in effect prior to the increase."

Motion No. 93

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 47 by striking out lines 37 to 44 at page 26 and substituting the following therefor:

"(4) Where the Commission allows a proposed lower rate under paragraph (2)(*b*), the Commission shall extend such lower rate by the same percentage reduction to all other shipping points covered by this Act."

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 94

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 47 by adding immediately after line 44 at page 26 the following:

"(5)(*a*) Ancillary charges are charges for services performed by a railway company in addition to the line-haul movement of grain.

(*b*) The Commission may, by order, prescribe the level of ancillary charges but in no case shall that amount exceed the level that in the opinion of the Commission is necessary to reflect the variable cost of an ancillary service."

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West) moved:

Motion No. 95

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 48 by striking out lines 1 to 3 at page 27 and substituting the following therefor:

"and shall, in respect of any crop year, include in its tariff a rate in respect of any joint line movement if such rate is requested by the Canadian Transport Commission or Canadian Wheat Board.

(2) A rate in respect of a joint line movement shall not exceed the rate that would apply if the movement was a single line movement."

and by renumbering subsection (2) as subsection (3).

Motion No. 96

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 48 by adding immediately after line 7 at page 27 the following:

"(3) Notwithstanding subsection (1), the Commission shall prevent back hauls and cross hauls of grain by requiring the railway companies to file rates for joint line movements that would be applicable if the rate was filed as if it were a single line movement."

Motion No. 97

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 49 by striking out lines 20 to 31 at page 27 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) Notwithstanding subsection 48(1), the Canadian Transport Commission shall, in consultation with the railway companies and such system participants as it deems appropriate, promote reciprocal and other arrangements between the railway companies for the interchange of grain and shall require the railway companies to establish rates for joint line movement of grain to Prince Rupert and Ridley Island from any point on any line of railway other than a line of railway of the Canadian National Railway Company and shall require Canadian Pacific Limited and Canadian National railway Company to establish rates for joint line movement of grain to Churchill and such rates to Prince Rupert, Ridley Island, and Churchill shall not exceed the rates that would apply for single line movements."

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 158

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 59 by striking out lines 22 to 26 at page 34 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*a*) the apportionment of costs between the Government of Canada and the shippers of grain in respect of the period beyond the 1985-1986".

Motion No. 161

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 59 by adding immediately after line 3 at page 35 the following:

"(*e*) the method by which any inappropriate and excessive contribution by the producers determined under paragraph (*d*) might be refunded to those producers; and."

and by renumbering paragraph (*e*) as paragraph (*f*).

● (1810)

Motion No. 162

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 59

(*a*) by striking out line 14 at page 34 and substituting the following therefor:

"59.(1) The Minister shall, during the 1985-";

(*b*) by adding immediately after line 6 at page 35 the following:

"(2) The Minister shall cause a copy of the results of any review or study carried out under this section to be laid before Parliament on any of the first fifteen days that either House of Parliament sits after the completion of such review or study and such copy shall stand permanently referred to any Committee of Parliament established for the purpose of reviewing matters relating to transportation."

Motion No. 163

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 6 at page 35 the following:

"60.(1) Following the completion of any review or study carried out under section 59, the Minister, within 90 days, shall prepare a detailed and comprehensive response to such review or study, including the Minister's acceptance or rejection of each conclusion and recommendation contained in any review or study and the reasons therefor.

(2) The Minister shall cause a copy of his response referred to in subsection (1) to be laid before Parliament on any of the first fifteen days that either House of Parliament sits after the preparation of that response and such response shall stand permanently referred to any Committee of Parliament established for the purpose of reviewing matters relating to transportation."

Motion No. 165A

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 62 by striking out lines 19 to 23 at page 35 and substituting the following therefor:

"thereto, the Government of Canada, in the spirit of the Constitution of Canada which gives to the several provinces the proprietary interest in, and the right to legislate for, lands, minerals and resources within their respective provinces, shall, for greater certainty, confirm the proprietary ownership in all lands and minerals, including coal, within Parcels 73 and 82 of the Dominion Coal Blocks, to Her Majesty in right of British Columbia to hold, dispose of or otherwise deal with, as is deemed fit."

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke) moved:

Motion No. 165B

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 62 by striking out lines 19 to 23 at page 35 and substituting the following therefor:

"thereto, the Government of Canada shall convey to the Government of the Province of British Columbia immediately upon the passage of this Bill all lands and the coal, mineral or other rights on such lands which it received pursuant to paragraph 1(i) of the Crow's Nest Pass Act."

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I just want to make sure that you mentioned Motion No. 33 as having being disposed of in the past.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes. We come now to group D. I believe none of these have been disposed of. Is it agreed that Motions Nos. 71, 101, 142, 157A, 90, 91, 167, and 170 be disposed of?

Mr. Nielsen: Be deferred.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Correction, be deferred.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport) moved:

Motion No. 71

That Bill C-155 be amended

(*a*) by renumbering Clause 35 as subclause 35(1);

(*b*) by adding immediately after line 42 at page 18 the following:

"(2) Where it is necessary in prescribing the annual rate scale to establish rates for distances exceeding those set out in Schedule II, such rates shall be established by the Commission and be consistent with rate-making principles used to derive the base rate scale for distances exceeding 1,200 miles."

Western Grain Transportation Act

Motion No. 101

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 10 to 16 at page 29 and substituting the following therefor:

" "cumulative government share of the cost change", in respect of any crop year, means an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying the number of tonnes of grain moved in that crop year or 31.5 million tonnes, whichever is the lesser, by the aggregate of".

Motion No. 142

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 54 by striking out lines 37 to 47 at page 31 and substituting the following therefor:

"(4) The Commission may from time to time reduce the cumulative government share of the cost change per tonne referred to in paragraph (b) of the definition "cumulative government share of the cost change" in subsection (1) where, in its opinion, that share has been excessively increased as a consequence of the spreading of line-related variable costs over a number of tonnes of grain that is less than 31.5 million moved in any crop year."

Motion No. 157A

That Bill C-155 be amended by striking out the heading "Part IV" preceding Clause 59 at page 34 and substituting the following therefor:

"PART IV
SHIPPER SHARE LIMITATION

59. In this Part,

"freight to price ratio", in respect of any calendar year, means an amount equal to the quotient, expressed as a percentage obtained by dividing the average cost to the shipper of moving one tonne of grain in that calendar year by the weighted average price for that calendar year;

"shipper share limitation adjustment", in respect of any calendar year, means an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying

(*a*) the number of percentage points by which the freight to price ratio in that calendar year exceeds, in the case of the calendar year

(i) 1984, four per cent,

(ii) 1985, five per cent,

(iii) 1986, eight per cent,

(iv) 1987, nine per cent, and

(v) 1988 and thereafter, ten per cent

by

(*b*) the product obtained by multiplying the weighted average price for that calendar year by the total number of tonnes of grain moved in that calendar year;

"six grains" means wheat, oats, barley, rye, flaxseed and rapeseed;

"weighted average price", in respect of any calendar year, means the weighted average determined under paragraph 60(1)(*b*) in respect of that calendar year.

60.(1) The Commission shall, on or before March 1st of each year, using the information that it deems appropriate, determine, in respect of the preceding calendar year,

(*a*) the average price per tonne at which each of the six grains, in storage, was available for sale on each trading day at the port that handled the largest volume of that grain in the calendar year;

(*b*) the average of the average prices referred to in paragraph (*a*), weighted on the basis of the number of tonnes of each of the six grains moved in the calendar year;

(*c*) the average cost to the shipper of moving one tonne of grain in the calendar year; and

(*d*) the freight to price ratio.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1)(*a*), the average price per tonne at which each of the six grains was available for sale shall be determined on the basis of the price per tonne of the grade of each of those grains the largest volume of which was moved in the calendar year.

PART V"

and by renumbering the subsequent Parts and Clauses and amending all references accordingly.

Motion No. 90

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 43 by adding immediately after line 34 at page 24 the following:

"(3) Subsection (2) does not apply in respect of a lower rate referred to in section 46."

Motion No. 91

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 46 by striking out lines 41 to 46 at page 25 and lines 1 and 2 at page 26 and substituting the following therefor:

"46.(1) Notwithstanding sections 43 and 45 but subject to subsection (2), a railway company may, in respect of any crop year, include in its tariff a rate that is lower than that provided by section 43 in respect of

(*a*) any point of origin that was treated as a competitive or continuous point in the tariff of rates applicable to the 1981-82 crop year; and

(*b*) any additional point of origin that is designated by the Commission as a competitive or contiguous point prior to December 31, 1983."

Motion No. 167

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 70 by striking out lines 27 to 37 at page 37 and lines 1 to 14 at page 38 and substituting the following therefor:

"70.(1) For the purpose of applying this Act in respect of the period beginning on January 1, 1984 and ending on July 31, 1984, notwithstanding anything in this Act,

(*a*) the quotient referred to in subsection 36(1) shall be deemed to be 5.06;

(*b*) the quotient expressed as a percentage, referred to in subsection 37(2) shall be deemed to be 76.7 per cent;

(*c*) every railway company, on or before November 1, 1983, shall file and publish a tariff rrespecting the period beginning on January 1, 1984 and ending on July 31, 1984;

(*d*) section 53 applies as if it provided for the rates set out in that tariff to take effect on January 1, 1984, and to continue in force until July 31, 1984;

(*e*) the amount of 31.5 million tonnes referred to in the definition "cumulative government share of the cost change" shall be 31.5 million tonnes, less the actual number of tonnes of grain moved during the period beginning on August 1, 1983 and ending on December 31, 1983; and

(*f*) any provision of this Act that requires anything to be done at a particular time for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act shall be deemed to require that thing to be done at such time as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection in respect of the period beginning on January 1, 1984 and ending on July 31, 1984."

Motion No. 170

That Bill C-155 be amended by adding immediately after line 17 at page 38 the following:

"Coming into Force

71. This Act or any provision thereof shall come into force on a day or days to be fixed by proclamation."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We come now to group E. Is it agreed that Motions Nos. 82 and 160A be deferred?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport) moved:

Motion No. 82

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 39 by striking out lines 13 and 14 at page 22 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*a*) volume-related variable costs, $590 million; and".

Recommendation
(pursuant to Standing Order 79(6))

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons that Bill C-155, An Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, be amended in subclause 39(1) by striking out paragraph (*a*) thereof and substituting the following paragraph therefor:

"(*a*) volume-related variable costs, $590 million; and".

Motion No. 168

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 70 by striking out lines 15 to 17 at page 38 and substituting the following therefor:

"(2) On or before April 15, 1984, the Minister may, subject to such terms and conditions as the Treasury Board may approve, pay an amount not exceeding $82 million dollars to the Canadian National Railway Company and an amount not exceeding $95 million dollars to Canadian Pacific Limited in respect of movements of grain during the period beginning on August 1, 1983 and ending on December 31, 1983.

(3) On or before April 15, 1984, the Minister may, subject to such terms and conditions as the Treasury Board may approve, pay to shippers of rapeseed or canola meal or rapeseed or canola oil or linseed meal or linseed oil processed in the Western Division from grain a sum equal to the difference between the freight rate paid by them for the movement of that commodity during the period beginning on August 1, 1983 and ending on December 31, 1983 and the freight rate that would have been paid by those shippers for shipping that commodity under the freight rates that are effective on January 1, 1984 had those rates been in force during that period."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We come now to group F. Is it agreed that Motions Nos. 148, 145, 153, 154, 154A, 159 and 92 be deferred?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 148

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 55 by adding immediately after line 29 at page 32 the following:

"(4) For greater certainty, it is declared that for any of the crop years 1983-1984 to 1985-1986, the total revenue to be received by the railway companies shall not exceed the aggregate of the volume-related variable costs and line-related variable costs for the movement of grain in each such crop year.

(5) The Commission shall undertake to develop a formula, for possible application after the 1985-1986 crop year, which will allow the railway companies a contribution to constant costs for the movement of grain based on and reflective of new railway investment required to accommodate the movement of grain."

Motion No. 145

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 55 by striking out lines 1 to 8 at page 32 and substituting the following therefor:

"55.(1) Subject to any regulations promulgated by the Governor in Council pursuant to Section 58 and subject to Section 21 and subsections 55(2), and (3), the Minister shall, in respect of the 1983-84 and subsequent crop years pay to the railway companies the Crow Benefit plus the government contribution to cost increases."

Motion No. 153

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 58 by striking out lines 40 to 42 at page 33 and substituting the following therefor:

"58.(1) Notwithstanding Section 55, the Governor in Council may make regulations prescribing".

Motion No. 154

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 58 by striking out line 43 at page 33 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*a*) the manner in which the parties to whom payments under".

Motion No. 154A

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 58 by adding immediately after line 13 at page 34 the following:

"58.(3) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, based upon the recommendations of the committee established under section 59(2) to examine the method of payment, the Governor in Council may, subject to approval by Parliament, make regulations prescribing the manner in which, and the parties to whom, payment of the government contribution, including the Crow benefit, shall be made."

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette) moved:

Motion No. 159

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 59 by striking out lines 35 to 39 at page 34 and substituting the following therefor:

"(*b*) the appropriateness of any method of payment of the Crow Benefit that may be authorized in any subsequent Act as well as the suitability of any formula for the payment of a contribution to constant costs to the railway companies for the movement of grain developed by the Commission;".

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville) moved:

Motion No. 92

That Bill C-155 be amended in Clause 46 by striking out line 2 at page 26 and substituting the following therefor:

"applicable to the 1981-82 crop year or which are subsequently declared to be competitive or contiguous points by the Commission."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 10A. Motion No. 10A is in the name of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski).

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the Members.

● (1820)

The first question is on Motion 10A. According to the agreement among the Parties, this division will also apply to Motions Nos. 14A, 61, 156, 164, 168, 169, 171 and the Minister's new Motion, No. 175.

The House divided on Motion No. 10A (Mr. Mazankowski) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 375*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand	Blackburn	Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Althouse	Blaikie	Campbell (LaSalle)
Andre	Blais	Campbell (Cardigan)
Anguish	Blaker	Chénier
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Blenkarn	Chrétien
Axworthy	Bloomfield	Clark (Yellowhead)
Bachand	Bockstael	Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Beatty	Bosley	
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)	Bossy	
Bégin (Miss)	Bradley	
Benjamin	Breau	
Berger	Bujold	
	Burghardt	

Western Grain Transportation Act

Messrs.

Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Fulton
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Parker
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson (Burnaby)
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Sargeant
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis
Young—257.

NAYS

Messrs.

Nil

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

The House divided on Motion No. 14A (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 376*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Fulton
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart

Messrs.

Malone
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Parker
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Sargeant
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis
Young—257.

NAYS

Messrs.

Nil

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

The House divided on Motion No. 61 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 403*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Fulton
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Parker
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Sargeant
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis
Young—257.

NAYS

Messrs.

Nil

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

The House divided on Motion No. 156 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

Western Grain Transportation Act

(*Division No. 447*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Fulton
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Parker
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson (Burnaby)
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi

Messrs.

Roy
St. Germain
Sargeant
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis
Young—257.

NAYS

Messrs.

Nil

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

The House divided on Motion 164 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 455*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Fulton
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre

Messrs.

Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Parker
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson (Burnaby)
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Sargeant
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis
Young—257.

NAYS

Messrs.

Nil

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

The House divided on Motion No. 168 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 459*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Fulton
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Parker
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson (Burnaby)
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Sargeant
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis
Young—257.

NAYS

Messrs.

Nil

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

The House divided on Motion No. 169 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

Western Grain Transportation Act

(Division No. 460)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Fulton
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Parker
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson (Burnaby)
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Sargeant
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis
Young—257.

NAYS

Messrs.

Nil

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

The House divided on Motion 171 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 462)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Fulton
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudecki

Messrs.

Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Parker
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Sargeant
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis
Young—257.

NAYS

Messrs.

Nil

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

The House divided on Motion No. 175 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 463*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Fulton
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Parker
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Sargeant
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis
Young—257.

NAYS

Messrs.

Nil

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

Since Motion No. 61 has been adopted the question on Motion No. 62 will not be put. The next question is on Motion No. 24. According to the agreement this division will also apply to Motions Nos. 29, 32, 34, 36, 41, 42, 43, 47, 50, 55, 56, 60, 76, 78 and 83.

● (1840)

The House divided on Motion No. 24 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 377)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 29 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 378)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen

Messrs.

Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion 32 which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 379*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche

Messrs.

Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 34 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 381*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 36 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 383*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling

Messrs.

Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 41 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 388)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain

Messrs.

Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 42 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 389*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 43 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 390*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin

Messrs.

Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 47 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 394)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin

Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 50 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 397*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 55 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division.

(*Division No. 399*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)

Messrs.

Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 56 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 400)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey

Messrs.

Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 60 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 402*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 76 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 410*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin

Messrs.

Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 78 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

Western Grain Transportation Act

(Division No. 412)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet

Messrs.

Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 83 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 415*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 33. According to the agreement this division also applies to Motions Nos. 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 52, 58, 63, 65, 68, 69, 72, 77, 79, 84, 88, 90A, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 103, 115, 127, 130, 131, 133, 134A, 136, 138, 140, 143, 158, 161, 162, 163, 165A and 165B.

The question is on Motion No. 33.

The House divided on Motion No. 33 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 380*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson

Messrs.

Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid (St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton-Est)
Nicholson (Mlle)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

● (1850)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 35 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 382)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid (St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin

Messrs.

Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 37 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 384*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 38 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 385*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn

Messrs.

Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 39 (Mr. Gustafson) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 386)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan

Messrs.

Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 40 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 387*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 44 (Mr. McKnight) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 391*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes

Messrs.

Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 45 (Mr. Mayer) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 392*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle

Messrs.

Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 46 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 393*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 48 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 395*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes

Messrs.

Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 49 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 396*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin

Messrs.

Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 52 (Mr. Mayer) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 398*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 58 (Mr. McKnight) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 401*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn

Messrs.

Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 63 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 404*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin

Messrs.

Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 65 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 405*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 68 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 406*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes

Messrs.

Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 69 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 407*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins

Messrs.

Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 72 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 409*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 77 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 411*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn

Messrs.

Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 79 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 413*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle

Messrs.

Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 84 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 416*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 88 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 417*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn

Messrs.

Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 90A (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 419*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins

Messrs.

Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 93 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 422*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 94 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 423*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn

Messrs.

Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 95 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 424)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle

Messrs.

Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 96 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 425*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 97 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 426*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes

Messrs.

Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 98 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 427*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins

Messrs.

Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 99 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 428*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 103 (Mr. Benjamin) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 430*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn

Messrs.

Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 115 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 431*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert

Messrs.

Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 127 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 432*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid (St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 130 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 433*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn

Messrs.

Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 131 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 434*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins

Messrs.

Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 133 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 435*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 134A (Mr. Hovdebo) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 436*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn

Messrs.

Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 136 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 437*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins

Messrs.

Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 138 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 438*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 140 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 439*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington

Messrs.

Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 143 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 441*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray

Messrs.

Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 158 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 449*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid (St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 161 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 452*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn

Messrs.

Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 162 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 453*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray

Messrs.

Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 163 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 454*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid (St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 165A (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 456*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington

Messrs.

Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 165B (Mr. Parker) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 457*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)

Western Grain Transportation Act

Messrs.

Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The next question is on Motion No. 71. According to the agreement, this division also applies to Motions Nos. 74A, 90, 91, 101, 142, 157A, 167 and 170.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I am just curious to know when we will decide on Motions Nos. 40, 49, 78, 134A, 84 and 165B. The reason I ask, Sir, is as follows: a negative vote—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In the interests of following each other, could the Hon. Member indicate which group these motions are from?

Mr. Deans: Yes, I will, group No. C, which we have just completed voting on. The following situation arises: a negative vote on Motion No. 39, which we have just completed, necessitates a vote on Motion No. 40. A negative vote on Motion No. 48, which we have just completed, necessitates a vote on Motion No. 49. A negative vote on Motion No. 133, which we have just completed, necessitates a vote on Motion No. 134A. A negative vote on Motion No. 83, which we have just completed, necessitates a vote on Motion No. 84. A negative vote on Motion No. 165A, necessitates a vote on Motion No. 165B. Finally, a negative vote on Motion No. 77, necessitates a vote on Motion No. 78. I was wondering if you might go through those now, Sir, in order that we—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member properly raises a point in the interests of getting the record straight. Every one of those motions has been included in other groupings for the vote. None of them have failed to be mentioned individually in the course of the groupings. The point the Hon. Member makes is a very valid point. However, it has been considered in the groupings. There could be a discussion, perhaps, between the officers of the Table, to verify. However, I am informed that each one of these has been considered at some point.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes, they are.

Mr. Deans: I do not see them.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion No. 77 is in group C. Motion No. 78, which has just been mentioned, is in group B, and so on. The Hon. Member, if he looks at the motions, will find that every one of these cases has been provided for in the grouping. They have been checked and rechecked, I am assured by the Table officers. There appears to be a consensus also among Hon. Members close to me who indicate they have also made the check.

Mr. Deans: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry, Sir. This is one of the difficulties when one is working from two different pieces of paper. I asked before the vote started if we would all be working from the same piece of paper. Let me suggest to you that it is entirely possible that Hon. Members might have voted differently—I do not know. I will accept the vote as it is.

Mr. Blenkarn: You have no choice.

Mr. Deans: Well, I do have a choice. The Speaker in his original grouping made the suggestion that I am now requesting be looked at. The Speaker's grouping originally said that a negative vote on Motion No. 39 necessitated a separate vote on Motion No. 40. I am, therefore, not at all sure that Members who voted on the last grouping understood that voting for Motions Nos. 39 and 40 at the same time is the same thing as voting for Motion No. 39, and subsequently having to vote on Motion No. 40.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The point of the Hon. Member is extremely well taken. This was the original observation of the Chair. However, the Chair can only observe at this point that every motion has been provided for in the grouping. Reference was made to Motion No. 40. This was referred to very specifically in group C. I believe that for any motion that the Hon. Member cares to mention, the Chair can provide a point at which it has been provided for.

Mr. Nielsen: We are all working from the same piece of paper.

The House divided on Motion No. 71 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 408*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos

Messrs.

Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

● (1900)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Western Grain Transportation Act

Since Motion No. 101 has been adopted, the question on Motion No. 102 will not be put.

The House divided on Motion No. 157A (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 448*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp

Messrs.

Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

The House divided on Motion No. 90 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 418*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

The House divided on Motion No. 91 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 420*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)

Messrs.

Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

Western Grain Transportation Act

The House divided on Motion No. 101 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 429*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly

Western Grain Transportation Act

Messrs.

Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

The House divided on Motion No. 142 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 440*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

The House divided on Motion No. 167 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 458*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan

Messrs.

Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

The House divided on Motion No. 170 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 461)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais

Messrs.

Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow

Messrs.

Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid (St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—124.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 82. According to the agreement this division also applies to Motion No. 160A.

The House divided on Motion No. 82 (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 414)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (St. Catharines)
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

● (1910)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Since Motion No. 160A is deemed to have been adopted, the question will not be put on Motion No. 160.

The House divided on Motion No. 160A (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 451)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis

Messrs.

Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Kushner
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—228.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kristiansen
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—29.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 148. According to the agreement, this division also applies to Motions Nos. 92, 145, 153, 154, 154A and 159. Motion No. 148 is in the name of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski).

Western Grain Transportation Act

• (1920)

The House divided on Motion No. 148 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 443*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre
Beatty
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Paproski
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Roche
St. Germain
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright—95.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Fulton
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Heap
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Kristiansen
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky

Western Grain Transportation Act

Messrs.

Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Parker
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Sargeant
Savard
Schroder
Skelly
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis
Young—162.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

The House divided on Motion No. 92 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 421*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre
Beatty
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Paproski
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Roche
St. Germain
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright—95.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Fulton
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Heap
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Kristiansen
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Parker
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Sargeant
Savard
Schroder
Skelly
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis
Young—162.

The House divided on Motion No. 145 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 442*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre
Beatty
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie

Messrs.

McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Paproski
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Roche
St. Germain
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright—95.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Fulton
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Heap
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Kristiansen
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Parker
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Sargeant
Savard
Schroder
Skelly
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis
Young—162.

The House divided on Motion No. 153 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

Western Grain Transportation Act

(Division No. 444)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre
Beatty
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Paproski
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Roche
St. Germain
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright—95.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Fulton
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Heap
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Kristiansen
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan

Western Grain Transportation Act

Messrs.

Malépart
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Parker
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Sargeant
Savard
Schroder
Skelly
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis
Young—162.

The House divided on Motion No. 154 (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 445*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre
Beatty
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Paproski
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Roche
St. Germain
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright—95.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Fulton
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Heap
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Kristiansen
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Parker
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Sargeant
Savard
Schroder
Skelly
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis
Young—162.

The House divided on Motion No. 154A (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 446*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre
Beatty
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil

Messrs.

Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Paproski
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Roche
St. Germain
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright—95.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Fulton
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Heap
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Kristiansen
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Parker
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Sargeant
Savard
Schroder
Skelly
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis
Young—162.

The House divided on Motion No. 159 (Mr. Mayer) which was negatived on the following division:

Western Grain Transportation Act

(*Division No. 450*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre
Beatty
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Paproski
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Roche
St. Germain
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright—95.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Althouse
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Fulton
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Heap
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Jewett (Miss)
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Kristiansen
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley

Messrs.

MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murphy
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Parker
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Sargeant
Savard
Schroder
Skelly
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis
Young—162.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This disposes of the motions according to the groupings agreed upon.

There remains Motion No. 174 in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

Hon. Members will recall that, on October 3, 1983, the Speaker observed that motions to alter the long title of a Bill are not in order "unless such substantial changes are made to the Bill that would necessitate a change in the title to reflect the content and intent of the Bill". In this regard, I would refer Hon. Members to Citation 780(1) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, and also to Erskine May's Nineteenth Edition at page 531.

The Chair is not convinced that the amendments agreed to at report stage necessitate an amendment to the title. Therefore, I must rule out of order Motion No. 174 standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport) moves that Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, as amended, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the years have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the Members. Shall we dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 464*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Yanakis—133.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hargrave
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn

Messrs.

Hovdebo	McGrath	Robinson (Burnaby)
Howie	McKenzie	Roche
Huntington	McKinnon	St. Germain
Jarvis	McKnight	Sargeant
Jelinek	McLean	Schellenberger
Jewett (Miss)	Miller	Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Keeper	Mitchell (Mrs.)	Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Kempling	Mitges	Shields
Kilgour	Mulroney	Siddon
King	Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)	Skelly
Kristiansen	Murphy	Speyer
Kushner	Murta	Stevens
Lambert	Neil	Stewart
La Salle	Nickerson	Taylor
Lawrence	Nielsen	Thacker
Lewycky	Nowlan	Thomson
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)	Nystrom	Towers
MacDougall	Oberle	Vankoughnet
Malone	Ogle	Waddell
Manly	Orlikow	Wenman
Mayer	Paproski	Wilson
Mazankowski	Parker	Wise
McCain	Patterson	Wright
McDermid	Reid (St. Catharines)	Young—124.
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)	Riis	

• (1930)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the Bill be read a third time?

Some Hon. Members: Never.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to Order made Wednesday, October 26, at the next sitting of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being 7.37 p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at eleven o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 7.37 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 4, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

[English]

REMEMBRANCE DAY

COMMEMORATION OF SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN

Hon. W. Bennett Campbell (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour for me as Minister of Veterans Affairs to remind all Hon. Members that next Friday is Remembrance Day.

I will have the happy duty next week of accompanying a number of First World War veterans to Vimy Ridge. For these veterans it will have been 65 years since the Armistice ending the First World War signalled their salvation. They had survived the bloodiest conflict in history, and bequeathed to Canada a reputation for gallantry that has been untarnished by time. Remembrance Day was intended to commemorate the memory of those who lost their lives in the "war to end all wars", but on November 11 Canadians will also be honouring the victims of later conflicts.

Next year, Mr. Speaker, another generation of Canadians will be returning to France to recall the fortieth Anniversary of D-Day, the day that returned hope and freedom to millions of Europeans held prisoner in their own lands.

Last month, Canadians went overseas to honour the sacrifice of those killed in yet another war. A delegation went to the Far East to mark the thirtieth Anniversary of the end of the Korean conflict. The welcome given to these Canadians by the people of Korea left no doubt about the enduring respect our forces won in the service of the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, more than 110,000 of our countrymen and women died in those wars. Many others returned home with injuries that would be a permanent reminder of the pain of war.

Next Friday, on the sixty-fifth anniversary of the event that led to Remembrance Day, we should, above all, remind ourselves that Canada's commitment to the almost three-quarter million veterans alive today and their families has no cut-off date, no sunset clause. This commitment continues until the last veteran and the last dependant of a veteran has passed away. They gave of their best, and, in return, they deserve the best.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon), our critic for Veterans Affairs, for affording me the opportunity in joining with the Minister in this tribute, an opportunity I have never sought in the lengthy time that I have been in this House.

Sixty-six years ago, on November 11, 1918, the guns were stilled on the Western Front and Allied and German troops fraternized in the mud of Flanders. Some 41 years ago, the sons and daughters of these same men once again laid down their arms after years of the most horrendous carnage the world had seen, involving battle-fronts in all the corners of the world. Such was our good fortune historically that the gods of war stayed away from our shores in this country, except for brief incursions in 1759, 1774, and 1812-14.

Today, the fires of war are flaring in the Caribbean and Central America as two conflicting world philosophies meet in deadly confrontation. It is our hope, and that of all men solicitous for the continuation in prosperity and hope of the human race, that diplomacy, understanding, and mutual self-interest, will outlaw war from this planet.

Today, with hope for the future and reverence for the past, we mark the deeds of those who have passed into the shades of history. Although vanished, they have gained immortality for their achievements.

• (1110)

Men and women fought and died 40 years ago—and many who fought are still living—so that freedom should not perish. Freedom to those of us who are veterans was more than an abstraction, more than an ideal to serve as a centre-piece for commencement addresses. Freedom was something we understood in the very fibre of our natures, something without which life was not worth living.

Freedom is that without which all of the other blessings of human living become merely ashes. Freedom is man's capacity to pursue individual goals as well as the goals set by society. Freedom is the right to create, to preserve, to nourish the original flashes of human genius without requiring the approval of the state. Freedom is man's right to reach for the stars, whether or not his grasp is adequate to attain the creative ideals which his nature conjures up.

The exercise of real freedom demands peace. There can be no full exercise of freedom in war, where everything is subordinated to the military objective. No society can be more desirous of peace, more anxious to attain it, and more eager to preserve it, than a free society.

The upward movement of the human mind required to produce great literature, art, ballet, technology and other creative arts must have that free play of the human mind which comes only with peace. The free world is dedicated to the cause of peace and the freedom of men's minds that goes with it. We shall do all that must be done to preserve it, and shall avoid everything that threatens its attainment.

Remembrance Day

While the cause of freedom must never intrude in the domestic affairs of others, nevertheless it must be prepared to respond when freedom is endangered. Freedom cannot be imposed on those who reject it, but it cannot be withheld from those who are willing to make an effort to retain it or to attain it.

Recently, in this House of Commons, Prime Minister Thatcher of Great Britain said, "It is time for freedom to take the offensive." Freedom cannot take the offensive by closing its eyes to the incursions of those who sponsor aggression and total control over minds and bodies. Justice may be blind but freedom cannot be, if it intends to survive. Nor can freedom be the cherished possession of the few while denied to the restless and helpless millions around the world.

Freedom stems from the very nature of humanity, from the fact that men and women are gifted with intelligence and the capacity to choose for themselves. By so much as they are denied that right, by so much does humanity suffer.

When creative thinking is placed at the service of the state and reduced to a servile status so that the best and greatest minds are denied the capacity to function creatively, then this is an assault on the very nature of man.

Joseph Howe, in the early days of this nation, had this to say:

> Let a wise nation preserve its monuments, decorate the graves of its illustrious dead, repair its great structures, and foster national pride by perpetual allusion to the glories and sacrifices of the past.

All Members of this Chamber, and particularly those of us who are veterans on both sides of the House, join with Canadians in this pledge to our fallen comrades. We shall remember them. Their memory is green in our hearts.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be able to join with my two colleagues in offering, on behalf of this Party, and in particular on behalf of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Beaches (Mr. Young), our Veterans Affairs critic, some words on the eve of Remembrance Day.

● (1115)

Each year on November 11 we pause, albeit for a moment, to remember the horrors of war, to remember those who died, to remember those who returned from the battle, broken, disabled, and in some cases devastated.

Those of us who lived through the destruction remember the bombs and sirens, and the panic and the blackouts, and the gas masks and the fears—the fear of a letter that might arrive any day from the War Office. We remember the end of the conflicts. We remember the celebration of victory, and we remember the relief tnat was felt that, at last, it was over. We remember the triumphant return of men and women to their homes and families, and the tears for those who could not return.

We vowed—I remember we vowed—never again. We vowed our enthusiastic commitment to peace. We understood that we owed a great deal to those whose lifetimes would be ones of suffering, and we owed a great deal to the widows and families of those who had lost their lives. We were prepared to make sacrifices to make sure that those who had returned, and those who had lost, would never want.

I ask—have we kept the faith? Could we have done better? Have we truly remembered as we promised we would?

We remember all those things on November 11 each year, but that is not enough. We are once again poised on the brink—another world war, perhaps? All around, the signals warn of the possibility—armed conflict in the Middle East, armed conflict in the Caribbean, armed conflict in Afghanistan—wherever you turn in the world it seems that those who have disputes settle them by armed conflict. We see terrorism and fanaticism. We watch as the super powers play politics with weapons capable of total destruction.

I ask, has the sacrifice of all those who went through the wars been forgotten? I do not think so, but I do believe that the passage of time dims the memory.

We have to remember every day, not just on November 11. We have to rededicate ourselves to the necessity for peace in the world, to showing by our example, our gratitude to those who fought in wars that were intended to end all wars, by taking up where they left off, and by re-echoing the plea that I remember, and I am sure many here remember—for God's sake, never again.

On behalf of my friend and colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), whose battle for veterans has been and continues to be never ending, and on behalf of all my colleagues in the New Democratic Party, I join in paying tribute and in pleading that in the years ahead we will try to pay our debt to those who served in World Wars I and II, in Korea, and in the other conflicts as part of our peace-keeping effort—conflicts in which we participated willingly. I pray that we will remain mindful of the need to develop throughout the world an economic order that will eliminate poverty and want for all people, and to that end, eliminate, once and for all, the need for war.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

● (1120)

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEDIA REPORTS OF DEBATE

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I have chosen to chew on my own political umbilical cord one more time. A politician who is not sensitive to the need for eternal infatuation with the news media is, to be sure, a person with lonesome neurons. Nevertheless, I elbow our centralized news media about national issues with regional roots.

For the better part of a year Canadians have heard about the Crow rate. The media would have them believe the issue deals with excessive debating, hours of petitions, Members of Parliament still speaking and poking holes in the air with their fingers at 4 a.m., and a beautiful Member of Parliament with silver, curly hair being ejected from the House of Commons. Most Canadians have come to believe that the Crow rate and parliamentary tactics are synonymous.

The majority of Canadains were never educated, however, to the fact that the Crow rate is not just a western issue but a national one. Annually it impacts on $6 billion worth of relief to our balance of payments. It affects the capacity of western producers to purchase central Canadian goods.

Some will argue, with legitimate logic, that a total payment of the Crow benefit to the railways will devastate the western meat industry and other value added economies. Others will argue that variable rates will change the map of prairie Canada, diminishing its towns and villages in favour of a few widely dispersed prairie cities.

Few realize that the present Crow rate legislation does not have the support of any of the prairie Governments or of a single prairie farm organization. Let us hope that Knowlton will give a balanced, objective, educational media report on this national issue before he "Nashes" another goodnight.

Some Hon. Members: Oh!

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

NEWFOUNDLAND'S OBLIGATION TO RECOGNIZE INDIAN RIGHTS

Mr. André Maltais (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the native people in my riding are very pleased with the news that the special report on autonomy and native rights was presented yesterday. I think some words of congratulations are in order for the Committee, which did tremendous work on recognition of native rights, and I feel this is the direction in wich all native people want the Government to go. However, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the obligation of the Government of Newfoundland to recognize Indian hunting, fishing and trapping rights in Labrador. For four years, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has been trying to get permission for native people in Labrador, in the Schefferville area—they are practically the only people left around Schefferville—for native people born in that region, to hunt, fish and trap according to their traditional ways. However, the Conservative Government of Newfoundland has always denied the Indians this absolute right to live according to their native traditions. Mr. Speaker, speaking from the floor of this House, I would urge the Government of Newfoundland, and especially Mr. Brian Peckford, to acknowledge as of this fall, that Indians in the Labrador region of Newfoundland have hunting, trapping and fishing rights. This is extremely important, and there are daily examples of flagrant injustice in this part of our country, and I think that if our friends opposite agree with the philosophy of the report presented by the Special Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, we should immediately put pressure on the Government of Newfoundland to recognize this absolute right.

* * *

[*English*]

SMALL BUSINESS

RECOMMENDATION THAT EMPLOYMENT TAX CREDITS BE INTRODUCED

Mr. Otto Jelinek (Halton): Mr. Speaker, because of my concern with the very high level of unemployment in Canada, and the fact that small business is one of the hardest hit sectors with respect to lost jobs—in fact 700,000 to 800,000 jobs were lost in the small business sector between January, 1981, and February, 1983—I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) during Question Period yesterday a very simple question, namely, whether he would consider introducing employment tax credits for small business since it is a widely accepted fact that small business, despite all obstacles, still remains the largest potential provider of new jobs.

I expected a civil answer from the Minister, particularly because, when I asked him a similar question a few months ago, he thanked me for recommending such a positive idea and said that it was worth while pursuing. Yesterday, in his answer, you will recall that the Minister, in his pompous and arrogant way, did not even address himself to this very important question of creating jobs within the small business sector. Instead, he rattled on at length about unrelated matters. Obviously the Minister of Finance is either hard of hearing or he intentionally attempted to mislead this House. In any event, I want to emphasize to the Minister that, despite his apparent disinterest in the potential of job creation within the small business sector, and his obvious fixation with bailing out large multinational corporations instead, this Party is committed to pursue all positive incentive oriented recommendations—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

● (1125)

THE MEDIA

CALL FOR IN-DEPTH NEWS REPORTS

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, major events in our global community occur with such suddenness that many people are caught unaware and they become uneasy and anxious. This

insecurity arises partially because many are ill informed and often confused by international events as they unfold.

For Canadians, the major sources of information about global incidents are the newspapers and television. However, the main thrust of reporting in the visual and print media is "news as it occurs", with little attempt to provide background data to put the news in a historical perspective. The communication of appropriate background information to current news is vital if Canadians are to be more aware of world events.

It is time that serious consideration be given to the establishment of a more in-depth international component to our national television networks and newspapers, with more emphasis given to ongoing news and information about the various regions of the globe. This information should be presented in such a way as to provide substantive historical and cultural background material, as well as a review of current political, military, and social developments while limiting, as far as possible, slanted views and editorial comments.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

CALL FOR UPGRADING OF OVERSEAS OFFICES

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, last week in the House I spoke about the situation where Canadian immigration lawyers and consultants flocked into Hong Kong to take advantage of the difficult situation there. Some put misleading ads in the papers, and charged big fees for work the Canadian Embassy could do for nothing. It got so bad that the Embassy took out counter ads. This situation gave Canada a bad reputation.

I am happy to report to the House I have had discussions with the immigration section of the Canadian Bar Association, whose members are self policing and who report bad or misleading ads, and are trying to upgrade the status of immigration lawyers generally. I think that is a very good response. In return, I would like to ask that the Government and the Minister responsible upgrade our immigration offices in Hong Kong, Islamabad, and in Delhi. The people are burning out there. Money to improve the facilities there is tied up in Treasury Board.

There is a further problem. I warn the Government that the immigration policies themselves are inequitable. The implication is that if you are a Chinese Canadian with a brother or sister in Hong Kong, you cannot get them in under family reunification, but if you have $250,000 or $300,000 you can almost buy your way in by investing in a business in Canada. That is not really fair or just.

THE ECONOMY

SUPPORT FOR FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, Andrei Sakharov, a brilliant physicist, was the key figure in Soviet development of the hydrogen bomb. For 20 years he was a pillar of the Soviet establishment. As the years went by he saw the folly of communism and called, first, for a halt to the testing of nuclear weapons in Russia, and later declared that the state monopoly "inevitably entails servitude and compulsory conformism . . . people become hypocrites, time servers, mediocre and stupidly self-deceiving." But because communism permits no one to speak against the state he was arrested, and today he is dying without medical treatment in Gorki. I join with the whole free world in asking that he be given medical treatment and his freedom.

The pioneers in Canada built this country on free enterprise, but the Liberal Government has been moving Canada more and more towards a socialist state. The PC Party, under our Leader (Mr. Brian Mulroney), the next Prime Minister, will return Canada to the basic principles of free enterprises which made this country great. We will encourage the entrepreneur, the farmer, and businessman to invest and hire Canadians and expand their businesses. Profit will not be a sin, and taxation will leave some of the money earned in the pockets of the earners and producers. Like Sakharov, we will recognize that economic freedom is the best pre-condition for freedom of thought, creativity and productivity, and Canada will reach the greatness envisioned by our founders. May that day come soon!

* * *

SOCIAL SERVICES

RESTRICTION INSTITUTED BY YUKON GOVERNMENT

Mrs. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, the Yukon Government has instituted a very restrictive requirement for people applying for social assistance. This should not be tolerated by the federal Government. In order to receive social assistance, a person must have lived in the Yukon for one year and worked for three months out of the last 12. Even long-time Yukoners must prove they have made a serious effort to obtain employment. This requirement is causing considerable hardship for people who have no other source of income and require basic help in acquiring food and shelter.

• (1130)

The Yukon is one of Canada's most depressed areas. The mining industry is virtually closed down. Bankruptcies have increased 100 per cent, and unemployment insurance claims are up by 86 per cent. Depleted unemployment insurance benefits are forcing workers to apply for social assistance, only to be faced with these onerous requirements.

The federal Government has a direct responsibility for social services in the Territories and must not condone these unjust requirements. However, the territorial Minister has stated that federal Canada Assistance Plan representatives, as well as federal auditors, did not object to this policy. I urge the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) to put an end to this unjust and hurtful work requirement policy.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

NEED FOR MODERN EQUIPMENT

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, we have recently heard the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Blais), and even the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), make emphatic statements regarding Canada's commitment to the western alliance and to NATO. These statements are most welcome, representing as they do a major shift in attitude by the Prime Minister who, early in his mandate as Prime Minister, sought to withdraw Canada from NATO and, failing in that regard, did bring about a very large reduction in Canada's commitments to NATO and in our over-all defence effort.

In his recent speech concerning East-West relations the Prime Minister did acknowledge that most strategists recognize that strong conventional defences have the effect of raising the nuclear threshold or, in other words, making nuclear war less likely. Most strategists also recognize that strong defences make all wars less likely, and that must surely be Canada's highest priority.

If the Prime Minister and his Ministers are sincere, they will change Canada's defence policy so as to stop the deterioration in our defence capabilities as exemplified by the fact that we still have war ships with vacuum tube electronics, replacement parts for which are only manufactured behind the Iron Curtain, and as exemplified by the fact that Canadian forces in Europe were unable to participate in the full range of the annual autumn exercises this year because of budgetary constraints.

The House and the country look forward to the Government's actions backing up the recent affirmations of commitment to defence made by the Prime Minister and his Ministers.

* * *

ABORIGINAL RIGHTS

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS IN NORTHERN AREAS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, intertwined with the constitutional process in the Northwest Territories are unsettled comprehensive aboriginal rights negotiations. These involve the Dene of the West, the Innuvialuit of the Beaufort region, and the Inuit in the central and eastern Arctic. Federal Liberal Members, in a statement in May, 1983, tied the division of the N.W.T. to three preconditions; first, the settlement of land claims; second, the agreement of the placement of a boundary between East and West; and third, the development of the party system in the politics of the area. These preconditions, particularly the requirement for the party system, constitute a direct interference in the democratic rights of the citizens in this federal colony who are marching toward their own responsible Government.

Members of the NDP support a constitutional process for the establishment of new territories without federal interference in the form of preconditions. In concert with this would be the establishment of a new and more harmonious political arrangement between aboriginal and other Canadians in the North. We also support concentration on the development of the renewable resources of the North, including the use of small scale hydro and alternate energy programs, and we support development of the non-renewable resources of the North in the national interest but with northern control. We support a universal tax credit for all northerners, which would recognize the real differences of the cost of living in the North. We also hope that immediate measures will be taken in the North regarding the status of women in the Northwest Territories, and their particular needs.

* * *

MEDICAL CARE

REPORTED REFUSAL BY DOCTORS TO TREAT 10-YEAR-OLD VICTIM OF RAPE

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, a few days ago in Alberta, a ten-year old girl was viciously raped. The very fact that this could and did take place leaves us appalled, but what leaves Canadians in an utter state of abhorrence and disbelief is the fact that the girl was subsequently denied medical treatment and examination, apparently because no doctor wanted to become involved in legal proceedings likely to follow.

Society has habitually held medical practitioners in high esteem and rewarded them accordingly. In return, society has every right to expect a high standard of ethical and moral behaviour. People expect doctors to uphold the oath they have taken. It is not something to be set aside lightly when they do not want to become involved.

The Alberta College of Physicians and Surgeons ought to investigate the incident thoroughly, and other provincial organizations ought to ensure that this could not happen in their areas.

Parliament extends, I am sure, its sympathies to the helpless victim of this crime, and reflects the feelings of all Canadians in condemning the subsequent abuse to which she was subjected.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DECLINE IN EMPLOYMENT—REQUEST FOR NEW JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration, who was in his seat a few moments ago. The labour force data released today indicates that there were 25,000 fewer people working in October than there were in September, and 47,000 fewer Canadians working full time. Will the Minister be accelerating new job-creation programs, given the fact that unemployment traditionally worsens in the wintertime, and also given the fact that this is the first time since November, 1982, that there has been a decline in the rate of employment?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I would have thought that the Hon. Member would also have wanted to recognize that the latest figures have shown that the unemployment rate in Canada has dropped once again, to 11.1 per cent. That means that since last July there has been a drop in the unemployment rate of almost one percentage point, something about which I think he should be pleased and would want to welcome.

It is true that there is this disappointing aspect of a fall in the actual number of jobs over the past month. This is the first time this has occurred since last November, and I think that we will see in months to come that the trend line which has already been established will continue. There are indications that the economy is recovering and that there will be, as has been the case continually since last November, an increase in jobs, seasonally adjusted, in the Canadian economy.

As to the proposals we will be making, the Hon. Member knows that we are very anxious to finish the business presently before the House so that we will be able to bring in proposals for the strengthening and re-profiling of existing programs, and perhaps for the addition of some new programs for job creation within the context of a Speech from the Throne.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, the Minister can play that kind of a statistical shell game, but the fact remains that there were more people unemployed in October than there were in September. That is a fact.

TIMING OF INTRODUCTION OF NEW PROGRAMS

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, given the fact that there were more people unemployed in October than there were in September, we have a right to ask the Minister if he intends to bring on the new programs about which he has been musing, at this time, given the likelihood that there will not be a Speech from the Throne until December or perhaps even January. These people cannot wait. Why can the Minister not bring on his programs now, rather than getting press coverage for himself by musing upon them every weekend?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am not the one who is playing a shell game with statistics. I did draw to the attention of the Hon. Member that, indeed, there was a decrease in the number of jobs created over the last month. It was the Hon. Member who was being selective in two ways; first, by not giving any indication that there has been a fall in the level of unemployment and, second, by giving no indication of the generally successful record of the creation of new jobs in the Canadian economy since last year.

As I have said repeatedly, it seems to me that the proper way for assessing programs which are presented in relation to job creation is within the over-all context of a Speech from the Throne. If his Party and the other opposition Party had been more expeditious in handling important business of the House, we would have been at that point already.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the Minister and the Minister of Finance talk about recovery. Perhaps he can explain to the House how it is that in the United States there are a million more people working today than when the recession began, while we in Canada are still a quarter of a million jobs behind, and are now falling further behind at the rate of 25,000 jobs a month. Let him explain that, and let him also explain the fact that there were 17,000 fewer young Canadians working in October than in September. What will he do about that?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member, in his excitement, addressed the question to the Minister of Finance. I assume he meant to address the question to me.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Friday mornings you're brilliant.

Mr. Roberts: I would be glad to accept the testimony of the Hon. Member to the effect that I am brilliant although, given the source, I would be skeptical of any such judgment.

I think the Hon. Member and all Members of the House know that one of the most important markets for the Canadian economy is the United States, and it is traditionally the case that when there is a recovery in the United States the full impact of that on Canadian exports and, therefore, on the Canadian economy, is found after a lag period. It is not surprising that the upswing of the American economy should take more time to have its full effects felt in the Canadian economy. That is neither extraordinary nor unusual. It is the normal pattern of events.

● (1140)

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

FORMULA GOVERNING LEVEL OF WEEKLY INSURABLE EARNINGS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. I would like to explore with him another of his strange formulas. In this case it is the one which he uses to determine the weekly insurable earnings for unemployment insurance. The net effect of that formula will be to provide a raise of 10.4 per cent to the highest weekly income earners. At the same time it kicks out of the plan and denies any kind of assistance to people at the low end of the wage scale.

Could the Minister tell us how many people he will be kicking out of the plan on January 1? Could he also tell us whether he believes it is Liberal justice to give a big raise, in a year of six and five, to high income earners, and kick low income earners out of the plan?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in all honesty I must say that I am not exactly sure what the Hon. Member is talking about. If he is talking about the insurable earnings for unemployment insurance, it is true, as I believe was indicated about a week ago, that there is no increase in premiums this year but, as a result of automatic application of the law, there is roughly a 10 per cent increase in the insurable earnings of people under unemployment insurance.

That addition to insurable earnings takes place each year on the basis of a formula of an average over a ten-year period, I believe, and leads to automatic increases in the degree of insurable earnings. Therefore, as the insurable earnings of an employee go up, so, to that degree, do the premiums which are paid to cover those insurable earnings. That is not something over which I have discretion. It is a question of the automatic exercise of the law.

It may be that I have not fully understood what the Hon. Member is referring to, but if I have understood, then that is the answer I should give.

Mr. Hawkes: It confirms my worst fears. The Minister administers laws that he really does not understand. It is an eight-year average, not ten. It will have increasing effects of the kind I described, in the years ahead.

PERMISSION FOR BENEFICIARIES TO ATTEND SCHOOL

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the business of the Parliament of Canada is to change bad laws. I suggest to the Minister that he is administering a bad law. He has not recognized that fact. It is obvious that he has no intention of changing that. I commend that course of action to him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would suggest that the Hon. Member ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Hawkes: The Minister does have the power under the law to allow unemployed people to use their UIC benefit period to go to school. Last month, for which figures are available—

Some Hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Hawkes: Of that one million people, only 12,000 were allowed to go to school to get increased training. Will the Minister administer the law in a fashion that will allow an increasing number of Canadians on unemployment insurance to take training and go to school in order to use their benefit period to improve themselves? Will he do that with the law?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member has essentially confirmed what I said. We are not dealing with a discretionary action on the part of the Minister but with the automatic application of the present law, which we are required to do. He does not happen to like that law. It would be interesting to know how many of his colleagues believe it should be changed or amended in a way which he describes.

Of course, I will continue to use the discretion that I have under the Act to do as he suggests, and certainly I will give very considerable reflection to his recommendations.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

DECLINE IN EMPLOYMENT—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. The Minister of Employment and Immigratiaon just informed the House that we have seen a shrinking of the job market in Canada this month by 25,000 jobs. It is the first time in seven months that the job market has actually decreased. Will the Prime Minister not agree that this surely indicates that the domestic recovery has stalled and, if so, what is his Government prepared to do about it?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I would not agree.

LEVEL OF INTEREST RATES

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, the Conference Board of Canada, the C.D. Howe Institute, and Statistics Canada have indicated that two areas are hindering the domestic recovery. They are high interest rates and an increased taxation that is about to occur for all Canadians. Is the Prime Minister prepared to listen to these organizations, accept their advice, and do something about the excessively high interest rates and the new taxation that Canadians are about to experience?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are always anxious to get advice from the various sources, and of course we listen to what they say. But, as the Hon. Member knows, many economists have conflicting views on the situation and its remedies. The Government is in a different position in that it must make choices, and it does make choices.

I was wondering this morning how the Opposition would manage to seek grief because unemployment had fallen for the seventh consecutive month and the figures are good and encouraging.

Mr. Riis: There are 25,000 fewer jobs.

Mr. Trudeau: I am interested in seeing that the Opposition can still put a sad face on good news.

* * *

TRADE

UNITED STATES DECISION ON CANADIAN POTATO EXPORTS

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In the next 36 hours he faces two important deadlines. At midnight tonight the United States Commerce Department may confirm a ruling which would put a 17 per cent penalty on the export of certain Canadian products to the United States. In this case it is potatoes, but it is a precedent which could, if set, apply to trade generally between Canada and the United States. Can the Minister assure the House that the United States will not take this step, or are we to accept this as further evidence of the general breakdown in the rapport between the United States and Canada?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member is not quite right in his analysis of the situation affecting Canadian potatotes. A number of determinations have been made by the United States authorities, but the final determination as to injury has not yet been made. The U.S. authorities have until December 19 to make that determination. We believe we have a very good case against the finding that would lead to an injury determination.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ENDING OF BAN ON AEROFLOT FLIGHTS TO CANADA

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, the second deadline that the Minister faces is the 60-day ban on Aeroflot flights, which runs out this Sunday. It is now 58 days since the ban was put in place, a period in which the Government has had little but dynamic inaction on this matter. Would the Minister indicate if it is the Government's intention to extend the ban?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when the Government acted to suspend Aeroflot flights, the Hon. Member will recall that it was the first Government which took action. The action that was taken by the Government of Canada has been longer and more intensive than any action by any other Government.

While the suspension of Aeroflot flights is still in existence as of today, it was waived many weeks ago with respect to most other countries. Therefore, there is no basis to describe Canadian action in the terms which the Hon. Member has used.

Mr. Stevens: Have you got compensation?

Mr. MacEachen: When we did make that suspension for 60 days it was made with a purpose, with a specific term, and it is not the intention of the Government to extend that—

Mr. Stevens: Shame.

Mr. MacEachen: —beyond the present period, which expires on November 6.

Mr. Stevens: What about the compensation?

* * *

FORESTRY

GOVERNMENT FUNDING OF OVERSEAS PROJECTS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. As the Prime Minister knows, over the past five years his Government has funded over 100 forestry projects outside Canada, internationally, at a cost of over $430 million. Would he tell the House and Canadians generally why he and his Government will not fund identical project proposals, particularly in British Columbia where unemployment in some areas now exceeds 50 per cent?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Guy Dubois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the question about special projects should be asked by a Member from British Columbia. If the Hon. Member's party would be willing to expedite the third reading stage of the Bill now before the House, we would be able to use the legislation on the Crow rate to create a number of jobs in the Vancouver area and elsewhere in the Province. I think this is a program that should create substantial employment.

● (1150)

[*English*]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES POTATO TRADE—REQUEST FOR TASK FORCE REVIEW

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Deputy Prime Minister and to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is a decision in place which imposes a 17.9 per cent surcharge on every shipment, either by the posting of a bond, or by the placing of a cash deposit in the hands of United States authorities. The first decision has been reached in the potato trade structure.

Would the Deputy Prime Minister, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs interested in trade and agriculture, now put together a task force which could accumulate evidence to portray the history of trade between Canada and the United States, the massive imbalance of trade in favour of the United States, and the consequence of a final decision by ITC that, indeed, a surcharge should be imposed upon Canadian potato shipments to the United States? It will cover the whole field of trade between the two countries if they prevail and get a surcharge imposed. Would he do this in co-operation with the Canadian Horticultural Council and the Governments of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, which are fighting the battle alone?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Governments are not fighting the battle alone. The Canadian Government is fighting the battle along with the Provinces and with the industry. Just recently, on the occasion of our meeting with Mr. Shultz in Halifax, the Minister of State for International Trade made a very spirited intervention in the consultations to indicate the Canadian view.

The Hon. Member suggested that we put together a task force. I know that ongoing consultations are taking place between the industry and the Government. I will look at the structure in place and, if it requires strengthening, I would be pleased to consider that, because I think we have a very good case and we ought to ensure that it is put together in the strongest possible way.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

CANADA-UNITED STATES DISCUSSIONS ON ACID RAIN

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It concerns the meeting which he and his colleague, the Minister of the Environment, had with Secretary Shultz and EPA Administrator Ruckelshaus a few weeks ago. Was the Minister able to give to the Americans any commitment as to when Canada would proceed to a 50 per cent reduction of sulphur emissions, which of course is the target that was suggested to the Americans?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that in order to achieve the proper reductions of sulphur emissions, it requires co-ordinated action between Canada and the United States. It is true, as the Minister of the Environment stated, that the Government of Canada and the Provinces of Canada have come together with a proposal which, if linked with similar decisions in the United States, would lead to a targeted reduction. As the Hon. Member knows, at that meeting the U.S. authorities were not in a position to indicate what would be their proposals. They are still under active consideration. Therefore, a joint plan or a joint agreement could not be reached. That is the situation at the present time. It is not any deficiency on the part of either the Government of Canada or the Provinces of Canada.

Mr. Fraser: The Minister's response is completely ridiculous when everyone knows that, sooner or later, this country has to reduce its emissions by 50 per cent; we may as well get started now rather than later.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, from the foolishness the Minister has given us this morning, are we to accept that the Government position is to do absolutely nothing until the Reagan Administration finally gets around to doing something? Is that the position of the Canadian Government?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fraser: Then what is it?

* * *

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

USE OF IMPERIAL MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Could he explain an official departmental work order dated September 28, 1983, which specifies the supply and delivery of 300 years of three-quarter inch road crusched gravel on Transport Canada site road approximately ten miles east of Whitecourt, Alberta, and two miles north on the Gas Co-op Road? Would the Minister not agree that this voluntary and welcome use of imperial measurement applies not only in Alberta but throughout Transport Canada all across Canada?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I did not know that the Hon. Member took such an intense interest in the supplying and piling up of gravel. I will attempt to determine exactly the whereabouts of that location in

Alberta, see how high the gravel is, and see to what degree it is measured in metric or imperial standard.

* * *

AIR SAFETY

PENALTIES IMPOSED ON AIR CANADA PILOTS FLYING METRIC MEASUREMENT AIRCRAFT

Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I have a brief supplementary question. While the Minister is checking out the pile of gravel, would he also consider, given the uncaring attitude on the part of Transport Canada and Air Canada toward that courageous crew who landed an airliner at Gimli because of a metric mix-up, that this is utter hypocrisy on the part of Transport Canada, when it issues official orders in imperial, and penalizes and demotes pilots who accidentally got something mixed up because of a metric dipstick mix-up?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member's supplementary question shows how Hon. Members on the other side are really the Chamber's experts on looking at piles of other kinds of substances. The fact of the matter is that, if the Hon. Member had been paying attention a few weeks back, he would have learned that we established a special inquiry into the Gimli incident. That inquiry is opening hearings in Winnipeg on November 15, at which time the various parties to the circumstance will have the opportunity to present the causes and effects of that problem. Rather than rushing to prejudge, as he and his other colleagues are so prone to do, he should leave it to an independent inquiry to determine the facts.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT IN SASKATCHEWAN—ALLOCATION OF JOB-CREATION FUNDS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Employment and Immigration my question is directed to the Minister of State for Economic Development. At the Minister knows, in the unemployment statistics this morning the only two Provinces where unemployment has risen in the last year are Alberta and my Province of Saskatchewan. In fact the number of people seeking work has risen by 75 per cent in the last year, and the number of people on welfare is up 14 per cent, all since the election of the Conservative Government in Saskatchewan. Could the Minister announce the immediate allocation of more funds for job creation in Saskatchewan, either in special projects or for small business, so that we can have more jobs back home?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I am sympathetic to at least part of the preamble to the Hon. Member's question. However, we have allocated substantial funds to Saskatchewan under Special Recovery Capital Projects. In fact, as the Hon. Member knows, we have, in Saskatchewan, the irrigation works rehabilitation in the Swift Current-Maple Creek area. We have the expansion of the West Agribition Centre in Regina, which is very significant. As Hon. Members know, the amount of $5,700,000 has been devoted to that particular program. We have a major program under way at the Regina airport, an expansion of that airport, as well as at the Prince Albert airport. There is $6 million going to the Regina airport, as the Hon. Member knows.

I had the pleasure myself of visiting Saskatchewan to announce the expansion of the prairie laboratory of the National Research Council, which is an additional $6 million investment in that area. All these investments have created, are creating, and will continue to create jobs as these projects are completed within the time frame set by the Special Recovery Capital Projects criteria, established by the Minister of Finance back in April. It was that they would be started within six months, which is what is being done, and that at least 60 per cent to 70 per cent of those projects would be completed within the next two years. I suggest that is the time frame about which we all must be concerned with respect to job creation. We are certainly doing our part.

• (1200)

I share the view of the Hon. Member that we must encourage the provincial Governments as well to do their part in bringing in complementary programs which will absorb that kind of unemployment to which the Hon. Member makes reference.

REGINA WATER FILTRATION PLANT PROJECT

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, we still have had the highest increase in unemployment in the country in the last year. The Minister and his Government have been approached to put forward funding for a $15 million carbon filtration plant for the water system in Regina and Saskatoon. They are delaying that. Can the Minister assure us that the federal Government will pay half the cost of this important project, in order to put people back to work? Second, if he cannot assure us now, when will he be making an important announcement for the people of Saskatchewan?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that the issue of the water problem in Regina is one that has preoccupied both levels of government for some time. There has been much discussion as to what the most sensible approach would be, whether it would take the form of a pipeline from Lake Diefenbaker, or whether there should be an irrigation canal. At the moment it looks like the carbon filtration plant, as suggested by the Hon. Member, is a sensible thing to do, certainly in the near term. Negotiations and discussions are ongoing with the Province of Saskatchewan. I expect to be meeting with the Province in the relatively near future with

respect to the economic and regional development agreements. Undoubtedly that subject will also be pursued in the course of those discussions.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—CONSULTATION ON CONVENING OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis in his capacity as Chairman of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. I do not have yesterday's *Hansard*, and I do not say that critically because I realize the extraordinary burden placed upon the printing facilities after yesterday's proceedings, but, if I recall correctly, in response to my question yesterday, the Government House Leader said that he would be consulting with the Chairman of the Standing Committee with a view to having referred to that Standing Committee the question of the mismanagement of arrangements by the Government to obtain the rescue of Canadian citizens caught in Grenada. Has the consultation taken place? Will that matter be referred? If so, when?

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I take objection to the comment by the House Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition about the mismanagement of Government. I have to take exception, and I do take exception.

Second, the Hon. Member saw me in the House throughout the full Question Period yesterday. It was only at 3 o'clock, after Question Period was over, that I left to receive a telephone call. I had been expecting a question. When I came back, the Hon. Member was right in the middle of questions with regard to the Foreign Affairs Chairman and the Committee. I am still consulting. He saw that just a minute ago the critic for the Official Opposition, the Hon. Member for York-Peel, asked me what I intend to do. I will tell him what I intend to do.

As soon as the House comes back on November 14, or next Monday as the case may be, and I do not know what the House Leader will do, the Supplementary Estimates will be before the House of Commons. I want the Hon. Member to know that I do not receive marching orders either from the House Leader—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis is giving a lengthy reply.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: I have a very brief supplementary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon seems to be able to trigger very lengthy replies.

REQUEST THAT STEERING COMMITTEE MEET

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, the last thing I would want to do would be to trigger the Hon. Member for Saint-Denis. Will he call a Steering Committee meeting today?

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I shall call the Steering Committee in due time, when I finish my consultation.

* * *

CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE

SENATE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Solicitor General. It relates to the Senate Committee report on the Canadian Security Intelligence Service, Bill C-157. As the Minister will be aware, the report was virtually a clause by clause repudiation of the major provisions of that Bill. Does the Solicitor General accept the principal recommendations of the Senate Committee?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I would have interpreted the principal recommendations of the Committee as urging Parliament to deal quickly with the creation of an agency to see to Canada's national security, based on the Security Service in the RCMP. I would have seen it as an endorsement of the principle of separation. In that sense, I welcome the report. I spent a considerable amount of time last night reading it. I have undertaken to consult with my colleagues about it. I hope to be in a position to respond to that report on behalf of the Government in early December.

PRESENTATION OF LEGISLATION

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. After such a long wait to get the original Bill which was proposed by the Minister, and to find that that Bill consisted of a major assault on the civil liberties of Canadians, can we assume from the Minister's response that we are now going to have a brand new Bill presented to us, with very major surgery performed on it in accordance with some of the principal recommendations of the Senate Committee?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I would say that the report has been very helpful to the Government and helpful to the country in increasing the understanding of national security issues. I have expressed my view and contradicted the interpretation that the Hon. Member gave to the Bill. What I think would be timely would be to have the views of the Opposition, both of the Conservative Party and of the New Democratic Party, which would be of considerable assistance to me in advising my colleagues as to the proposal to establish a security agency and to implement

the other aspects of the Bill to which reference was made in the report.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

LEASING OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUILDING

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In his absence, I will direct it to the Minister of Public Works. It is a question that might be answered by either Minister. Can the Minister indicate to the House the cost of leasing the DVA building from Rampart Enterprises during the term of the lease which is, I understand, for 35 years? Will the Minister consider tabling the leasing agreement in the House, or making a copy of it available to interested Members?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Hon. Member, with his long experience in the House, would not expect me to have at my fingertips that type of information. I will obviously look into it and write to him directly.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVASION OF GRENADA—SUGGESTED INVESTIGATION OF DEATHS ON ISLAND

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I am sure he is aware of the fact that there are many Canadians of Grenadian origin, their families having come from Grenada. There has been great loss of human life on the island of Grenada. These people have no way of finding out who has been killed, what has happened to the bodies, and so forth. Why will the Minister not support an interparliamentary group representing all Parties to observe the situation and bring back information to Canada?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has raised the question of loss of life in Grenada and the identity of persons who may have lost their lives, particularly those who have been engaged in combat. I have requested information be gathered on the numbers who may have been affected, and their identity, if possible. I think there are efficient ways of collecting that information without sending a parliamentary committee.

● (1210)

ADMISSION OF REFUGEES TO CANADA

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to ask a question of the Minister of Employment and Immigration or of the Right Hon. Prime Minister. Since they have both left the Chamber, I will ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Returning CUSO volunteers indicated they heard that prisons had been opened and many criminals and murderers had been let out on the streets. They are also hearing that the army of occupation is attempting to search down former members of the New Jewel Movement. Is Canada going to open its doors to refugees, and how is it going to screen the refugees who do apply?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I understand that very early next week an interim Government will be put in place in Grenada. According to my reports prisoners did escape, if that is the correct word, including political prisoners and criminals. The criminal element has been brought back into the prisons. Mr. Speaker, if there is a requirement for a refugee program, although at the moment there may not be, the Government would consider it. It is premature to reach a conclusion until the interim Government is in place as indicated by the Governor General.

* * *

MEDICAL CARE

REPORTED REFUSAL BY DOCTORS TO TREAT 10-YEAR-OLD VICTIM OF RAPE

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. This week there was a ten-year old rape victim who was refused medical help for the reason that doctors who were asked to help "did not want to get involved in legal procedures". I recognize this is a complicated matter. Has the Minister had consultations with either the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General on how information or evidence might be received and yet desperately needed medical help be given when there are legal implications? What advice does she have for the House or for her colleagues?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I expected the Hon. Member to ask when we were going to table the Medicare Act. He does not seem to be interested in that. He asked me a question which clearly should be directed to the Minister of Justice.

As to the responsibility which would fall in the field of health for the conduct of a doctor who refuses help and medical assistance to any patient, which I must advise him is provincial, this should be referred immediately to the Province in question. I have not been made aware by the Hon. Member of the incident and it has not been brought to my attention. Therefore I have to answer in a general theoretical way that that conduct should be reported immediately to the provincial medical association and to the provincial minister.

AGRICULTURE

CONVENING OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Rimouski-Témiscouata in her capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. The Committee has not met since September 12. There are many matters affecting agriculture. One of them was raised in the House today regarding agricultural trade and there is the whole area of farm finance. Would the Hon. Member be prepared to give us a commitment that she will approach her House Leader to see if, immediately upon our return on November 14, the very distinguished and hard-working Committee would again have a chance to meet and address some of the major concerns in the agricultural sector of the economy?

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Éva Côté (Rimouski-Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the Member for Portage-Marquette on being appointed official critic for the Progressive Conservative Opposition, thus taking the place of the Member for Elgin. I also wish to thank the Hon. Member for Elgin who, during the three years I have been a Member of the Agriculture Committee, has worked very hard to make the Committee's proceedings a success.

There are a number of reasons why the Committee did not sit, but first I should say that from the outset, the Committee has been very successful in examining a number of Bills, including Canagrex. The Members of the Agriculture Committee have been travelling because they sat on the Transport Committee in connection with Bill C-155.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Could the Hon. Member perhaps answer the question?

Mrs. Côté: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. It is the first time the Member for Portage-Marquette asked me about the Agriculture Committee, and it seems to me that the most important piece of legislation was Bill C-155, which is before the House today and is of particular interest to farmers. When the House resumes sitting on November 14, I should be glad to get in touch with Committee Members to find out what can be done.

* * *

[*English*]

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR CASH ADVANCE PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. The elevators in the Drumheller area are jammed, no grain has been moved for weeks, and many farmers are unable to deliver their quotas. The elevators in southern Saskatchewan are empty, and the Canadian Grain Commission indicated that in the last month they have delivered several million tonnes of grain less than they delivered last year. In view of these facts will the Minister investigate and arrange for an increase in the cash advance payments, to give the farmers some cash until the Canadian Wheat Board is able to get some cars into the area, or deal with the quota issue in southern Saskatchewan in order to start the grain moving again?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be examining the exact situation that the Hon. Member has drawn to my attention.

The broader question of advance payments is a matter that is now being very thoroughly examined by the Minister of State responsible for the Wheat Board. I hope that he will have some recommendations to bring forward to Cabinet very shortly. He has been waiting for the close of the 1983 crop year which is now virtually complete, and we expect to have some recommendations from him. Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member's question demonstrates once again how important it is that we finally complete our discussion on the Crow so that we will have no problems in transportation in western Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

STATISTICS CANADA

NUMBERS COUNTED IN LABOUR FORCE

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the question asked by the Hon. Member for St. John's, and is for the Minister responsible for Statistics Canada. We are quite pleased with the 11.1 per cent unemployment rate, but is it not a fact that the unemployment rate is down because he has reduced the number of people in the labour force by 52,000? What happened to those 52,000? Did they get the flu? Why were they taken out of the total labour force? What happened in Canada? Did we all of a sudden lose people? Is there a reduction in population? What is the problem?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member should have some more information on the labour force survey, and I should be happy to give him a full briefing session, if he so desires. Why 52,000 people disappeared from the statistics? The reason is that the survey includes the following question: Did you seek employment during the last six months? If the answer is yes, the respondent is supposed to answer a sub-question: Did you seek employment during the last four weeks? As far as the people referred to by the Hon. Member are concerned, they answered no to the second question, to indicate that they had not sought employment during the last few weeks. That explains the difference, but I should be very happy, and I am sure the Chief Statistician of Canada would be as well, to provide a more comprehensive information session for the Hon. Member.

[*English*]

SHIPBUILDING

WAIVING OF CONTRACT PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Supply and Services. In light of the fact that bidding tenders on new ship construction were conditional on bid bonds and were priced on surety bond requirement, why did the Minister waive the contract performance requirements on contracts let on recent shipbuilding needs? Is the waiving of surety bonds a new Government policy?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I wish the Hon. Member would give me a few examples before I try to answer his question.

[*English*]

GUIDELINES GOVERNING CONTRACTS

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the same Minister. The Department of Supply and Services and Treasury Board both have guidelines on the letting of contracts. We remember the *Bonaventure* experience, and the fact that seven vessels built in 1982 are now either total write-offs or are in shipyards being repaired at prices beyond the original contract. Why are the Minister and the President of the Treasury Board not enforcing the guidelines at hand, to protect the public purse? A very serious situation exists in light of the contracts set, and it looks as though we are into a series of runaway price escalations.

● (1220)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, obviously, the question does not make sense, because I asked the Hon. Member to give me one or several examples of specific ships where we did not follow common practice, and he mentions the *Bonaventure*, which is something that happened many years ago. The letting of contracts was done as expeditiously as possible, Mr. Speaker, to create employment in Canadian shipyards, because that is what Canadian workers need at this time.

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, if you seek the unanimous consent of the House that Orders of the Day be now read, I have good reason to believe that no one will object and that, therefore, the House would consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement that we now proceed to Orders of the Day?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport) moved that Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, be read the third time and do pass.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the spirit with which we conducted business last night has carried over to today and will allow us, if I may draw an analogy from a movie I watched last night, to begin the "last waltz" on the Crow Bill.

I should like to say how enjoyable it has been to be a part of this interesting exercise over the past several months—perhaps we could even say years. It seems that after all this time, after the millions of words intered and the hundreds of pages of *Hansard*, a final round of speeches and declarations might be redundant. I believe it is useful, however, to recognize what an important and significant occasion this is. The House is engaged in final debate on a piece of legislation that will have important and beneficial significance for all Canadians for a long time to come.

This morning the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) said that in the last several weeks far too much attention has been paid by the media to the parliamentary games, the high jinks, the "Tory trot" where they bounced all over the dance floor, and the "NDP frug" where they stayed in one place and kept saying no, no, no. The concentration on those particular antics missed the point. As the Hon. Member for Crowfoot said, the media should be concentrating on the substance and depth of this Bill and the impact it will have. It has given a lot of occasion for commentary and an assessment of the machinations of the Parties as we zigzagged our way through the exercise, and certain columnists have had a chance to vent their ageing spleen on various people and personnel. The fact is, however, that the House has been engaged in a very important and significant initiative. It has been developing a basis for future growth and economic activity, not just in western Canada but in the entire country.

I think it is important that we recognize that all this took place only because of the extraordinary effort and initiative of a few key individuals. I am sure the history books will record better than I can in a short speech the names of those who played an important part in this legislation. I should like to take a moment, however, to pay tribute to certain individuals who were instrumental in bringing us to the point where we are about to decide on the importance of the Crow rate.

First and foremost I am sure Hon. Members would join me in paying tribute to my predecessor in this portfolio, the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin), the former Minister of Transport. He was the author of the basic blueprint.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Axworthy: Through his perseverance, initiative and intelligence, he was able to devise a plan and work with a variety of groups to develop a proposal. Sometimes we tend to forget that the plan was based on the most extraordinarily extensive consultations ever undertaken with any piece of legislation. Hundreds of groups and thousands of individuals were brought in for in depth discussion and examination which culminated in the Gilson report. Members of major farm organizations, railroads and shippers were brought together in one place to hammer out the architecture for the reorganization of their programs. I think we all recognize the important contribution that the Minister of State for External Relations has made in this area.

Some very able Parliamentarians on this side of the House helped the Minister. I mention the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael) and the Hon. Member for Parkdale-High Park (Mr. Flis) who, as his Parliamentary Secretary, sometimes escaped both the burden and the glory. Both were able to provide backup and support in the organization of the Bill.

I should also like to pay tribute to Members of the Transport Committee who spent many months at hearings in Ottawa and across the country. They listened to over 200 briefs and gave everyone who wanted it a chance to be heard. No one was turned down. Everyone who appeared had the right to give a presentation. Members from all sides of the House were party to that very important contribution. My only regret is that the chairman of the Committee, the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne), is not in the House today to share in this moment. Unquestionably, of all those involved in the Committee, he was the leader. We on this side of the House would like to pay homage to his contribution to this very important piece of legislation.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Axworthy: I think it is important to recognize a number of other individuals who are not Members of the House but who also contributed. A number of very fine, highly qualified and dedicated public servants worked hundreds of thousands of hours not only in putting the Bill together, but in attending committee hearings, providing material and responding to the inquiries of Members of Parliament. Those men and women are very much part of this historical moment. A number of dedicated individuals in groups and organizations across Canada spent time on the Bill—not always in total harmony or agreement, we concede.

I think of many people from my Province who spent time in Ottawa with their organization in an effort to develop the best interests of their members and to represent the interests of the farming community and the various agrarian groups in Canada.

I want to mention all these people, Mr. Speaker, because regardless of what position was taken, no one can denigrate or downgrade the significance of what they are doing. I think it is important in this final round of debate that we clear away the sometimes intense interchange between Members of Parliament and come back to the basic consideration of what we are trying to do and what will be achieved by this legislation.

First and foremost, we are addressing the most critical factor, the most undeniable and essential ingredient in the prosperity of western agriculture, and that is the ability to move the product to market. The agrarian agricultural system of western Canada is almost unique in that it has to export virtually all its product. The geography of the west requires that the product be moved long distances by rail. Without that system of rail transportation, we could not sell. If we could not sell, we could not gain the kind of economic growth of which the entire country is the beneficiary.

● (1230)

One thing which has been clear for years, Mr. Speaker, is that freight rates have been a key to that development of western agriculture. However, we also have to recognize that something which has becme imbedded in history for well over 80 years must be re-examined in terms of its relevance today. What was becoming increasingly clear, not just to Hon. Members on this side of the House but to a wide variety of people, is that that system of freight rates was becoming counterproductive. It was preventing the development of a modern, up-to-date transportation system which would allow us to give certainty of market to our buyers, so that when they bought a bushel of grain from the Wheat Board or any other seller, they would be assured that the grain would be delivered on time and at a good price. We know from recent history that this is not the case right now. The reason it is not the case is that the Crow rates provide insufficient revenues to allow the railways to maintain a decent level of investment in the plant, rolling stock and maintenance of those railway lines to ensure that delivery. That is a simple, fundamental fact.

We are not going to get a good system of transportation if it cannot be paid for. If the money is not there to update it, to modernize it, to upgrade it, to make sure we have the hopper cars, the proper switching materials and the trackage, there will not be an efficient railway system which is so essential to western agriculture.

What was clear over the years is that the revenue base conditioned by the Crow was shrinking. There is an interesting article in today's *The Globe and Mail* which I would recommend to Hon. Members. It is the beginning of a continuing series about the CPR. It points out that when the Crow rate was first brought in, transportation represented 20 per cent of the farmers' costs. Today it represents 3 per cent or 4 per cent of those costs. Those are accurate figures and there is no one in this House who can deny it.

The fact of the matter is that over the years those rates have fluctuated up and down. However, what was becoming increasingly clear was a revenue shortfall. It does not take a great deal of wit about economics to realize that unless we can provide a system of payment to the railways to ensure a continuous, stable flow of revenue, it will be impossible for the railways to go to the capital market and generate the $15 billion or $16 billion worth of capital required in order to

modernize the branch lines, the main track and the communication systems. There is no lender in North America or around the world who would lend the kind of capital the railways need unless they could demonstrate they have a revenue base to justify the repayment on that capital.

All the various schemes and formulae which we have heard bandied about over the last year and a half simply do not work because they defy logic and economics. A three-year freeze, a no-freeze, a one-sale-buy-out; none of these things will work. The time has come to end the capricious ad hoc financing of our railway system and to put in place a system which will ensure a continual, ever-growing expansion and modernization of the railway service in western Canada. That is what this Bill is all about, Mr. Speaker. That is why this Government has pursued this Bill against all opposition, because we believe it is the right thing to do.

More than that, we also know that the Crow rate, over a period of time, has begun to develop as well a serious distortion in the range of agricultural diversification in western Canada. It provided disparities in the kind of costs related to one product as compared with another. As a westerner, I believe the future of agriculture and the future of the economy in the west is dependent upon that diversification, on a broadening of our economic base. It is dependent on allowing westerners not only to grow a wider variety of products, but to process those products in western Canada, to have value added manufacturing and development in western Canada. That is the future of western Canada. That is what westerners must build their future on. We must have that diversification, that ability to broaden the base of our economy and to eliminate those distortions in our country.

Mr. Huntington: That is absolute distortion of the truth.

Mr. Gustafson: Pay the producer, then.

Mr. Axworthy: I will get to the Hon. Member from British Columbia in just a moment. Just hold on.

Mr. Huntington: I am looking forward to it.

Mr. Axworthy: The third element of the Bill is that not only does it broaden in the long term a modern railway system and begin to eliminate the distortion—even in the present legislation, if the Hon. Member knew anything about it, which he does not—but it also unquestionably is the largest, single economic growth project in the history of Canada. We are talking about an investment of $16.5 billion of direct capital, never mind the secondary or tertiary benefits. We are talking about direct capital investment. We are talking about over 300,000 jobs. We are talking about benefits spread from one end of the country to the other.

I have to admit to being amazed at times at certain Hon. Members opposite who were standing on their feet with the utmost indignation and opposing a Bill which would have brought hundreds of thousands of jobs to their region.

Mr. McKnight: Name three.

Mr. Axworthy: I am going to name them right now. I will start with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney). I do not want to say too much because I know I will hurt his feelings. I know what a sensitive soul he has, so I do not want to say too much about it. However, what about the 800 workers who are working in the Trenton steel works plant today because of this Bill?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That is not right and you know it.

Mr. Axworthy: Is he prepared to continue to oppose a Bill which is providing work for 800 of his constituents? What about the Hon. Members from British Columbia, both the Conservative and New Democratic Members, who by their continual delay have rejected the investment of over $3 billion in the economy of British Columbia—

Mr. Huntington: Name the Member from British Columbia.

Mr. Axworthy: —with 70,000 or 80,000 jobs going in there.

Mr. Huntington: That is absolutely not the truth, Lloyd, and you know it.

Mr. Axworthy: I want those Members to go back and tell their constituents—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please.

Mr. Gustafson: Mr. Speaker, this Party has never said that we were against development. We were against—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. There is a ten-minute question and answer period following the speech of every Hon. Member, including the Minister. That is the opportunity for this type of crossfire.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would welcome it if Hon. Members, during the course of their remarks on their reading, explain their stand in opposing that major mass of job creation projects. How could one expect the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) or anyone on this side to take the wild indignation of Hon. Members on that side seriously?

Mr. Gustafson: You always have the same answer.

Mr. Axworthy: We listened this morning to the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) standing up and asking "Where are your job creation projects?" And we have been sitting in this House for months with a piece of legislation which would create hundreds of thousands of jobs and—

Mr. Gustafson: Like the National Energy Policy.

Mr. Axworthy: —and that Party has been the opponent of it. How can those Hon. Members expect to be taken seriously by anyone as they stood in their places, waving their arms and flapping their wings with wild cries of horror and resentment, when in fact what they were doing was stopping the engine of

growth which could fuel this economy and create hundreds of thousands of jobs?

Mr. Gustafson: Just like the National Energy Policy, in the same way?

Mr. Axworthy: That is something that they will have to answer for at some point—

Mr. Huntington: Let us go to the people.

Mr. Axworthy: —because their constituents know this. The reason they were receiving those letters and telegrams saying "Quit fooling around in Parliament" is because their constituents know what this Bill will mean to economic growth in this country. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that has been the purpose of the Bill and that is the reason this Government has considered it to be of the highest priority.

We also recognize there are issues which have to be faced. When I was asked to take over this Ministry and met with a number of farm leaders across this country, it was made clear to me that certain issues still had to be recognized. One was the question of the ability to pay the farmers. We all recognize the kind of squeeze affecting farmers under the present grain levels—

Mr. Gustafson: It is too late now, you have done it.

Mr. Axworthy: —but what we were able to do, Mr. Speaker, is introduce into this Bill, passed last night at report stage, a major insurance policy for the farmers through the safety net.

Mr. Gustafson: Ten per cent.

Mr. Axworthy: If the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson) would go over the historical record of grain prices, he would recognize, as I have just said, that at the time the Crow rate originated the farmers were paying 20 per cent of cost, not 10 per cent. There is a continuing fluctuation. If they knew anything about the economics of grain, they would recognize that.

● (1240)

Beginning next year we are providing a 4 per cent safety net, then 5 per cent, 6 per cent, 8 per cent, 9 per cent and 10 per cent, to ensure farmers are protected against any drastic change in the cost/price ratio. We are aware of the problem and have tried to respond with the recommendations put forward by Hon. Members. We recognized their concern and the need to provide that degree of protection and assurance so that farmers recognize this Bill is not designed to provide for a major pull-out. But it does have a ceiling on costs related to the over-all price of grain. That is the safety net and that is why I am pleased we had that amendment passed last evening. I appreciate the co-operation of Members of the Opposition in allowing that amendment to be introduced and passed.

We have also recognized, Mr. Speaker, the very important divergence of opinion over method of payment. Let us clear up that issue. We recognize that the original proposition put forward by my predecessor included a 50/50 method of payment to producers and railroads. But it was the opposition of major agricultural groups in provinces represented by Members opposite which brought about that change. It was the pools of western Canada that demanded that the railways receive full payment. It was the organizations representing the majority of grain producers that spoke with a very clear voice to say the basis of their support is payment to the railways. On that issue we felt we had to make the change.

We also recognize that the issue is not closed. It still must be brought forward for examination. There will be a parliamentary review in 1985-86. To ensure that is simply not a re-creation of what we have had in the past several months, we have also established a special commission to bring together experts to examine the various methods of payment and determine what the impact will be so that Members of Parliament will be able to make a more learned, rational judgment about the proper method of payment to be implemented. We have given further assurances to the groups concerned that not only will the report be tabled in the House, but it will also be available for debate so there will be a clear window through which the views of the different Parties can be expressed.

These examples demonstrate we have tried to respond to the concerns and be sensitive to the issues raised. We have tried to be flexible in making changes. We have accepted many amendments, such as that put forward by the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) on export definitions. Over 80 amendments have been accepted, not only in committee but during report stage. We have negotiated with Members opposite in an attempt to get the best kind of Bill. We do not claim it is perfect but we are saying it is an important beginning.

I would like to conclude my remarks by saying that we now have to implement this legislation well and effectively. The major challenge now is how to bring into full, effective implementation the many important, major steps brought forward in this Bill: the establishment of the Grain Committee, development of the Review Commission, the organization of rates and the ability to provide a more efficient and effective transportation system. We have to bring together representatives of the grain companies, the railroads, the elevators, the ports and the truckers. They are the major players and they will be required to develop the dynamics of improving the system. They will do that simply by displaying what they are prepared to do.

There are in this Bill major safeguards concerning the performance of the railways, not only through examination and evaluation by the Canadian Transport Commission, but also through the sanctions and rewards the Minister of Transport can impose if the railways do not live up to the expectations and requirements we make of them. There are a number of critically essential initiatives which must be taken. This must be done in a spirit of co-operation. It certainly would be in my interests as the Minister of Transport, and in the interests of this Government, to begin working with the farm organizations, municipalities and others involved to make this

Bill work for the interests of western agriculture and the interests of our country. That is our intention now. We can put the debate and controversy behind us. We have to get the Bill working.

I invite Members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, to join in this effort. We recognize there is opposition, but surely they recognize how important this Bill is to their constituents and the country. I hope they will be able to put their feelings aside and, when we vote on this Bill, turn their minds to helping us bring about legislation which is written not just on paper but will begin to take on life and meaning and become one of the most important and significant milestones in the future growth and development of the agricultural system of western Canada and the economic system of our country. Members of Parliament are truly engaged in a rare opportunity to do something of major importance for the country. I am pleased we are now at a stage where we can all join not only in the passage of the bill but its future development and implementation.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, as is his pattern, the Minister has made an awful lot about $16 billion of benefits to the economic structure of western Canada. He will have to pardon some of us if we are a little skeptical about the arithmetic. We have been hearing about $4.5 billion for double tracking, $2.5 billion as early as 1971 at the transportation conference in Calgay, and we see these figures recycled and ballooned one on top of the other and rotated through the press for political purposes.

How fair and how sound does the Minister think that figure of $16 billion is in light of the fact that the Province of British Columbia turned the coal lands over to the CPR in a deal tied to the Crow when those lands in today's market are worth something like $450 billion? This bill does not return those lands to the Province, but rather grabs them from the Province and turns them over to PetroCan. What kind of fairness and equity and sense of well-being does he think that will develop between the people of British Columbia and the federal Government?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware of how the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) is an entrenched skeptic, along with some other attributes that go with that. I will take the opportunity to give him the evidence he asks for. In British Columbia we are talking about direct expenditures by the railways of $5.4 billion, which will result in 87,000 person-years of work. That will mean $3.1 billion worth of labour income, which results in about $4.4 billion of gross domestic product, and about $8.5 billion in total industrial sales.

We are talking about a major project involving over 3,000 workers in the Roger's Pass tunnel. We are talking about several thousand workers in the Prince George area. We are talking about the Valemount to Prince Rupert rail line and 400 person-years of work. We are talking about expenditure of $900 million on the main line between Vancouver and Valemount.

Those are some examples of what is going to happen in his Province, Mr. Speaker. No thanks to him because he has been one of the most obdurate, unthinking and unresponsive Members of this House to that kind of investment. Those are the kinds of projects we are talking about in immediate terms, starting now.

• (1250)

When we come to the question of coal lands, if the Government of the Province of British Columbia had taken any interest in the issue, it might have made some representations to us. It has not done that yet.

Mr. Schellenberger: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister. Before I ask those questions though, in light of the importance of the matter now before the House of Commons I think Hon. Members should be given every opportunity within the constraint of time allocation that was passed by the House to debate this Bill, and therefore, pursuant to provisions of Standing Order 8(4)(*a*), I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson):

That the House continue to sit through the lunch hour today for the purpose of considering third reading stage of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion the nays have it. According to the provisions of Standing Order 8(4)(a), if 25 Members rise in their places to object, the motion is declared defeated. Shall the motion carry?

And 25 Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It has been confirmed by myself and by the Clerk that exactly 25 Members have risen to oppose the motion. Accordingly, the motion is defeated.

Are Hon. Members standing on points or order?

Some Hon. Members: Questions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) has not yet completed his remarks.

Mr. Schellenberger: Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that the Government would not allow one additional hour for debate. We have been trying to debate the motions in the House for weeks now without that opportunity given to certain amendments that were moved at the beginning by Members of the NDP. One extra hour of debate would have helped a small bit by allowing us to put forward our positions.

In any event, I would like to ask the Minister a question. Given that the Government will not accept the burden to pay this subsidy to the producer, how will the Government deal with the injury to the livestock industry that will be created by this Bill for the next three years until the review is in place? Is it the Government's intention, now that it has not accepted any of the amendments that would assist in this area, to use the agricultural adjustment fund in the next three years in some way to assist the livestock producer in western Canada and the agri-business that the Minister has just spoken of in order to allow them to continue in some manner until this review has been undertaken?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, first let me address myself to the opening remarks of the Hon. Member for Westaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger). I think his remarks demonstrate the importance of what I mentioned in my closing remarks, and that is working in co-operation. If Members of the House had indicated in some way prior to the moving of the motion their interest in continuing the debate, we would have had a chance to consider the motion. However, springing that motion on us by surprise with no prior consultation with House Leaders according to their agreement demonstrates which side is really playing fair on this question.

I can give the Hon. Member the assurance that we would have responded if there had been any attempt, initiative or willingness on the part of the Hon. Member opposite to send a note indicating his intention. I think that that demonstrates that co-operation is working on both sides, Mr. Speaker, not just on one side alone. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the sooner Hon. Members on the opposite side learn that, the better off we will be.

I shall now address myself to the questions asked by the Hon. Member. First, there is a relevance to the livestock distortion through the very fact that the rates themselves will be increasing. Of course, the costs will be increasing. That is part of the rate, but that does reduce the cost differential. I would remind the Hon. Member that if he would look at the projected scale rates, he would see that the Crow has maintained the status quo. If the amendment put forward by his Party had been accepted, that distortion would have grown larger. By not maintaining the status quo, that distortion would not have stayed the same but would have grown even larger. The real fact is that there would have been a higher distortion in those areas.

Dealing with the second part of the Hon. Member's question, Mr. Speaker, we have stated clearly that as part of the contingency related to the review in 1985-86, a $204 million adjustment fund has been set aside in reserve contingency for that period pending the outcome of that review.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. Hon. Members will be aware that I am trying to facilitate the ability of both Opposition Parties to ask questions and I think it would be reasonable, in view of the interruption for the purpose of taking a vote, that we might agree to extend the period of questions and answers until one o'clock. May I ask Hon. Members to try to keep questions and answers very brief? There are quite a few Hon. Members who would like to put questions and comments to the Minister.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I have three questions for the Minister. I will put them all at once and I will put them quickly. When the new Minister lost his virginity at the committee hearings on his very first appearance, he talked about how he wanted to co-operate. He could not do that just now.

Can the Minister name one farm organization on either side of the argument that supports this Bill the way it stands at the moment? Second, what is the Government's policy on the disposition of the Dominion coal lands? Will it return them to the Province of British Columbia, which is where they should be, or will it not? Third, in light of the telex received from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in which the Saskatchewan Pool indicated that unless four fundamental changes were made to the Bill, it should be scrapped, and in light of the fact that at least three of those four changes have not been accepted by the Government, does the Government still intend to leave the Bill as is? The word received from the Alberta and Manitoba Pools indicated that unless three changes were made, the Bill should be scrapped. What is the Minister's response to that?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I find it a trifle ironic that the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) who has been the author of countless hundreds of hours of wasted parliamentary time through petitions and points of order of total irrelevance is now complaining about the loss of one hour's debating time. If he is seriously concerned about using full debating time, why then would his Party have taken up tens of hundreds of hours of parliamentary time when the debate could have gone forward? Why was it that his Party brought forward so many amendments at report stage that we were not able to get to many of the critical and essential amendments but were debating amendments that had been examined in committee for tens of hundreds of hours? He simply brought them back for repetition. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is a presumptuous statement by a very self-righteous Member of Parliament which he has no business making.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Axworthy: I would also remind the Hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, that the questions he asked were questions that have all been answered before in committee and just now. Dealing with the Dominion coal lands, the Province of British Columbia itself has not made the initiative on that question. What kind of discussion does the Hon. Member want to get into about that?

On the Hon. Member's second question which dealt with farm organizations, I would only refer him to the latest series of stories I have heard. One which I would like to relate to him deals with a distinguished farmer from my own Province of Manitoba. He said: "What good is a bushel of grain to me if I cannot give it to someone who wants to buy it?" He said he is prepared to go for it. I would suggest to him that there are

thousands of farmers in the Prairies who recognize that the move we are making is essential to their future and they are supporting us.

• (1300)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I really should not recognize another Hon. Member but I have had the courtesey of being advised of his intentions and I think the House can deal with the matter as it sees fit.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I wonder whether the Government might not reconsider and offer unanimous consent to sit through the lunch hour?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I will put that question and then I will call it one o'clock, depending, of course, on the decison. Is there unanimous consent to sit during the lunch hour?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): There is not unanimous consent. I now call it one o'clock. At two o'clock the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) will take the floor.

At 1.02 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me indicate that it is very difficult to deal with a complex piece of legislation such as the one with which we are dealing today in one allocated day. A number of motions were presented and placed on the Order Paper. Probably between 60 and 70 of them have not been dealt with. This Bill is far from perfect; it has many defects and deficiencies. We are being asked to try to cover all its aspects in this final stage. However, I say very honestly that it is a task which cannot be achieved.

I am disappointed as well in the fact that the Government refused to allow unanimous consent on this final day of debate to provide Hon. Members on all sides with another hour in which to express their views and deal with some of the issues that have not yet been dealt with, particularly, as the Minister pointed out earlier, issues which go to the very core of the Bill. Those issues could not be debated at second reading, could not be considered at committee stage or at report stage. We are really being denied an opportunity to deal with major points, such as the method of payment, the safety net and the ability of farmers to pay.

Anyone inside or outside the Chamber who believes that with the passage of this Bill the controversy surrounding the Crow will go away is fooling himself or herself. I say that without equivocation. My belief is that the new Crow regime which will emerge from the Bill will be more contentious and far more controversial than the old Crow. Moreover, there is no doubt in my mind nor in the minds of Hon. Members of my Party that this measure will be most oppressive to western agriculture. Unless major changes are made, it will do irreparable harm to the western agricultural economy, which is still one of our basic industries, the one upon which we rely the most and upon which Canada as a nation relies to a great extent.

When the debate started back in the middle of May, our Party expressed some very grave reservations about a number of matters. I want to deal with the more important matters. Other Hon. Members will be dealing with them as well and with other issues which relate thereto. At the very outset we expressed serious reservations about the ability of farmers to pay more for the movement of grain, particularly at a time when they have had input cost increases of 300 per cent to 400 per cent over the last ten years. Also we indicated that commodity prices had fallen to a level equivalent to 1972-73, that fuel costs had doubled in 2.5 years and that the federal Government was ripping off individual farmers to the extent of $275 million annually just in taxes. We say prairie farm incomes decline by 29 per cent in 1982. We know what happened to interest rates, a 400 per cent to 500 per cent increase. Aslo we know that 10 per cent to 15 per cent of western canadian farmers are on the verge of bankruptcy.

We pointed out that at a time when other countries were increasing their support and subsidies for grain producers, we were going in the other direction; we were reducing ours. Based upon the last ten years, the average subsidy received by United States wheat farmers amounted to $11.41 per tonne, EEC wheat farmers were subsidized to the tune of $19.96 per tonne and Canadian wheat farmers received an average subsidy or support of $6.35 per tonne, which was primarily comprised of the transportation component, the Crowsnest Pass freight rate or the statutory freight rate. Canadian barley producers were faced with a similar situation. They received a subsidy on average over the last ten years of $6.32 per tonne, whereas United States producers received $7.57 per tonne and EEC producers received $32.80 per tonne. This study was conducted by a consulting firm commissioned by the Province of Manitoba.

When we look at Canada in relation to the United States, we find that in the 1982-83 crop year while Canadian wheat producers were supported by the federal treasury through the Crow rate by 37 cents per bushel, United States wheat producers received a subsidy of something in the order of $1.12 per bushel.

We could talk about the benefits or the breaks that Argentinian and Australian farmers receive in terms of freight rate subsidies, but I point out in passing that we are reducing our support to grain farmers while other countries are increasing their support. Whenever that happens, Canadian farmers lose because Canadian producers are price-takers not price-setters. Any increase in freight rate to producers will result in reduced

income because they cannot pass the increase on to the customers.

The second area to which we took very strong exception was the ever-escalating freight rate structure and its openendedness with which farmers would be faced. This structure was being based upon so-called railway costs, a self-perpetuating cost-plus regime for which farmers would pay very dearly. In conjunction with that, the complexity of trying to figure out the freight rate was explained during the process of committee hearings. However, to establish such a freight rate a time frame of 2.5 years is required. Farmers will not know their freight rates for the current crop year until the freight rate cycle is completed 2.5 years hence.

The Minister has come up with a safety net. The general principle of a safety net would be supported by most people in the Chamber and indeed in the agricultural community. But when we look at the safety net which the Minister brought forth, we find on the basis of the calculations and the figures provided by the Department of Transport that for the year 1983-84 the freight rates would have to rise to $8 per tonne or grain prices would have to fall to a weighted average of $144 per tonne in order to activate the safety net. We know very well that on the basis of the figures for 1982-83, the weighted average was $192.88. That is pretty low. It is the 1972-73 level.

● (1410)

As we look at the period 1990-91, in order for the safety net to be triggered, prices would have to remain the same in 1990-91 as they are today. That is not much of a safety net. It is not much protection. It becomes obvious that the farmers will essentially have to be in dire straits before this will have any effect on them. That concern still remains intact.

Third, we took exception to the fact that this Bill locked in the method of payment to the railways. We said that what it really does is, in effect, provide them with a guaranteed annual income. My friends to the left in the NDP support that principle. While they condemn the railways on the one hand, they say the money should all go to the railways. We say that this will further perpetuate the distortions that this Bill was supposed to address. It will perpetuate the same inefficiencies that have been in existence heretofore. It will perpetuate the cost-plus system. This will be paid for by the farmers and taxpayers of Canada.

Quite frankly, this Bill is not going to address those problems which this Minister was supposed to address, namely the distortions. The Minister talked today about diversification and broadening the base of agriculture, encouragement to the livestock industry and the processing industry. I say they will be worse off than before; there is no question about that. That is why in the October 24 edition of *Agriweek*, there is an article entitled "Prairie Groups Withdraw Support for Fed's Crow Bill". I quote from the article:

> In Winnipeg, October 12, the Prairie Farm Commodity Coalition, the United Grain Growers, Manitoba Farm Bureau, the Western Feed Grains Council, Alberta and Saskatchewan Stock Growers said that there had to be major changes to the Crow Bill.

If not, they said kill the bill.

Those allies who were on the side of the Government when the former Minister started this process have now left the sinking ship. They are not in support of it either. I can also quote from an independent group, the Canada West Foundation, which has passed judgment on Bill C-155. It outlines the winners and losers, and I will have more to say about this. The winners are clearly the two national railways. I quote from page 8 of their brief:

> The losers . . . under the method of payment scheme laid out in Bill C-155, the long term interests of western Canada will not be served—major losers in the Crow debate are Prairie livestock interests as represented by feed grain producer and livestock associations. Bill C-155 clearly discriminates against these groups by encouraging farmers through its subsidy structure to produce grain for export markets . . . the biggest losers are western Canadian agribusiness. Paying the Crow benefit to the railways deals a near death-blow to the existing and future agricultural processing in western Canada.

The Minister talked about the great splash of processing and manufacturing activity that will take place. This statement comes from an independent body, the Canada West Foundation. It is an independent think thank which has passed judgment on this. One has only to look at the groups that have come out in opposition to this measure.

What is happening is that of the four or five principles which the former Minister wanted to achieve, only one principle will be achieved. Maybe we will get more capacity in the railways. The railways will certainly get paid. They will be the major beneficiaries because this is nothing more than a sweetheart deal for the railways.

This brings me to my next point. I am pleased to see the former Minister as well as the current Minister in the House. At the time this debate started, we took exception to the generosity of this package as far as the railways are concerned. As I said, it is a sweetheart deal. It constitutes a form of corporate welfare unprecedented in this country. One has only to look at the record to confirm that.

We were also less than impressed by the so-called notional schemes, the awards and sanctions that were being imposed that would guarantee performance, efficiency and investment. We tried in the committee to tighten that up. We also tried to tighten it up in report stage. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) tried in Motion No. 58 to tighten up that provision. Unfortunately, the axe of closure fell and we were not able to deal with that motion. I just want to confirm what this means to the railroads. I am not picking on CPR because I think the other railway will be served in much the same way. I quote from the Wood Gundy report of July 12, 1983:

> The federal initiative will add an estimated $3.50 per share in earnings in the 1983-85 period.

I quote from a recent document dated September, 1983 put out by Wood Gundy commenting on the CPR:

> The Crow revision will be a primary engine of this growth which should propel the railway's net earnings to almost double their previous peak (1981) by 1985.

This will, in effect, double the railways' earnings over their best year ever, 1981, between now and 1985. It really is a sweetheart Bill.

We were told during the committee stage that there is at least $40 to $50 million worth of fat in this package. The two competing consultants who appeared before the committee took issue with that and documented it very accurately. These were some of the concerns that we expressed when we started debate on this issue in mid-May. We still have these concerns today. They are issues that have not been rectified. Since that time, during the course of the hearings and the six months that have elapsed, the Government has really not done anything to allay these concerns and fears. It has provided some window dressing and made a few gestures, but really nothing substantive.

During second reading debate and outside the House as well, the former Minister said that he would look at ways and means of reducing the burden on the producer. He said he would entertain the possibility of adjusting the 31.1 million tonne cap. It has been adjusted somewhat because there have been additional crops which have been brought in. He was going to look at the pros and cons of that. Also, he was again going to look seriously at the method of payment. It was really on that basis that this Bill passed second reading and went to committee. When it got to committee, we found that these matters could not be dealt with. They were found to be out of order, going beyond the Royal Proclamation or beyond the expressed intent of the Bill as it passed second reading.

What happened after that? The former Minister was dumped and a new Minister was named. He appeared before the committee, and I commend him for that, within a couple of days of his appointment. He was the epitome of conciliation and accommodation. He was going to listen to the committee. He challenged the committee to bring forth proposals with respect to the method of payment, a different freight rate structure and with respect to finding ways and means and reducing the burden on producers. He even came up with some suggestions on the agriculture adjustment fund; there was no mechanism to implement that. It was not in the terms of reference.

We have been working at this. My colleague from Wetaskiwin (Mr. Schellenberger) outlined his proposal for the utilization of the agriculture adjustment fund. I commend it to the Minister because, as he says, the $204 million is still in the envelope. He recognizes, and everyone who understands this Bill just a little bit knows, that the livestock hurt is still there and it is going to be worse as more grain moves more freely to export markets. That will simply exacerbate the problem. I ask the Minister to look at the proposal of my colleague the Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin.

● (1420)

The Minister appeared before the committee and said outside the committee that there was one thing that was not negotiable, and that was the method of payment. All this good will that was generated, all this conciliation and these acts of accommodation were nothing but fluff. He had not met his caucus. As well as committing himself to one review that was included in the Bill, the Minister also committed himself to set up a special commission of inquiry under the Inquiries Act, where we witnesses can be subpoenaed and evidence taken under oath, to study the method of payment.

They also found out they had some reservations about the sweetheart deal to the railroads with respect to the constant costs, so the Government set up another study to look at the appropriateness of constant costs, which is really nothing but a profit to the railroads. The railways are going to receive full cost recovery for the movement of grain. Included in that cost recovery is a component for return on investment of anywhere from 18 per cent to 20 per cent and depreciaiton. On top of that, they are going to get a 20 per cent mark-up. It is a 20 per cent cost-plus operation. Without the constant costs the railways are still going to receive more than $1 billion a year for moving grain between their payments from the farmers, the Government the railway rehabilitation and all the other programs.

They are saying now: "Pass the Bill and we will review the impact after the Bill is passed". One review which is enshrined in the Bill is to study the impact assessment, the farmers' ability to pay, the appropriateness of the freight rates imposed upon the farmers. We have been saying: "Let us study the impact on the increased freight rates on the farmer and whether there is a better way to distribute the method of payment before we burden the producers with these exorbitant freight rate increases".

The Government have the cart before the horse. They are doing everything backward. We had a golden opportunity because there was no consensus for Crow reform and there is no consensus now. The reason there is no consensus now is that, this Minister chose to do nothing different from the former Minister. He had a golden opportunity to bring forth a new approach which would have taken into consideration those concerns of western Canada. He could and should have defended the interests of western Canadian agriculture, but he turned out to be a pygmy. He was crushed by the overwhelming influence of his Quebec colleagues. It is disturbing to westerners that, while this issue has implications right across the country, it is a western issue which is being solved—

Mr. Dubois: It is a Canadian issue.

Mr. Mazankowski: Yes, it is a Canadian issue, but the real core of it is a western issue. The implications and the spin-off extends throughout the whole of the country but it is a western issue. The formula for Crow reform has been prescribed, not by westerners but by the politicians from Quebec and Ontario with a western Minister presiding. That is a shame and a failure. There is no question in my mind that it is going to cripple—

Some Hon. Members: Say that in Quebec.

Mr. Mazankowski: Yes, I will say it in Quebec. I will say it anywhere because it is the truth. I regret that very much. I am

surprised that the Members opposite are not receptive to hearing what the views of people in other parts of Canada are.

An Hon. Member: What are the rules on that?

Mr. Mazankowski: Well, someone will cover that before the day is over.

Mr. Axworthy: Where are the pools?

Mr. Huntington: Are they the Government now, Mr. Minister? Are the pools the Government now? Give away the polling and go to the pools.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Vegreville has the floor.

Mr. Mazankowski: The Minister asks where are the pools. I do not see the pools joyously clapping their hands and supporting this Bill. They are not supporting this Bill at all. It only confirms that this Bill is going to cripple the livestock industry and could spell the demise of many farms and farm communities.

An Hon. Member: What did they tell you in western Canada?

Mr. Mazankowski: The Hon. Member opposite who is not sitting in his seat is asking, "What to they tell you in western Canada?" I will tell him what they told us in western Canada. I am quoting from a brief that was presented by the Research Action and Education Centre, Regina, Saskatchewan. They say that on the basis of their calculations this Bill will have the effect of removing some 30,000 to 35,000 farms from rural Saskatchewan during the next decade.

Mr. Gustafson: Right on.

Mr. Mazankowski: These people are worried about jobs. What about the poor farmers that are going to be driven out of business as a result of this legislation? This is not a farmers' brief. It is a brief that was put together by university academics who have an agricultural base and understand the social and economic fabric of Saskatchewan and western Canada.

I say that the Minister has been a failure. He has been overwhelmed and crushed by the influences within the Liberal caucus that have a lot more influence than he. I regret that very much because I know the Minister firmly believes that his method of payment solution is not satisfactory. I know that and I commend him for trying, but that is the way the Liberal Party operates.

Throughout the debate we have opposed those sections of the legislation which we believed to be wrong and we have proposed alternatives. We advanced a proposition that would lighten the burden of producers and give them a chance to adjust. This decision was taken after a great deal of care and deliberation. We went out and heard what the producers, communities and groups in western Canada had to say. They convinced us that the time was not ready for the dismantlement of the Crow and that this was not the time to impose an additional burden upon the backs of producers. Therefore, we have advanced the proposition for retaining the Crowsnest Pass freight rates until the end of the 1985-86 crop year. It would not cost the treasury any money. It would just mean that during that period the railways would not get their contribution to constant costs. That is their 20 per cent profit. We are talking about something under $200 million because it is now a two and one-half year freeze since the new rates will come into effect on January 1. Mr. Speaker, that would have given the Government some time to do its impact assessment and review analysis to see what the effect would be on the individual family farm, the farm communities and the western agricultural community as a whole. They could then look at the various scenarios with respect to the method of payment and determine what effect this method or that method of payment would have upon future processing and the livestock industry.

Speaking of future processing, the canola processors are worse off now than they were before the Bill was passed and their product is being included as a statutory grain. It is ridiculous for the Minister to stand in his place and say that all these new things are going to occur.

● (1430)

We made a very serious proposal. It was practical and was based on common sense. It would have given the producers some time to prepared for any potential increase and we think this was the right way to go about it. It would have been fair and equitable.

We advanced proposals with respect to the method of payment. In an attempt to break the deadlock we proposed freedom of choice, not a formula delivered from on high. We challenged the western agricultural groups to examine the freedom of choice method of payment. The Alberta Government and a number of Alberta farm groups came up with the double 80 proposal. The Manitoba Farm Bureau came up with a very good proposal which would have offered freedom of choice and allowed further diversification in spreading the Crow benefit among a larger group of producers. I am sure there are more proposals as well. The Minister looked at them but then he said: "It is not negotiable". Mr. Speaker, what is the point of pursuing it any further? The Minister chose, instead, and elaborate review process.

Even at this late date we are merely asking that the Minister include a permissive provision in the Bill which would allow another method of payment after the review process is completed. If the inquiry comes forward with a recommendation for another method of payment, there is nothing in the Bill to allow the change to be made. We are asking that the provision be inserted so that by Order in Council, subject to parliamentary approval, a modified method of payment may be incorporated after a review. We contend that this is a reasonable and realistic proposal.

We offered amendments to include the B.C. Railway. I am pleased that the Government saw fit to allow that and, with some degree of reluctance, the Minister included the B.C.

Railway as an eligible railway to receive subsidies under the program.

We proposed ways and means of cutting back on the generosity of the railroads by eliminating the constant cost until we could determine with some degree of accuracy what level was appropriate. The Government suggested that the railways need the money now. They are certainly going to be a lot better off than they were previously, Mr. Speaker. They are going to get full cost recovery including return on investment and provision for depreciation. We said that was fine but that 20 per cent profit was a bit much so we backed it off. I wonder how many farmers operate at a profit of 20 per cent over cost. No business in the world has that kind of sweetheart deal.

We made changes to the Senior Grain Transportation Committee and tried to strengthen the role of the Grain Transportation Agency Administrator. In committee we contributed to a better bill but we cannot support the burden the Government is proposing to impose on producers and the fact that the method of payment is totally wrong. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we maintained a responsible position. We worked hard in an attempt to seek out and prescribe a solution that would be fair and in the best interests of all.

Mr. Pepin: You were divided.

Mr. Mazankowski: The Minister is carrying on a conversation now. He knows that the agricultural community is divided in western Canada.

Mr. Pepin: So are you in your Party.

Mr. Mazankowski: At least we are prepared to listen to various points of view and to work toward a solution. The Party opposite says it has the answer and come hell or high water, that is the proposal; it will be rammed down our throats.

Mr. Pepin: Some day you must make a decision.

Mr. Mazankowski: All this leads to further disharmony and will strain regional tensions in the country. I regret having to say that, Mr. Speaker.

The concerns that existed last May exist today. In terms of the additional burden being placed on producers we say, let us see the review before we accept it. That is a logical, common sense, realistic proposal.

I find it strange that some people are surprised that we advanced the proposal for the two and a half year freeze. Anyone who followed the debate closely might have drawn that conclusion. Anyone who followed the committee proceedings would not have been surprised. I should like to read into the record what I said in debate on May 12, because I think it will put the whole thing into perspective. As reported at page 25382 of *Hansard* I said:

> This Bill will have a very dramatic impact on the economy and social lifestyle of western Canada. It is very, very difficult to gauge the degree of that impact. That is why this House and Canadians in general will have to move very slowly and deliberately on this legislation.

> To begin dismantling the historic and statutory rates enjoyed by producers in western Canada is in some respects to approach the land of the unknown. The social and economic base of western Canada has largely been founded upon the production, distribution, marketing and transportation of grain. Certain patterns evolved as a result of that. The Crowsnest Pass statutory freight rate was a major component of the development of those patterns. In essence, the Crowsnest Pass statutory freight rate served as a constitutional pillar of the western agricultural industry.

I went on to talk about the difficult times that farmers were facing. As reported at page 25384 I said:

> I think a strong case can be made, therefore, for no increase until such time as the price of the farmer's commodity increases or at least reaches a level which will bear some semblance to the price of input costs and, indeed, bear some relationship to the international marketplace.

I repeated that at page 25385. The Minister of Transport was not in the House during that debate so I bring it to his attention now. I said:

> This is certainly not the time to be imposing an additional burden upon the backs of the farmers of western Canada.

I repeated that and I do not know how many times I can say it. I then went on to outline my reasons. We expected change and accommodation when the new Minister took over but we did not get it. Today we are being asked to pass a Bill which the prairie community does not support and the Government is not prepared to listen to us.

I should like to close by saying a few things about the Bill to my urban friends. Those who live in urban areas in the country are probably sick and tired of hearing about the Crow, particularly those who live in urban areas outside the prairie basin. I am sure that they have some difficulty appreciating what the Crow is all about. They are not alone; we have had some difficulty as well. It is a complex issue, more complex than simply a matter of one half a cent per tonne per mile. I should like to remind them of what the grain industry means to Canada. It means in excess of $6 billion in exports. That is pretty important in terms of foreign exchange and economic spin-off. In direct employment, over 150,000 families are directly involved in the production of grain—families, not persons, Mr. Speaker. Employment in transportation and the railway system means at least another 25,000 to 30,000 people directly involved in the industry.

● (1440)

Rural communities, municipalities and cities exist as a result of this important industry. What does this mean in terms of spin-off? In 1981, farmers spent some $2 billion on farm machinery and parts. Most of that was spent in central Canada, in cities where people work in factories producing these important products. And farmers are very good spenders. In 1981, farmers spent $760 million on fuel and well over $200 million went directly into the federal coffers in the form of taxes. In 1981 some $642 million was spent on fertilizer and, again, a good portion of that in the form of taxes went directly into Government coffers. In terms of the multiplier effect, every dollar's worth of grain which is exported generates $4 worth of economic activity. Therefore, we are looking at something like $24 billion.

All of this translates into jobs. Of the tonnage which moves along the St. Lawrence Seaway, 52 per cent is grain. Two-thirds of that grain is Canadian grain. The Port of Vancouver owes its existence to the western farmer. Over 20 per cent of the tonnage which goes through the Port of Vancouver is grain. That translates into jobs. So when we are talking about jobs, let us not undermine that industry which produces jobs, which has jobs in place, because if the farmers are driven out of business those jobs are going to be destroyed. That is one of the points which this Government has failed to recognize.

This session opened with a Speech from the Throne delivered on April 14, 1980. At the conclusion, the Throne Speech has this to say:

> Like all of your colleagues in the House of Commons, you who represent the people of Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia have a responsibility to represent your constituents to the nation. You also have an extra responsibility in the present circumstances to represent the nation to your constituents. It is a task no one else can fulfil. My government is prepared to co-operate fully in helping you to achieve this.

We have a Bill before us, Mr. Speaker, which is being rammed through under double and triple closure by a Government which has no rural representation in western Canada, by a Government which has not achieved a consensus about which the Minister of Transport and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) spoke, by a Government which does not have a mandate to tamper with the Crow because it did not mention the Crow during the last election campaign. We have a Government which is moving to invoke this Bill, which is not supported by western Canadian Members of Parliament, nor the western farmers, nor the western farm organizations, nor the western governments.

I can only draw this conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that this Government, this Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and this Minister of Transport simply cannot be trusted, because if those words in the Speech from the Throne have any meaning, they would not be proceeding with this particular piece of legislation at this time. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the motion with which we are dealing as follows:

> That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following therefor:
>
> "Bill C-155, the Western Grain Transportation Act, be not now read a third time but be referred back to the Standing Committee on Transport for the purposes of reconsidering Clauses 43, 55, 58 and 62."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Benjamin: Are we on debate, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member want to be recognized to speak to the amendment?

Mr. Benjamin: I want to speak on the Bill, thank you, on third reading and on the amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will those in favour of the motion please say yea?

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In accordance with the Standing Orders of the House of Commons adopted, the vote stands deferred.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, perhaps you could clarify your ruling. We understand, first, that the motion has been defeated, so he is not speaking on the—

Some Hon. Members: Deferred!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion has been deferred, according to our rules.

We will now revert to the usual ten-minute question and answer period. The Hon. Member had unlimited time and this caused some concern to the Chair. However, it is quite clear that it is in order for there to be a ten-minute question and answer period.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take advantage of the ten-minute question and answer period. I listened with great interest to what the spokesman for the Official Opposition had to say. I listened for 31 days in committee, nine days on second reading and 15 days or whatever at report stage, and what I would like to ask the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) is, what is the Tory bottom line?

Mr. Epp: We gave it to you.

Mr. Flis: What is that Party's ultimate position? And does it have—

An Hon. Member: Are you asleep?

Mr. Forrestall: If you had some credibility, you have just blown it.

Mr. Flis: Listen! And does it—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Parliamentary Secretary has been recognized for the purpose of asking a question. He has the floor.

Mr. Flis: Does it have consensus on that position? Because the Hon. Member criticized the Government, saying that we do not have a consensus on this Bill. With all these amendments put by ourselves, the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party making it the best Bill possible under the circumstances, what is the Tory position? What is its bottom line? And does it have a consensus for that position?

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly abide by your admonition. This could give me an opportunity to make a ten-minute speech. However, I will not seize that opportunity. I will try to answer the question as briefly as I can. Our bottom line has been and will continue to be to get a fair deal for the producers. This Bill does not constitute a fair deal for the producer and everything we have done in the course of the last six months has been done in an attempt to strike a better deal for the producers of Canada.

● (1450)

When the Minister and his Government complete all their studies on the appropriateness of the freight rate regime, the ability of the producers to pay, the method of payment and the appropriateness of the 20 per cent constant cost, all of which is going to be reviewed and studied by review committees set up by this Minister, then we will be in a better position to determine whether the producers can afford this kind of freight rate regime. The bottom line is simply that if the Government had accepted the two proposals we advanced, the freeze and the enabling provision for a modified method of payment on completion of the review inquiry, this would have gone a long way toward improving the Bill and attracting more support from western Canada. Our position has always been to try and seek out a solution in the best interests of the producer, and if it is in the best interests of the producer, then it is in the best interests of agriculture as a whole.

Mr. Flis: If the Hon. Member is sincere in his desire to have a package worked out in the best interests of the producer, I am sure he is thinking of all producers in western Canada. He is thinking not only of the grain producers but of the livestock producers, hog and poultry producers, the specialty crop producers and so on. We heard from those producers that the Crow rate has caused a distortion over all these years. They feel they are discriminated against to the extent of 80 per cent because the grain producer pays only 20 per cent of the shipment of grain while the livestock producers have to pay 100 per cent of the cost of shipping their products. I heard this from the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave) and others. These producers are shipping the same product, grain, but in the form of hogs or beef cattle or whatever. It is still the same product, grain, being transported, but they have to pay 100 per cent of the cost.

Would the Hon. Member explain to this House how putting a three-year freeze in place is going to correct that distortion? Will it not prolong the distortion for another three years? The NDP position would prolong the distortion indefinitely, and the Tories would prolong it for another three years. Can the Hon. Member clarify that fact? He gave us his bottom line and yet again we see there is no bottom line because they are all over the map in this situation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport has been waving around a $204 million agricultural adjustment fund which could certainly be used to alleviate any injury to producers. If he wants to take that proposition seriously, I commend to him the document produced by the Hon. Member for Wetaskiwin which answers the question the Parliamentary Secretary has advanced. Quite frankly, there is a livestock injury; there was, there is and there will be under this legislation. At least the former Minister had $204 million in the kitty to resolve that. Why does this Minister not utilize that money to relieve the livestock injury to some extent? That is what we would be doing and that is why this proposition is here.

The Hon. Member suggests that things are going to be better as a result of the increased freight rates. This is what the prairie commodity groups say. The Bill removes all incentive for increased efficiency in handling, leaving in effect a cost-plus system which will encourage the railways to maximize their grain cost structure. This system will be disastrous for grain producers who will be paying an even larger share of the enormously costly, inefficient and inadequate system that no one can afford.

The Bill goes on to say that because more grain will be moving, it will create a further distortion for the livestock producer. If the Minister and his Government are as serious about incorporating a different method of payment as they say they are, then they should be very eager to incorporate an enabling provision in this legislation. That is what we are asking for. It is a two-pronged effect but let us do it after the proper analysis and study have been done. We have spent ten years studying the so-called losses of the railway campanies. I think we can stand at least a couple of years to study the impact this proposal will have on the producers, whether they can afford to pay more, and how the benefit would best be distributed.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, one is undecided whether to try and take the high road, middle road or low road in a debate such as this. Once every 20, 30 or 50 years Parliament is faced with legislation of such consequence that it is incumbent upon people all over the country, but particularly on Opposition Parties, not only to oppose and propose, but also to try to prevent. This is one of those rare occasions.

This Parliament has sat for over three years in one session in which we have passed over 100 pieces of legislation. Some of that legislation the Opposition agreed with, some we opposed and voted against. But the Government was able to have its way. However, every once in a while, on rare occasions, a government may be embarked on a course which harms our nationhood and our Confederation. This is one of those rare occasions.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies for, in fact I am proud of, the role my Party and my colleagues have played from day one when we said we would do everything we could under the rules of Parliament to prevent his legislation from passing. I do not mean this unkindly, Sir, because I generally welcome the support of the Conservative Party in trying to prevent this Bill from passing. But it is not enough just to vote against the Bill, whether it is second reading, report stage amendments or third reading. That is easy. When we have that rare occasion when

we must try to prevent this kind of harm to our nation and our Confederation and to an important region of Canada, it seems to me, while we welcome the conversion of my colleagues from the Conservative Party on their version of the Road to Damascus, that they could have stopped this Bill back in June. They had the numbers and the rules, and they could have stopped this Bill any time after it was first introduced. They could have but they did not. They opposed the Bill, Mr. Speaker. They are in favour of stopping and killing the Crow rate but they cannot have it both ways. They do not want to abolish the statutory grain rates now. They want to do it a year and a half or two years or two and a half years from now. They cannot be half pregnant, Mr. Speaker. There is no such thing. They are either in favour of keeping the statutory grain rate for the grain producers or they are not.

● (1500)

Working both sides of the street is not worthy of that very historic Party. It is not worthy of Conservative and Liberal Governments that, from 1881 on, saw to it that regions of the nation were not discriminated against because of geography or because of where the goods are produced.

In all regions of Canada, Mr. Speaker, there are programs implemented by the national Government, the costs of which are shared by all the people of Canada. When we go back to the original regional programs, that concept was called the beginnings of co-operative federalism. I will never forget the first Leader of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Tommy Douglas, who campaigned in 1962 and 1963 on a platform of co-operative federalism. It was pooh-poohed by Grits and Tories at that time. Now everybody uses the phrase, and well they should because it is a non-partisan phrase and deals with the unity of the country and how we live together and deal with one another decently and fairly.

In the last few days, we have welcomed one of the few things, or perhaps the only thing, the Government has done right and that is the freeze on the St. Lawrence Seaway tolls. The St. Lawrence Seaway is essential for all of Canada, and all Canadians share in paying for its cost and losses. I would like to tell the Government that western farmers and people from western Canada supported central Canada in its bid to freeze the St. Lawrence Seaway tolls for at least one more year.

There is an attempt in the House to perpetuate a philosophy that was put forward by a Member who is neither missed nor forgotten, although I wish I could forget him, and that is the philosophy of user-pay. Members of our Party, and perhaps Members of other Parties, had access to a Cabinet document in the fall of 1981. That Cabinet document referred not only to abolishing the statutory grain rates. It also referred to the feed freight assistance Act, the At and East rates, the Maritime freight assistance Act, the Atlantic Provinces assistance Act, the deficits on the St. Lawrence Seaway and the deficits on airports. It was a document that followed up on Mr. Lang's original proposals regarding user-pay in order to get the federal Treasury and the Government out from under all of these regional programs.

I warned my colleagues on the Government side, particularly those in the backbenches, and I warned my colleagues on the Conservative side that the statutory grain rates was just the beginning and that every other regional program was at stake. Hon. Members had best remember that warning because user-pay is indefensible when it comes to transportation since every mode of transportation is subsidized. Hundreds of commodities are subsidized. They must be subsidized in a country with our geography, our climate and our thinly and widely scattered population. There is no other alternative. We are not a nation with a large and dense population.

I do not want to say the following, but I must. It was strange how successful we were when we sought the freeze on the St. Lawrence Seaway tolls, an issue that meant so much to central Canada and to all of the ports from Thunder Bay to the Gulf of St. Lawrence. People rallied from central Canada and from western Canada to stop the increase in St. Lawrence Seaway tolls. However, Mr. Speaker, people have rallied from all across Canada to stop this legislation. It is strange that we did not get the same amount of time and attention on this issue from the Government in a year. It is only the last few weeks we have even had the time and attention of the Conservative Party.

I would like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that there are at least 200,000 signatures appearing on petitions of all kinds submitted by Members of Parliament from both Opposition Parties and submitted by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool through a Government Member. Even if 50,000 of those signatures appear on more than one petition. One hundred and fifty thousand people, most of them from western Canada, have asked that the Government not proceed with this legislation. People from coast to coast have asked the same thing. Most of those people are farmers.

The Minister spoke about rail upgrading. He proved this morning that he does not know one end of a boxcar from another. The deliberate attempt to make the grain producers and the statutory grain rate the villains of the piece is the worst kind of political chicanery that can be performed by someone who should kow better. If he knew anything about the problem, he would know better.

The Crowsnest Pass grain rates and then the statutory grain rates, have been in effect since 1897 and 1925. That, according to the Minister, was supposed to have prevented the modernizing and upgrading of the railways. Since 1897, under the staturory grain rates, there have been many improvements. During the time from 1900 to 1920, a spiral tunnel was constructed, the Connaught Tunnel was constructed and double-tracking was installed. The 1930s were kind of slow but there were a few improvements even then. The 1940s and 1950s saw the implementation of centralized traffic control from coast to coast and dieselization from coast to coast. Double tracks were installed right up until 1957 or 1958. Do you know what happened, then, Mr. Speaker? The Liberal Government followed by a Tory Government allowed the

railways to lift up something like 600 miles of double track in western Canada.

So much for the Minister's nonsense and his political and economic blackmail that would have us believe that if we do not raise the grain rates, we will not have the rails upgraded. If there was not another bushel of grain shipped to Vancouver and Prince Rupert starting tomorrow, those tracks would still have to be upgraded. If we moved all of the grain to Thunder Bay and Churchill and forgot about the West coast, those tracks would still have to be upgraded.

Mr. Justice Emmett Hall has made that proposition plain in his report and on several occasions since, particularly in front of the committee. He has made it plain that for the purposes of moving coal from British Columbia, the track is now almost completely upgraded from the Alberta border to Prince Rupert. That upgrading had nothing to do with grain and nothing to do with the freight rate on grain.

The statutory grain rate is a part of the charter for western Canada. We in western Canada are no different from people from anywhere else in the country. We are honest people and we deal honestly. We have always tried to operate in such a manner that a deal is a deal.

● (1510)

I want to say to my friend, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), whom I thank for repeating much of what I said in my speech at second reading, that we must cease just handing the money over to the railroads. The taxpayers, like any other investor, are entitled to have an opportunity for a return on their investment. Surely that is nothing more than good, sound business management and good free enterprise economics.

We submitted our alternative plan to the public. We mailed it to the former Minister of Transport, we mailed it to the Conservative Party and we mailed it to all the farm organizations. But I must say that we have not had the courtesy of a reply or a point by point answer from either the Government or the Official Opposition. It is the "KISS" principle which we meant mainly for the Government but which perhaps might help the Opposition. That principle is, "Keep it simple, stupid". With respect to the Dominion coal lands, all of my colleagues welcomed the fact that a Conservative Member from Alberta or British Columbia got up and supported our number one point. Our point is that the B.C. Coal lands should be returned to the Province of British Columbia. We announced our alternative program two days after the Minister's press conference in Winnipeg on February 1.

The present Minister says that British Columbia has not asked for the land back. I cannot help it if that Conservative, Liberal, Social Credit Government in British Columbia is so stupid. That is not my problem and it is not the Minister's problem. What is just and within the Constitution is the principle that the natural resources belong to the Provinces. I am not talking about offshore resources. These are inland resources in the southeastern part of British Columbia. That Province gave up many thousands of acres of that land, for what? They did it for the Kettle Valley Railway line. But where is that line? It has been abandoned. I say that a deal is a deal and since the railroads got out of their part of the deal, surely the people of British Columbia are entitled to have their part of the deal returned. Nothing could be more simple or more just.

Our second position is the retention of the statutory grain rates for the shipping of grain from western Canada. My colleague for Vegreville spoke about the competition which exists. I do not need to go into that any further because he is exactly right. Our competitors in the United States, Argentina, Australia and the European Economic Community provide subsidies of anywhere from $10 to $25 a tonne. The Government is seeking to reduce the present costs of the statutory rate from $5 to $6 a tonne, to zero by 1990, even if we accepted the railways' figures. It is asking grain producers, which it has done time and time again since the turn of the century, to compete with the treasuries of the rest of the world.

What happened to co-operative federalism? According to the statutory rates, whatever the deficit or out of pocket costs, the nation as a whole shares that cost because that grain export and grain production benefits the whole nation from Halifax to Prince Rupert.

We have already lost 3,000 miles of branch lines in western Canada. Through this legislation, with its variable rates, the Government is quitting on its commitment for branch line rehabilitation and is, in fact, even transferring funds from the branch line rehabilitation account to the subsidizing of trucks, which means that many fewer miles of branch lines will be upgraded, with the loss of another 1,500 miles of branch lines.

I hope that by Monday afternoon on November 14, the Government will agree that it needs to continue to look not only at the statutory grain rates but at all the regional transportation programs. I hope it will study how they fit together in a national objective, no matter what political Party is in power. This has never been dealt with.

I want to continue my remarks, but before you cut me off, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the following subamendment:

That the amendment be amended by inserting:

"for the purpose of reconsidering Clauses 55, 88, 89, 93, 116 and 157B".

That is seconded by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse). These numbers refer to motions on the Order Paper. Because some of these require some additions to the Bill, that is why we moved this subamendment.

I want to say to my friends in the Conservative Party that this issue does not only concern wheat. I want to say to my colleagues on the Government side that it is not just wheat. The ramifications of this legislation will provide a hurt. I have yet to have anyone show me that the so-called livestock hurt is attribuable to the statutory grain rate. It is a myth for anyone to believe that abolishing the statutory rate will somehow enable western livestock producers to invade the U.S. market, whether California, the central States or eastern States and that the U.S. administration will hold still for that. If they

believe that, they are dreaming in technicolour. In fact, the head of Burns Food said before the committee that he would like to know where those big markets are because he cannot find them. You can hardly call him a raving socialist. That is a piece of mythology peddled by those who want to blame somebody. Who do they blame? They blame the grain producers and the statutory rate.

I will never forget when a cattleman in the Peace River country in Alberta said that he did not want to make more money on his cattle on the backs of his neighbours from whom he buys grain.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Chair might enlighten me, for I would like to know whether the sub-amendment has been moved and accepted by the Chair.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I should explain to the Hon. Member that the sub-amendment has not yet been accepted by the Chair but, right now, the Chair would like to urge the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) to conclude his remarks because his time has expired, and during the period allowed for questions, answers and comments, perhaps I will be able to reach a decision concerning the sub-amendment.

[*English*]

I have indicated to the Hon. Member who stood on a point of order that I have not yet decided on the acceptability of the subamendment, but perhaps during the period of questions and answers we can achieve that.

I must indicate to the Hon. Member for Regina west (Mr. Benjamin) that his time has expired.

Mr. Benjamin: I have a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In that case, if the Hon. Member for Regina West wishes to raise a point of order, perhaps we could consider that his time for debate has expired and I will now recognize him on a point of order.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, if it will assist the Chair in regard to our subamendment, let me say that the numbers in it refer to motions that were on the Order Paper which, in turn, refer to the subject matter in the Bill, such as Canadian Wheat Board control, stop-off charges, variable rates, volume cap and producer share of costs, namely, the safety net. Because we only had a very few minutes in which to draft the subamendment hurriedly, and we did not have a copy of the one moved by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), which by the way we support, we had to use the motion numbers on the Order Paper. However, those motion numbers refer to the subject matters which are already in the Bill.

● (1520)

I hope the Chair will take that into consideration when it considers whether or not the motion is in order. If we had had ten minutes longer, perhaps we could have gone through the Bill and picked out the actual clause numbers. Time did not permit that. What we are aiming at is the subject matter now in the Bill at third reading. We only used the motion numbers on the Order Paper as a term of reference for the Chair and everyone else in the Chamber. I hope the Chair will be sympathetic in accepting our subamendment as well as the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: Would the Chair explain how it can accept a sub-amendment to an amendment on which the House has already divided?

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, that was the point I was rising on. As I sat in my office monitoring rather than being here because I had things to do there, what I saw transpire was that the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) moved an amendment which would have had a certain matter referred back to the committee for further study. I think inadvertently your colleague, the occupant of the chair at the time, stated that the motion was deferred, which I think was in error.

Mr. Benjamin: He said, "the vote".

Mr. Nielsen: What I heard was "motion".

Mr. Halliday: That is right.

Mr. Nielsen: What I heard was that the motion was deferred. As the Chair well knows, on an amendment such as the one put by the Hon. Member for Vegreville after the yeas and nays are called—and they were—the Standing Orders require the vote on that motion to be deferred until the next sitting day. It was at that point that the Chair then called for debate on the amendment and then proceeded directly into the ten-minute question period. I suggest to the Chair that the point in procedural time at which we should be now is on the debate on the amendment.

I will not offer any suggestions with respect to the putting of a subamendment. The Chair can sort that out for itself without any assistance from me. But the point in procedural time where we are now is on the debate on the amendment put by the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I would like to help my hon. colleague, but how can we be debating an amendment on which the yeas and nays have been called?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I will answer that question gladly. We went through the whole process on some 84 amendments where yeas and nays were called and the votes thereon deferred. That is exactly what happens on a Friday where a motion is put which comprises an amendment. The only course for the Chair to follow under the Standing Orders as they now exist, under the new experimental rules, is for the yeas and nays to be put, and there the process stops.

I see the Parliamentary Secretary shaking his head. That is the process. Otherwise, the only other alternative is for the bells to ring and a division to be taken, which is prohibited by the experimental Standing Orders. I suggest that the Chair is obliged, on a substantive motion such as the one moved by the Hon. Member for Vegreville, to call the yeas and nays. Thereafter, under the new Standing Orders it is obliged to say that the vote is deferred until the next sitting day, the same way the vote on third reading is deferred until Monday, November 14.

If the subamendment is accepted by the Chair, in my submission it is the obligation of the Chair to call for the yeas and nays on the subamendment and then, under the experimental Standing Orders, to defer the vote on the subamendment until November 14. The amendment by way of the motion of the Hon. Member for Vegreville has not been disposed of by the yeas and nays, not at all.

Mr. Evans: What do you think the yeas and nays are?

Mr. Nielsen: The yeas and nays—

Mr. Evans: It is a vote.

Mr. Nielsen: It is not a vote. The Parliamentary Secretary says, "It is a vote". It is not a recorded division.

Mr. Blais: It is not a recorded division but it is a vote; the question has been put.

Mr. Nielsen: The yeas and nays are taken and the vote is then deferred.

Mr. Blais: The recording of the vote is deferred.

Mr. Nielsen: There can be no question of that under our experimental Standing Orders. That is what happened all day yesterday, and we came to an agreement to shorten that voting process.

In my submission that amendment is still before the House. The vote was required to be deferred until the next sitting day. With respect to the NDP subamendment, it would seem that any subamendment—and they themselves call it a subamendment, quite properly—would have to relate to the clauses of the Bill itself. The way I heard the subamendment which was produced, it related to motions at report stage. It had no reference to the clauses of the Bill itself, as did the amendment moved by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. That is my submission with respect to the procedural time slot we are in, and I ask that you so find.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I am sorry, I should recognize another Hon. Member from a different Party. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom).

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will understand if I say that I am a bit confused about what is happening here procedurally. I do not know whether or not the right decision was made on the amendment. However, I want to say one or two words on the subamendment. What we are referring in the subamendment is the subject matter referred to in the motions read by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin).

I do not want to go into any lengthy argument whatsoever, but I would like to refer to page 155 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition wherein Citation 438 and Citation 439 refer to the feasibility of subamendments. Citation 439 in part reads:

> To an amendment, when proposed from the Chair, an amendment may be moved; but only two amendments can be proposed at the same time to a question. Some limit is necessary; the usage has grown into law that an amendment to an amendment is allowable—

What we have done here—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I wonder if I might assist the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville. The problem facing the Chair is whether or not there can be a subamendment if there is not an amendment; that is the only issue. The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) put the argument in a very precise way. Since the yeas and nays were taken on the amendment and the amendment was disposed of, if I may use that expression without in any sense affecting the argument, logically one has a difficulty with whether or not we can have a subamendment to a non-existing amendment. That is the only issue at which we are looking. Hon. Members of the House are obviously aware of that. I particularly refer to—

[*Translation*]

—the Hon. Member for Rosemont (Mr. Lachance) who raised the question immediately.

[*English*]

If we have disposed of an amendment, how do we have a subamendment? That is the issue. The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, in my submissions to you—

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You refused to recognize me—

Mr. Nielsen: I am sorry, I will defer to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard).

Mr. Pinard: —then you allowed an NDP Member to speak, and suddenly you stopped everyone and allowed the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) to speak.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Order, don't you have any respect for the Chair?

● (1530)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) will remember that I recognized him, then the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), back to the President of the Privy Council, back again to the Hon.

Member for Yukon. As is usually the case, and particularly since the issue involves a subamendment of the NDP, I then intervened and suggested that we ought to hear from the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom). What has happened now is that the Hon. Member has deferred by indicating to the Chair visually that he is willing to turn the matter over to the Hon. Member for Yukon. I will recognize either the President of the Privy Council or the Hon. Member for Yukon, whichever one rises.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with the Government House Leader speaking now, but if he would like to hear me first, I will speak briefly. It is up to him.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member very much for his courtesy. It makes more sense that I reply to what he has said. I have not participated in the debate on the point of order. I just asked a question of the Hon. Member for Yukon. I asked him how we could agree to a subamendment to an amendment that has been voted on by yeas and nays. He gave me an answer that I find unacceptable. I want to argue on this point first before he goes further.

The Hon. Member compared the situation with a vote on an amendment on yeas and nays at the report stage which was deferred. This is not the same case. At the report stage, when an amendment has not been disposed of completely but the yeas and nays are called, you cannot debate that amendment further. He said that here we could debate the amendment. I do not think we can. At report stage, once the yeas and nays have been called on an amendment, it is deferred. We then move to the following amendment. We do not debate the same amendment again. Therefore, I do not think his answer was adequate to the question I asked of him.

In this whole situation the problem is very simple. Nobody saw fit to debate the amendment moved by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) before the yeas and nays were called. Theoretically, debate should have ended and the House adjourned until November 14 the minute the yeas and nays were called and the vote was deferred until the next sitting day. We cannot debate the main motion without knowing what will happen with the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville. We will not know that before three o'clock on Monday the 14th. I am not saying that we might not consider giving the appropriate consent to allowing the debate to go on until five o'clock, but I would not like to have this interpreted as a precedent. I would not like this to prevent all questions being put without further debate on Monday the 14th at three o'clock. It would be mere courtesy on our part to allow debate to continue on the main motion, without agreeing to any subamendment because there cannot be a subamendment to an amendment that has not been voted on finally.

The situation is very simple and clear. Theoretically, according to the Standing Orders, we should not be debating the motion any further this afternoon. The amendment moved by the Hon. Member for Vegreville has been partially disposed of and cannot be voted on before Monday, November 14. Therefore, we cannot debate the main motion. We should adjourn. However, I am not asking that we adjourn. I am saying that we are willing to consider giving the appropriate consent to allow debate to go on until five o'clock without prejudice for the Standing Orders to apply fully for the vote to be taken at three o'clock on Monday the 14th without further debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I am attempting to provide courtesy on the part of the Chair. The issue is a subamendment standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville has once or twice deferred to the Hon. Member for Yukon. Again, I will take it in whatever order Members want it.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, in order to facilitate debate and not waste time on procedure, may I suggest to the House that we perhaps withdraw our subamendment and propose an amendment? If we had unanimous agreement for that, it might facilitate our procedure in the House.

Mr. Nielsen: There is a better solution.

Mr. Nystrom: The other solution is to have the Hon. Member for Vegreville resubmit his amendment with unanimous consent and we can do the same. There is not much time remaining. It would allow time for Members to participate.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, there might be a better and more acceptable solution. I have had quite a few years dealing with the Government House Leader. I find that his arguments today have been uniquely and unusually impeccable with respect to his analysis of the situation. What has happened here, and I am sure it will not be understood by a good many people watching, is that another one of those parliamentary black holes has occurred. It has swallowed up temporarily the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville.

The solution which might find acceptance, since the Government has indicated consent and since we only have about one hour and fifteen minutes debating time left, is for the House to consent, regardless of its clinical acceptability or not, to the subamendment being put by the NDP which will "revive" the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). We can then enter back upon the debate. It would mean of course, three votes instead of two on Monday, November 14. If the House were disposed to consent to that, perhaps everyone might be happy. We could proceed with the debate without creating any precedent.

Mr. Pinard: Without creating any precedent. Mr. Speaker, I have had long years of negotiation with the Hon. Member for Yukon. I must admit that his proposal is unusually interesting. What we could agree to, in order to allow debate to go on, would be to consent not to consider the amendment moved by the Hon. Member for Vegreville as having been voted on, even partially. That would allow a subamendment to be put. What the Members would have debated until now would have been the amendment. Therefore, everything would be regularized. We are willing to give that consent without prejudice to our

rights under the Standing Orders to have all votes without further debate at three o'clock on Monday, November 14.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, we find what the Hon. Member for Yukon and the Government House Leader have had to say is eminently acceptable to us. I appreciate that the Chair will have to rule on the admissibility of the subamendment.

In any event, before the Chair rules, now that we have had a few minutes, I would ask the Chair to accept a different set of numbers in our subamendment. We have now had time to go through the Bill. Instead of the Clause numbers we show in the subamendment the Clause numbers should read Clause 33, Clause 41, Clause 47, Clause 54 and Clause 59. That is an additional five clauses that are different from those proposed by the Hon. Member for Vegreville. We were correct on the subject matter, but we are now also correct on the clause numbers in the Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): For the sake of clarification, the Hon. Member for Regina West at one point said additional clauses and at another point said replacement clause numbers. If I understand him correctly, what he would now like to do is to change his subamendment so that the numbers earlier referred to are entirely deleted.

• (1540)

The new clauses which he has just given to the Chair, that is, Clauses 33, 41, 47, 54 and 59, would be in fact those clauses of the Bill which he would like to see sent to the Standing Committee. I have that correct apparently.

Mr. Benjamin: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): For the sake of formality, I want to indicate to the Hon. Member that he had already proposed a subamendment. In order to change it, he is suggesting that it be withdrawn and that his new subamendment be put in. That is the procedural way. I need the unanimous consent of the House, and I would gather that it is forthcoming, that the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) be permitted to withdraw his subamendment and replace it with the new one. Is that agreed by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, having resolved the procedural gymnastics, I would like to raise a question concerning the subamendment put forward by the Hon. Member for Regina West. He passed over it very quickly, but I believe two or three of his amendments did have substantial financial connotations to them and therefore would require a royal recommendation. I believe the precedent set by the Chair previously is to rule those out of order because obviously such recommendations are neither available nor forthcoming.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. I do not want to prejudge that issue. We are only dealing with a procedural issue as to the presentation of the subamendment. This is not a time to argue whether or not the spending power is involved. This is just a matter of whether or not the Hon. Member can withdraw his subamendment and replace it with different clauses. This is well in advance of the question of the Chair ruling on the admissibility of the proposed subamendment. We now seek unanimous consent of the House as to whether or not the Hon. Member is to be permitted to withdraw his subamendment and to produce the one that he has just read out. May I have that unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Thank you.

On the matter of the subamendment now proposed by the Hon. Member, the Chair will take it under consideration. I do not want to hear argument yet. We can go back to the suggestions of the Hon. Member for the Yukon and the President of the Privy Council that there may be a disposition in the House to accept, without doing violence to any precedent or to the provisional Standing Orders, that what is before the House now is the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). May I have unanimous consent on that?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Again I thank Hon. Members. Therefore, debate is open on the amendment, and the subamendment is now possible. The Chair will take into consideration the subamendment in due course. Debate will continue for the moment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ostiguy: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will understand that it is indeed an honour for me today to take part in this third reading debate on a Bill which, in my opinion, is the Bill of the century. It stands to reason that—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I apologize for interrupting the Hon. Member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ostiguy), but the Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) is seeking the floor on a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. Mazankowski: You have wasted enough time.

Mr. Benjamin: You got your extra ten minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Yorkton-Melville on a point of order.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt. I assure you it is a legitimate point of order. The Hon. Member for Regina West had finished his 20 minutes but you did not give a chance to the House to ask any questions of him, which is normally the course.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member is quite correct. The Chair made an error in that regard. I should have gone first to questions, comments and answers and I will do so now. With respect to the debate of the Hon. Member for Regina West; questions, comments and answers.

Mr. Althouse: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member was part way through his explanation of how he was proposing to bring about improvements to the rail system. I wonder if he could finish those remarks, so we have a complete understanding of it.

Mr. Dick: What an abuse.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, I hear the word "abuse". I learned this from some of my colleagues in the Official Opposition the first couple of times this happened.

However, Mr. Speaker, I will be brief and I thank my colleague. I regret that I did not complete the four-point alternative plan that we had proposed back in February. I had covered the B.C. coal lands and the retention of the Crow rate. The other two points are that we pay directly to the railways a subsidy that only covers their proven out-of-pocket costs. On the subsidy portion they cannot make any profit.

The fourth point is that all the moneys, which will be something in the order of $550 million, that will go to the railroads for rebuilding and modernizing railway lines are a capital investment. What we propose, and have proposed for these many months, is that that portion that goes into capital improvement in CN automatically increases the Government's equity ownership in CN by whatever number of shares. We take common stock shares in return for the portion that goes to Canadian Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, that is the NDP position. If the Government and the Official Opposition are not prepared to accept that, I would even be willing to say that if we made it a loan and charged them the bank rate, or even a couple of percentage points less than the bank rate, at least there would be an opportunity for a return on that investment to the taxpayers just as there is in the case of private or corporate investor.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please.

Mr. Benjamin: That is the nub of—that is the condition for—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please.

Mr. Benjamin: —for providing the money to the railroads.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. Some Hon. Members are distressed that one Member of the same Party as the speaker who had just spoken is able to use the ten-minute question period to exchange questions and answers between two Members of the same Party. That has been ruled on several times. There is no question that if other Hon. Members in the House do not choose to use that 10-minute question period to put questions or provide answers and comments to the Hon. Member who had the floor in debate, then a Member of his own Party may do so. That has happened from all Parties of the House.

Mr. Benjamin: That is right.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): That is settled. I want to be clear that I, as one of the occupants of the Chair, have quite often indicated that questions, answers, statements and comments are all to be guided by the amount of time given for statements made just prior to the question period. A minute and a half is what I regard as a good guideline. This is not an opportunity for a 30-second question and a nine and a half minute speech. A minute and a half is a guideline. I think the Hon. Member for Regina West has pretty well come to the conclusion of his remarks. I do not want to cut him off too abruptly. I see he indicates that I might go elsewhere.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I was interested in listening to the statement of the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). He did make a rather interesting point with regard to a comparison between the Crow benefits and the subsidies that are paid by the taxpayers of Canada on the St. Lawrence Seaway. It seemed to me that there was a flaw in that comparison. Does making that comparison not revolve around who benefits and whether that benefit is available to all people who use the facility, or should it be available only to some people who use the facility? The benefit from the subsidy that is paid by the taxpayers of Canada is available to anyone who uses the St. Lawrence Seaway. Yet the benefit on the Crow, which effectively is supposed to build a better railway system in Canada, is available only to people who happen to grow a certain type of product, certain grains, and anyone else who ships on that rail line does not receive the subsidy. It seems to me that in order to be consistent, the Hon. Member should be saying either that the benefit should not be available for shipping grain or that it should be available to anyone using the railroad.

• (1550)

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, the subsidy on the St. Lawrence Seaway benefits all of Canada. The statutory grain rates benefit all of Canada. The Hon. Member wants to ask about other commodities. Mr. Speaker, other commodities have commercial or compensatory rates because they get a price for their product. If coal prices were on a level with grain prices, then there should be a statutory rate for coal. But coal prices have risen 600 per cent while their freight rate has risen 500 per cent. If a statutory rate for coal were needed because of low world coal prices, that would be perfectly logical. It would be just like the statutory grain rate, the subsidized St. Lawrence Seaway and freight assistance in all the rest of Canada.

Mr. Flis: Mr. Speaker, in debate, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) stated that people from coast to coast are saying that we should not proceed with the Bill. He led the House to believe that everyone is saying that.

Mr. Benjamin: I did not say that.

Mr. Flis: I wonder if he would compare that statement to what Dennis McDermott, the President of the Canadian Labour Congress, said in his press release of October 14, when he urged all three Parties to get on with Bill C-155.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary has chosen one paragraph of that release. If he would care to quote the rest of it he will see that it says that the statutory rate should be retained for grain producers, that the rehabilitation and modernization of the railroads should continue for all commodities, not just for grain, and that jobs should be provided not only for railway workers but for other kinds of workers. The Canadian Labour Congress has supported the alternative proposal of the New Democratic Party since it was brought out in the first week of February.

Mr. Flis: Not according to this press release.

Mr. Benjamin: Read all of it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I gather that the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) wishes to enter the debate. Does the Hon. Member for Spadina (Mr. Heap) wish to enter debate or ask a question?

Mr. Heap: I have a question, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In the short time remaining I will allow the Hon. Member for Spadina the briefest possible question.

Mr. Heap: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) has touched on the question of trade. I should like to ask him to comment more generally on how maintaining the present Crow rate would affect foreign trade.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I extended a courtesy to the Hon. Member for Spadina but I did not extend an unlimited privilege to continue the ten-minute question period. I have already recognized the Hon. Member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ostiguy).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ostiguy: Mr. Speaker, one always says that in life—

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, as I know very well my colleague from Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ostiguy), I apologize for interrupting him. I would like to say for the record that the representatives of the various parties have reached an agreement. This morning, I received a request from the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) and, this afternoon, from the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), asking me that the votes on Bill C-155 not be taken at 3 p.m. but rather at 5.45 p.m., and that the bells be rung at 5.45 p.m. at the next sitting. It is therefore, by exception, an amendment if you will to Standing Order 12(3), so instead of ringing the bells for 15 minutes beginning at 3 p.m. the next sitting day—that will be Monday, November 14—we agree that the bells be rung beginning at 5.45, pursuant to Standing Order 12(3).

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): This is a good opportunity to indicate to the Hon. Member for Regina West and to the House that the subamendment he proposed is found to be in order.

That means, therefore, that the votes held on Monday, November 14, will be on the main motion, the amendment and the subamendment.

The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) is seeking the unanimous consent that the vote be held not at three o'clock but at 5.45 p.m. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Agreed and so ordered.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot is having some trouble being recognized. I shall recognize the Hon. Member, for the third time.

Mr. Marcel Ostiguy (Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The old saying that a picture is worth more than a thousands words would be very appropriate in this case, since this is the third time I was before the television cameras without being able to say a word.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that today, the debate on the Western grain transportation rate, Bill C-155, a very important piece of legislation, affects every single person in this country. No one can afford to ignore this important Bill. No one, on our farms, in our cities, in our factories, in towns and in the country, no one can afford to ignore this issue. In my experience, in the riding I have the honour to represent in the House, the riding of Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot, where more than 3,000 farmers live off the fruits of the land, the fruits of their labors, and I am thinking of the farmers in Saint-Damas, Saint-Hughes, Saint-André d'Acton and elsewhere—I must say that all these people have been, and still are, following the developments in this debate very closely. Mr. Speaker, my colleague in the National Assembly, the separatist Member for Saint-Hyacinthe, is something of an expert on farming and agricultural matters, and I say so without rancor, because at last winter's meetings when the objectors met the first time in Saint-Hyacinthe, including people from the UPA, the Coopérative fédérée and the Association des meuniers, my separatist colleague said that the Bill had already been passed, while it had not even been tabled at that time. He even said, and I shall quote him here from a publicity folder: "By imposing the recommendations of the Gilson Report, Pepin, Ouellet and Co. and all the others, you were all breaking the economic back of the agro-food business, probably just so you can have your picture taken with us when you hand out our wheel chairs."

I may therefore point out to my provincial counterpart that at the time, the Bill had not been passed and that the main arguments put forward by the objectors concerned the princi-

ple that payments would be made to the railways instead of to producers.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill has, of course, gone through several stages. First of all, in February 1982, Professor Gilson was contracted to make a full study of transportation rates for Western grain. Subsequently, the Gilson Report was submitted to the Minister of Transport, followed by publication of a statement of policy, and then the Bill was tabled in the House.

Last summer, I was fortunate enough to sit on the Transport Committee that travelled across Canada to hear witnesses and intervenors on the subject of the Bill concerning what is referred to as the Crow. Mr. Speaker, out West, I carefully followed the proceedings of the Committee and realized there was no consensus among farmers and the various agricultural organizations. As I have said several times, we deplored this. Earlier, the Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) said that the people of Quebec had forced the Government to change its position on the Bill.

● (1600)

I can inform the Member for Vegreville that in Quebec we have only one association, namely, the Union des producteurs agricoles. All other organizations related to agriculture or the agro-food business supported that association, and they were merely asking to have payments made to the railways instead of to farmers, for reasons they explained in great detail.

The objective of the people who were opposed to the Bill at the time was, of course, to ensure that the policy the Government would adopt on revision of railway transportation rates for grain would not alter the competitive balance within the livestock industry in Canada. This objective was in line with the traditional claims of Quebec intervenors with respect to Canada's grain policy, which boils down to one word: equity. As far as we are concerned, the word equity in this context means different things to different people. First, as far as ranchers are concerned, equity requires that there be nothing to prevent the same basic price from applying to feed grain throughout the domestic market, in other words that there be in Canada just one domestic market. Second, equity also requires that ranchers enjoy some sort of balance in transportation costs for meat and grain. And thirdly, as far as grain producers are concerned, equity requires that they get equal treatment from the governments wherever they may be in Canada, and also that a new price allowing for adequate returns be established. At that time, and the brief was clear on that, they were asking for federal transport subsidies to be paid to railroad companies rather than to producers.

This was very important for that farm group. And at that point in time, Mr. Pierre Bornais had this to say in an editorial in the newspaper *Le Courrier*, and I quote:

> How is it that something which was to be nothing more than a transport policy could evolve into a farm policy, capable of triggering a chain reaction across the land and more especially in Eastern Canada? Simply because a choice was made concerning the means selected to implement that policy, a choice indeed that changes that transport policy into an agricultural policy.

And he went on to say:

> As was to be expected, all Members of Parliament from this area are in agreement, although they claim they are sharing grassroots concerns—

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my friends opposite, concerning what they have been saying in their speeches since the start of this debate on freight rates for grain, that I only wish they had made those speeches in Quebec, in a rural constituency such as Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot. I only wish that their only Member, who one day had asked us to resign as Members of Parliament because we were not turning our attention to the Crow rate, the Hon. Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle), although we have never seen him, at least I have not seen him, not even once in this House during the debate on the Crow rate . . . And of all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, there came into that Party the great mind that would solve all farm problems and others in Canada. It was at that time that the now Leader of the Opposition wrote the following to my colleague and friend, the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde) on July 11, 1983: "As people are no doubt aware, the Hon. Don Mazankowski made a major speech in the House of Commons on May 12, in which he described in every detail our positions. It is my sincere hope that the Committee proceedings will lead to arrangements that will best meet the requirements of the various parts of the country in that respect."

As usual, Mr. Speaker, he did not commit himself, they did not commit themselves anymore than they had committed themselves at that point. The Tories, our friends opposite, proposed at one time to delay for another three years the passing of this legislation, in other words they requested a three-year hoist.

Mr. Speaker, this important bill has been before the House since August, 1982. I do not have the figures with me, but the Transport Committee held many hearings and we visited a great number of places. In any case, as I said earlier, I can tell the House that there was no consensus for or against change in Western Canada and British Columbia. Nearly all the witnesses asked that the bill be passed as quickly as possible and said that it could have very substantial economic spin-off benefits. As for the people in the province of Quebec, we have always maintained our position, and all those who expressed their views at the time are in agreement, and they too ask that this bill be passed as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to give a overview of the economic benefits which could derive from this important piece of legislation. Naturally, if passed, Bill C-155 will result in capital expenditures by the railways, as was mentioned on many occasions, of $16.5 billion, which will create 375,000 person-years of work. CNR and CPR will spend respectively $10 billion and $6.5 billion each, and it is expected that investments made in 1983 alone could create 5,500 person-

years of employment. Between 1983 and 1987, we can expect 23,700 person-years and at least 2,000 permanent jobs to be created.

Mr. Speaker, the major part of these expenditures depend on passage of the bill and on the Crow rate being changed. The railways have already undertaken their projects in anticipation of the bill being passed. They were encouraged by the decision of the Government early in 1983 to allow a depreciation allowance for railway investments. The Government has also offered the railways interim payments of approximately $300 million for the 1982-83 crop year to compensate for the losses incurred because of moving grain at the statutory price. With these payments, the railways will be able to increase their capital expenditures, namely by 40 per cent for CNR and 75 per cent for CPR. When passed the Bill C-155 will enable the railways to spend several billion dollars, and of course, to provide jobs and contribute to economic recovery in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, what will be the benefits for the provinces? In Western Canada, for instance? It has been recognized that the four Western provinces will be the major beneficiaries of the Crow rate reform. First, of course, the grain producers will benefit from a more effective and reliable railway network and rail transport system.

Everyone is aware, Mr. Speaker, that when travelling to Western Canada to hear the submissions made by residents of those provinces, all of them without exception told us that the present rail system was inefficient. I believe that this Bill will at least attempt to improve its efficiency. However, first of all, this will not prevent a reoccurrence of the congestion which occurred in 1977 and 1979 but will eliminate the need to rationalize the number of cars allotted to move each type of raw material, and second, it is in Western Canada that railway lines will be most improved. This will create jobs and provide new opportunities for local suppliers and industries. In addition, in order to assist these businesses, the Government has decided to provide $75 million worth of economic and industrial benefits as an incentive to industrial and economic development in Western Canada.

The province of British Columbia will benefit most from economic spin-offs. It is estimated that it will get 13 to more than a third of the $16 billion the railways will spend throughout the country. In Alberta, Mr. Speaker, the upgrading of the line will cost about $145 million. The CNR will spend 34 million dollars on concrete track ties manufactured in Alberta, and expand their freight stations in Japser, Edson, Edmonton and Wainwright.

● (1610)

In Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, the CNR will build a second track almost half as long as its mainline. The CNR maintenance facilities in Melville, Watrous, Saskatoon will be expanded. The CPR must expand its facilities in Regina and build, in 1983, a repair workshop for cars and diesel engines in Moose Jaw, if this Bill ever passes.

In Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, the CNR will expand their wheel maintenance shop in Transcona and modernize their marshalling yard in Symington. The CPR will spend $40 million to improve the regulation of railway traffic between Winnipeg and Thunder Bay, then they will expand again their wheel maintenance shop and build a new engine repair shop.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in Quebec and Ontario, the railways intend to spend $300 million over the next four years in upgrading their equipment and facilities. The CNR and CPR should spend about 1.4 billion dollars on rail supplies and equipment over the next decade.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government will spend some $3 million to improve the Port of Montreal and up-date its facilities to handle truck-delivered grain. It is the well-known war between Silos No. 4 and 5, and the work is already under way. The federal will order 3,840 hopper cars, most of which will be built at the Sorel plant. I see that my colleague the Hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Leduc) cannot help smiling, for he is thinking of all these railway cars which will be built in his plant. This will have spin-offs even in my riding of Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot, for the Griffin Steel Company there specializes in the making of railway wheels. Over 200 workers who are employed by this company have been closely following our proceedings on the Crow rate. I was very pleased to meet the president of the union in my riding office on a number of occasions. He was anxious to know when this bill would be adopted, for if it were, Marine Industries Limited in Sorel as well as other companies would receive orders for hopper cars, something which the workers in the Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot riding have been waiting for to get back to work. They had been unemployed for several months. I can tell you that as I am speaking, the building of these cars has already started and our unionized workers in the Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot riding are already back to work.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is important. It means billions of dollars in investments. It will give jobs to a great many Canadian men and women, so I cannot understand why our hon. friends opposite continue their filibuster. Earlier today, just before the lunch break, they asked for our consent to the House sitting during the lunch hour, and when we refused, they raised hell. I should like to ask them why they behaved as they did, allowing the bell to ring, when we were quite ready to work and defend this bill. The bell rang for hours and days and we were still on the same bill. Today, because we refused them one hour, we have been called traitors a moment ago in this House. I will not take seriously men who talk like that, and the citizens of this country will certainly see them for what they are when the time comes.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from an editorial published in the French newspaper *La Presse* on October 26, 1983, that is, quite recently. Frédéric Wagnière

said that Bill C-155 was a railway Act as opposed to an agricultural Act. I quote very briefly from his editorial. He said:

—while previously there was nothing but a hodgepodge of antiquated customs—

He was referring to the railways. And he concluded by saying:

These excessively close ties between transportation and agricultural policies are abnormal and have been permitted far too long. Legislation must be implemented as soon as possible in order to allow railway invesments which are badly needed, even if it means for the Minister of Agriculture to take required action to iron out difficulties this new transportation policy could cause the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest this quotation is enlightening. We as members of this Canadian Parliament are asked to take action and to pass third reading of Bill C-155 as soon as possible.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member referred to moneys or grants allocated in this Bill C-155 to upgrade ports. I suppose he was referring to Montreal and other places. However, I fail to find in this bill a single penny for the port of Vancouver.

[*English*]

Perhaps I can ask him a question about that because I could not put it to the Minister. The Minister talked about co-operation and then he stood up and lambasted the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), but in the spirit of that co-operation would the Hon. Member be prepared to approach the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and ask him whether he would give a commitment to tackle as a next step the terrible situation in the port of Vancouver, the transportation snags and so on? There is nothing in this Bill—

[*Translation*]

I note that there is not a penny for the port of Vancouver.

Mr. Ostiguy: Mr. Speaker, I never said there was, but some funds were previously voted, elsewhere to expand the facilities or services in the port of Vancouver. Obviously, there is nothing of the kind provided in this bill. But the benefits of the bill made it possible to undertake works now under way in the port of Montreal but of course they are not mentioned as such in the bill. It is not necessary to include everything in the bill. A lot can be done through the benefits flowing from the bill. Nevertheless, in the $16.6 billion provided for the entire amendment of the rates for grain, funds from other departments could be used to improve port facilities.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair has been apprised of the fact that there may be a desire to proceed in the following fashion. The Chair will recognize the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), then probably the Hon. Member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Hargrave), followed, I think, by the Hon. Member for Humboldt-Lake Centre (Mr. Althouse), but with the intention that possibly a Government Member may wish to complete the debate. It is not possible to do all those things in the time ramaining and I think it is up to the House to decide which way it wants to go. I simply say that, as I recognize the Hon. Member for Capilano, it is possible he may want to reduce his time to about ten minutes and a question and answer period of four or five minutes. But there is no House order to that effect so I have to leave it to Hon. Members to do as they wish.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, you are indicating three Opposition Members in a row. I would think the normal parliamentary practice and custom would be for the Government to be equally represented, and I wonder if you would like to revise that list accordingly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Perhaps there is a misunderstanding. As I said, there is no House order. The Chair has been approached with a request to find out if that is possible. I indicated I would mention it to the House and the House would decide as it sees fit. That is all. It is a common practice, when it is late in the day, that sometimes Hon. Members decide to reduce 20 minute speeches to ten in order to allow other Members to speak, that is all.

● (1620)

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, since it is Friday and the only Members left in the House are the ones who are most congenial, I am sure there would not be any problem if the Chair did not see the clock until perhaps 15 or 20 minutes after five in order to complete the kind of round of speakers which I am sure all sides would like to hear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It cannot be done that way. We have already indicated that it is simply because I have been approached in the chair with a request for some facilitation of the program that I have mentioned it, but it is not up to the Chair to make those decisions. I cannot do that. If the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) would like to put a motion, he can do so.

Mr. Benjamin: Mr. Speaker, Speakers have been known not only to not see an Hon. Member but to not see the clock. That is all I was suggesting.

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that it is so difficult to rise and give a speech on third reading of a Bill of this magnitude and importance to the country. It is a Bill that is extremely important to the prairie basin and very important to my Province of British Columbia.

The Hon. Member for Saint-Hyacinthe-Bagot (Mr. Ostiguy) said that all that the people in Quebec want out of this Bill is justice and equity, and he used those very marvellous words. That is all we in the West want as well, Sir. Let me assure the Hon. Member of that. I would also like to point out that I am reminded of Aleksander Solzhenitsyn's words in 1975 warning the western society of the legalistic society that is coming upon us and will be threatening our freedoms. We are certainly in the middle of that here today because, in the final hours of this debate, legalistic procedure has cut out one and a half to two speakers. During the last week we have lost a

day that never existed and now we have lost the opportunity for two Members from the West to speak.

I would like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that first comes the plough and then civilization. We are dealing right now with the plough of the West and the civilization of the West. The Crow rate of half a cent a ton mile made a lot of money for the railways in the beginning. It was not until the end of the 1950s and into the 1960s that inflation in the western world caught up with that statutory rate. For all those years, the Crow was a good thing for the railways and it gave the farmers of western Canada a statutory rate. They knew what that aspect of their cost would be. On the Prairies, grain prices today are the same as they were almost ten years ago. It is machinery, ingenuity, creativity and thrift that has allowed productivity in the prairie Provinces to adjust to the rising costs of energy and machinery. Now we shall see the rising costs of transportation with the removal of the protection of those costs.

As far as we are concerned, Mr. Speaker, the railways must have compensatory rates for their cost. We question if they need a 20 per cent profit on costs because who in this land can really understand the costing methods of the railways? The method of payment has been a very serious issue in the debate on this Bill. The entire payment will now go to the railway, reversing the stand taken by the previous Minister of Transport who more or less followed the Gilson line.

Throughout the debate, we have seen that the method of payment will be the heart and guts of where we will go in the future. If this Bill stands, Sir, and the subsidy goes to the railways, we have locked the West into an archaic transportation system. We have removed from the West and its farmers and industrialists the right to innovate, to put in better systems and to use other means of transportation. We have also eliminated the right of industrialists and farmers on the Prairies to have the freedom to choose what they will do with the wealth and the energy that comes from the prairie soil. That is the tragedy, Sir, and that is why some of us get so very, very emotional and upset about this legislation.

When the Minister opened the debate on third reading today, this one short day of debate on third reading of a Bill of this magnitude, he made some very disparaging remarks about the Province of British Columbia and said that if the Province had represented itself in Ottawa or had offered an opinion or statement on the coal lands, then perhaps the Government would have done something about it. I would simply like to tell Hon. Members how misleading the Minister's statement was, Mr. Speaker.

On May 20, 1983, ten days after the first reading of Bill C-155, the British Columbia Minister of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources sent the following message to the federal Minister of Transport:

> Your proposals to amend the grain rates established by the Crow's Nest Pass Act have received support from this Province. We continue to hope for an early resolution of this issue, although we have concerns with recent changes you have made to the subsidy arrangements. We believe it desirable to pay the subsidy to the farmers and not to the railways directly. We are troubled, moreover, by the language employed in Section 62 of Bill C-155. The Province of British Columbia has always maintained an ownership claim on the subject of coal lands. Moreover, it has regulatory requirements and land use priorities which must be met by all explorers and developers of coal. Accordingly, we trust that the federal government would never attempt to dispose of these coal lands unilaterally.
>
> I believe it is possible for our governments to take a co-operative approach—

A co-operative approach is something about which this Government knows nothing.

> —to resolving these outstanding issues in order to facilitate the orderly development of the coal resources for the benefit of British Columbia, and all of Canada.

That was the position taken by the British Columbia Government on May 20, 1983, ten days after first reading of Bill C-155. There was a limited response on June 22, 1983, to the British Columbia initiative. The government of British Columbia laid it on the line back then, Sir, and that is its position today.

When dealing with the method of payment, we keep getting it thrown back in our face that no one supports us on that issue. I would like to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Manitoba supports payment to the railways, but that Government is a socialist Government. What we are dealing with in this Bill is corporatism both in a state and a corporate sense. The Government will destroy the small farmer, the person with a bank debt or a mortgage on a farm. The whole damned prairie basin, Sir, will go to the big guys, the people without debt, the people with capital and the people of the second and third generations. That is what this formula of payment will do.

The Governmment of Saskatchewan is opposed to this method of payment and advocates payment to the producers. The Government of Alberta is opposed to the method of payment and believes that producers should be given the choice of how payment is to be made. It proposes the double-eighty option. The government of British Columbia is opposed to the method of payment in this Bill and favours producer payments for reasons of efficiency. Producer groups and the pools in Manitoba support payment to the railways. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool prefers the same method of payment as does the Manitoba Pool.

Why do the bureaucrats in the infrastructures that are locked into the railway system support payment to the railways? They are managers and elected directors and bureaucrats who manage a physical plant that is tied into the railway collection, distribution and delivery system. Of course they oppose payment to the producers because full payment or even partial payment to the producers allows some decision-making to be based at large among the population and interferes with the established infrastructure. It also interferes with the opportunity to install modern plants and find new ways of doing things with more efficiency for the delivery, production and handling costs of grain.

We find opposition all the way down the line. The United Grain Growers is opposed to the method of payment and proposes an alternate scheme similar to the freedom of choice option. Unifarm is opposed to railway payments and supports

the double-eighty proposal. Cargill is opposed to railway payments and supports the double-eighty proposal.

It is easy, Mr. Speaker, for a Member from Quebec to stand up and say that there is no consensus on the Prairies. The overwhelming consensus on the Prairies is that if we do not move to partial or full payment to the producer, we are locking in the future of western Canada.

Perhaps I can explain further, Sir, by telling you about my personal experience in a business in which I was once intimately involved. I am in the business of production of goods. I have also made my living as an efficiency expert, a critical path expert, a work study expert and a designer of better systems for handling cattle and the production of produce in the field of agriculture. That was my background. I was privy to a study that was given to me with the purpose of putting in a big packing plant and feeding operation in Lethbridge. We selected Lethbridge for many reasons. We were going to have massive feeding systems which were very efficient so that we could get a uniformity of finish on the cattle coming in.

• (1630)

We fed the cattle before they went to slaughter. The entrails were removed according to health of animals regulations. Hides were taken according to those regulations. The cattle were hung for curing in order to get the optimum quality out of this production. All of the tallow and bone were stripped according to health of animals protection and supervision. The meat was cut and certain cuts were ordered by hotel systems, restaurant systems and large supermarkets. This was all handled so that the maximum dollar value with no waste came out of that animal. It was one of the finest designs and one of the best economic structures in meat handling, from hoof all the way through to store shelf and the plate on the restaurant table, that we had seen. I was part and parcel of this.

That operation was uneconomical in the Canadian Prairies because the subsidy moving the grain out to the large areas of consumption made it impossible to move the finished product. That is why I stand here to say that what the Government is doing is wrong. It is smothering and suffocating the West with its stubborness and adherence to this concept of payment to the railroad. It is all right to say that we will set up a study of the matter which will examine it and that perhaps two and one-half years from now, when the committee reports back, we will change the Bill. One of the amendments my colleague for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) was asking for was an amendment to the Bill so that recommendations from that study could be put into the Bill. Therefore, if we have to follow a modified Gilson formula or whatever the committee decided flowing from its studies, something could be done that would give some staying power to the future and the infrastructure of the region I come from.

You cannot question my love of the country but do not blame me for being raised and educated in the West. I understand and love this country. I understand and love the freedoms that it has given me and allowed me to pass on. But I have a western sense about me, the same as the people from Quebec have a Quebecois sense about them. I am saying that if you want to keep this country going, regions that have political power in this House must not impose that power arbitrarily on the rest of us. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this week in Edmonton a new federal Party was formed. It is called "The Confederation of Regions' Party". That Party will address this regionalization of Canada if we in the House cannot.

Bill C-155 and the arrogance and manner with which it is being imposed upon us has produced an anger that will last and stay unless we fix it.

I do not have enough time to say the rest of what is in my heart. I really want that time but I am going to sit down after speaking for 15 minutes because I know that I have some colleagues who really want to express in the final minutes of this debate how they feel and how their regions feel about this Bill. But I tell those Members on the Government side that what they are ramming down our throats in the West with this Bill, on top of the National Energy Program, will not be forgotten. It will not heal the wounds of this country; it will aggravate them. With that, I will sit down and allow somebody else to speak in the few remaining minutes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I want to remind the House that the subamendment proposed by the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin) was found to be in order. Accordingly, I will put it to the House. Moved by Mr. Benjamin, seconded by Mr. Althouse:

That the amendment be amended by adding Clauses 33, 41, 47, 54 and 59.

As I already indicated to the House, the amendment is in order. The Chair will now call for questions, comments and answers for ten minutes related to the speech of the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington). At that time I will look to my right for the next speaker. Debate will close at 4.45 p.m.

Mr. Robert Bockstael (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, the problem with the Crow rate has been before this House for years. I came here in 1979 and served on the Transport Committee. It was evident that the Government of the day, with the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) as Minister of Transport, had to look to the Crow rate. It had to be one of the priorities for resolution in the very near future. It was a problem that would not go away and had to be faced, not deferred.

The previous Minister of Transport, now the Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin), established the Gilson task force. That task force came as close as possible to reaching a consensus. During the interim, unfortunately, different associations which had been part of that consensus allowed it to disintegrate because they were trying to bargain for more. The Gilson report was then amended and submitted.

In the P.C. dominated Provinces, the Gilson report as amended was slow to be endorsed. Subsequently, when we made our tours across the country, people said that we should

have adopted the Gilson report, but I must confess that we found no unity in the West on the resolution of the Crow. Many witnesses in Alberta told us that they would rather proceed with the present Bill with the expectation of amending it at a later date or making changes from the experience garnered rather than do nothing. When we went to British Columbia, the witnesses there told us emphatically to proceed and get on with the Bill because the country needs it. In Manitoba, many people said that they did not want any change at all but, on the other hand, they wanted increased benefits, improved capacity and to make sure the railway employees have work. But they did not want the Government to add any cost to the producers.

When we returned from the hearings which the Transport Committee held in the West we resumed our meetings in the Railway Committee room.

The Official Opposition launched its trial balloon saying that there should be freedom of choice. It was a nice catch phrase which can also apply when talking about abortion. The Conservatives advocated freedom of choice for the producers. They let that lapse and took the position that it is better to do nothing. Rather than make a decision they wanted to put a freeze on the rates and wait to see what happens. They suggested that we should gain three years of experience and proceed in the meantime with putting in the required infrastructure to improve the capacity of rail and product transportation to export.

There is no doubt in my mind that costs for producers have gone up. We recognize that grain producers are in a class by themselves. They do not have the option of passing on their production costs to the customer because of our system for marketing our cereal grains to export. Producers pay more for land, shelter, farm buildings, their equipment and supplies. That is not an exception to the rule. Show me a business that has not had increased costs. Everything has gone up, everything costs more. Show me a consumer whose costs of living have not gone up. Every business would like to have the guarantees given to grain producers. They have been guaranteed an adequate transportation and a safety net which will keep the percentage of the sale of their goods limited, so that they do not pay more than a fixed percentage to transport their grain. No one in the country, if invited, would want to pay more taxes. No one wanted to pay more for postage. No one wants to pay more for services.

● (1640)

What it boils down to is the fact that producers do not want to pay more for transportation. As was mentioned earlier today, their transportation costs represent 3 per cent to 4 per cent of the sale price of cereal grain. They do not want to pay more than that.

What does the federal Government propose to do to assist western transportation initiatives? Having established the datum of the Crow benefit at $650 million, Canadian taxpayers will continue to contribute in perpetuity at least $650 million toward the transportation of cereal grain. Last year producers paid $135 million for something that cost $785 million to handle. As increases are applied to the cost of transportation, producers will only have to pay twice as much in four crop years; they will be expected to pay twice as much for transportation in four crop years as they do today. There is a myth propagated that it will be five times Crow by 1991. There will be a review after four crop years. In anticipation of the review, we will look at the experience. The Opposition says that we should do nothing for three years and then look at what is possible. In that event we would defer ad nauseum what we will do for grain producers.

The Canadian Government is looking to spending $3.5 billion in the next 3.5 years, that is $1 billion per year. First there is the $650 million subsidy. Then there are the branch line rehabilitation fund, branch line subsidies and hopper car purchases and leases for which the Government of Canada pays. That runs close to $1 billion per year. We are doing a great deal to help grain producers.

Also the Government has taken initiatives in the area of helping to establish a superport at Prince Rupert, to improve the Port of Vancouver and to improve rail lines. These improvements will make it easier for grain producers and all suppliers of manufactured and processed goods and mineral resources across the country to receive goods, to transport them across the country and to export them. This is the catalyst which will cause the railways to spend $16 billion in the next eight years.

It has been mentioned by other speakers in the House how that $16 billion will be apportioned to the various regions of the country, how it will improve the economy and create jobs. Our intention is to create jobs, to provide employment and to enhance the economy. It is important that it be done on a broad spectrum to help everyone across the nation and to give the country the railway system and transportation it needs.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to travel in Saskatchewan where I met people who have been in wheat and grain production for years. The tradition was passed on from grandfather to father to son, and those people have told us: Ah, there is one thing which you should not do, and that is change the Crow rate.

[*English*]

For those people the Crow rate seemed to be a dogma of faith. We could not touch it. When we asked why, they really did not know. It was because they were told from generation to generation that they must never spend more on transportation. They had to spend more on everything else, but it was one thing on which they should not have to spend any more. That defies logic. It is necessary to realize that when everything else is costing more, people are prepared to meet what the Canadian Government wants to do.

May I in closing—

Some Hon. Members: Time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. It being 4.45 p.m., pursuant to order made Wednesday, October 26, 1983, it is my duty to interrupt proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of third reading of the Bill.

Consequently, the question is on the amendment to the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment to the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion the nays have it. Therefore I declare the amendment to the amendment lost.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Benjamin) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The next question is on the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski). All those in favor of the amendment will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Accordingly, the vote is deferred to 5.45 p.m., Monday, November 14, 1983, and the House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock a.m., Monday, November 14. Bonne semaine à tous; have a good week.

At 4.48 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Orders.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 14, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

THE LATE HON. WALTER BAKER

TRIBUTES TO FORMER MEMBER

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it is with true sadness and a deep sense of loss that I rise to pay tribute to our colleague, Walter Baker. With Walter's death yesterday, Canada has lost a gifted leader and a distinguished parliamentarian and all of us who knew him have lost a warm and a generous friend.

While new to this House, I am not insensitive to its traditions. During the short time that I have been here, I have seen that one of the noblest traditions seems to be the friendship that emerges from the forge of partisan battle. Such friendships, Mr. Speaker, tempered as they often are in the cauldron of debate, are both genuine and durable because, irrespective of Party, they are born in the deep respect that comes from true accomplishment on behalf of Canada.

During one of my first conversations with Walter after my election as Leader, he spoke movingly of his recent visits with the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Walter told me of the Hon. Member's great contribution to Parliament and to Canada over three decades and how much he would be missed should he decide not to run again. I found it both poignant and elevating, Mr. Speaker, that Walter would speak with such obvious affection for someone of another political Party. I knew that a man capable of such discernment loved people, revered Parliament and ennobled it by his presence.

To earn the respect and the admiration of one's colleagues, including and perhaps particularly those who represent other Parties, is, in my judgment, the ultimate tribute to one's time here. Walter recognized and indeed enjoyed the partisan nature of the House. He understood its rules and he stood in respect of its customs. But Walter sensed as well a growing estrangement of ordinary Canadians from this place he loved so well and served so admirably. He knew that vitriol was no substitute for vigorous debate; that partisanship did not preclude decency; and that humour, true humour, was an instrument to disarm and not a club to embarrass. He was the antithesis of the "merchants of discourtesy" so scorned by Churchill for debasing exchange in another Parliament.

So along with many here he worked tirelessly in the cause of parliamentary reform. The committee of which he was vice-chairman produced ten reports, all unanimous, all arrived at by consensus and all designed to improve the parliamentary life of Canada. Time and time again he warned that our rules must be more responsive, our procedures less arcane and our conduct more becoming, failing which Canadians would progressively question both our relevance and our value.

We should ensure, Mr. Speaker, that his gentle but incisive words not go unheeded. We should learn from his thoughtful personal conduct. We should remember him as a man of distinction who asked only that we refurbish the reputation of this historic place by conducting ourselves with the same sense of courtesy and responsibility we would wish to have associated with our professional careers or our private lives.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, Walter Baker was a great parliamentarian, but above all, he was a gentleman. He had great affection for this place and affection and admiration for all who work here, without regard for political orientation. He was a loyal Member of his Party, but he was never blindly partisan. He saw the qualities of his political adversaries and respected them, and during the short time that I have been in this House, I have always observed that the feeling was mutual.

[*English*]

Above all, Mr. Speaker, Walter Baker loved Canada. He loved it as a country of opportunity and a land of tolerance. He worked tirelessly toward its unity and its enhancement.

In all of the years that I knew Walter, I suppose that most of all I was always struck by his sense of fairness and by his sense of humour. Problems were to be solved but always with concern for those affected by the decisions. Positions were to be held strongly but always with openness for those of different views.

[*Translation*]

Ideas were to be put forward, but never with the cool brashness of people who think they have a monopoly on the truth.

[*English*]

Choices were to be made but never with malice toward those of other persuasions.

So today, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we salute Walter Baker and we say goodbye to a wonderful friend, a man with a unique love of Parliament, a delightful, happy individual of unfailing grace who loved Canada and enriched us all by his presence. On behalf of my Party and I am sure on behalf of all Members, I convey to Lois and the family our heartfelt sadness and our deepest condolences.

• (1110)

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it was with great dismay that we learned late yesterday of the untimely passing of our friend and fellow Member, the Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton, the Hon. Walter

Baker, my distinguished predecessor as President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada.

While we were all aware of the insidious disease which he had been battling since last summer, it appeared from his good spirits and hearty demeanour that he was winning. Therefore, it was a double blow to learn so suddenly of his death.

Walter Baker loved this place. He loved it from the moment he first stepped into the visitors' gallery. From his earliest days as a Member, he demonstrated that he had spent most of his life preparing himself for it. He was a servant of the House, both as Leader of the Government and as Opposition House Leader. More recently he served as vice-chairman of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure and became one of the most constructive influences on the operations of that Committee by consensus rather than by confrontation.

He was totally committed to the improvement of the institutions of democracy in Canada and as such served as a major contributor to the access to information law.

The people of Nepean-Carleton will miss him greatly. Walter Baker was not just a great parliamentarian, he was a great constituency man. Regardless of political affiliation, there was probably no resident of his district who could find anything but praise for his service to them.

The loss is hardest, however, for his wife, his three young children and his two tiny grandchildren. Walter always spoke of his family with pride and affection. We offer them our most sincere condolences.

[*Translation*]

Although I often had occasion to consult with the Hon. Walter Baker at our meetings of parliamentary House leaders, it was especially during the historic debate on the Constitution that I learned to appreciate my distinguished predecessor in the position of President of the Privy Council. I found his attitude positive, constructive and respectful. A man of "unfailing grace", as the previous speaker said so well, Walter Baker was a typical example of the parliamentarian this institution needs if it is to renew itself and provide better safeguards for our rights and freedoms. This loss will be felt by each and every one of us, and on behalf of the Government, I wish to offer his wife and his entire family our sincere sympathy.

[*English*]

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I was very sad this morning to hear of the passing of Walter Baker. I came to know Walter quite well in the short time I have been in the House of Commons. I came not only to know him when he was House Leader for the Government but also to know him outside Parliament. He was a man of very deep commitment, and he showed at all times a very genuine concern for his constituents on the one hand and for the institution of Parliament on the other. He was firm in his convictions, yet he was gentle in his approach. He was quick to challenge when he felt that you were wrong, but he was equally quick to come to your defence or to offer words of encouragement if you were under pressure or if you felt that you needed his support.

He clearly felt very deeply for the people of Nepean-Carleton. It has been said by many—and it has been said to me frequently—that we could always find Walter in the constituency. He was known by everyone. He attended every event, large or small. Every family felt touched by him and every family felt confident about Walter.

• (1115)

I remember an occasion when I was invited to speak in Walter's constituency and he noted an advertisement in the newspaper. He sent me a small clipping of the history of the constituency, providing me with some background, with a note just letting me know that he was happy I was going to be there. On another occasion, when my executive assistant was helping to organize a tenants' association, Walter phoned—although we were on different sides of the House—to offer his support and his encouragement, both of which he demonstrated frequently during the period of time when the organization was taking place.

He was committed to his wife and family. I recall going with Walter and his wife to Halifax where I saw a different side of Walter Baker. After the day's work was finished and the arguments had been put aside for the day, I saw the joyous side of Walter, dancing, singing, happy and sharing his happiness with the other people who were at that particular conference.

Walter will be remembered as a person of substance. He will be remembered fondly by his supporters and by his political adversaries alike. He will be remembered by those of us in the House of Commons for his work, as was said earlier, on the parliamentary reform committee. He believed that Parliament could be reformed to be a more meaningful place, and that came through at every meeting which we held when I was a member of that committee. He will be remembered by many for his work on freedom of information. There will be a lasting benefit to the people of Canada as a result of Walter's commitment to this cause.

Walter, of course, will be remembered by his family as a truly decent man. He was taken in the prime of his life but what he left behind will be remembered by everyone. His influence will be with us for years to come. I want to say on behalf of my good friend and colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—who unfortunately could not be here today—on behalf of my Leader and on behalf of our caucus, how sad we are at his passing. We want to say to his family that they should be proud of the accomplishments of their father, son, grandfather, husband; proud of Walter Baker.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I would like to contribute very briefly to the eloquent tributes paid to Walter Baker by my Leader and others who have spoken. For most of my time in this Parliament, Walter Baker was at my side as Acting Prime Minister and as House Leader in Gov-

ernment and in Opposition. I counted on him, not just for his industry and judgment, but because he was the most open and vital of men.

Walter loved his work, not just in Parliament, not just in his constituency, but wherever in the country that work carried him. He had the gift of making Government and Parliament personal. He leaves one kind of legacy in the debates and the rules of this Parliament and in the laws which he affected, but for those of us who were privileged to work with him, his larger legacy is the committed, generous, positive spirit which guided everything he did, even in the days when disease was pulling him down.

More than a colleague, even more than a friend, he was a constant example of the decency, generosity and love which are at the heart of the way we live. We miss him, we mourn him, and our hearts go out to Lois and to his family.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I wonder if I could be permitted at this point to join in the respect being paid to a man whom I have known for over 25 years and counted as a very good friend.

Walter was born in Cardinal, and practised law in Ottawa before coming to this place in association with the Hon. Dick Bell who was a Member for Carleton. Walter succeeded to that seat in 1972.

Members of the House have paid tribute to Walter as a parliamentarian and words cannot express his love for this place, his contribution and his work in the direction of parliamentary reform.

Words have also been said about his work as a constituency representative. Walter represented a constituency adjacent to my own. We had many occasions on which we acted jointly, always in a spirit of good friendship, with frank and free exchange of opinion where there were differences, but always with mutual respect and, I would like to think, affection.

• (1120)

Walter's family life was also a model. In days when people are sometimes disrespectful of those who hold public office, Walter Baker was a man no one could possibly criticize. His eminent virtue, his industry, his integrity and his warm human qualities made him very much endeared as a friend. I personally wish to express my sympathy to Lois and members of his family. This has been a difficult period for all of them. I hope it is some comfort to her and to them to know of the deep affection and admiration we held for Walter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Thomas H. Lefebvre (Pontiac-Gatineau-Labelle): Mr. Speaker last night I was both astonished and saddened at the news of the death of our colleague, the Hon. Walter Baker. On behalf of all the Members of the Special Committee on Procedure and Organization, a committee I have been privileged to chair and on which I was also privileged to work together with Mr. Baker in his capacity as Vice-Chairman, I wish to offer our sincere sympathy to his wife Lois and all his children. It was a very rewarding experience to work with an experienced parliamentarian like Walter Baker. I am sure that his passing will be felt as a tremendous loss, not only by the members of his family but by his constituents and the Parliament of Canada.

[*English*]

There is no doubt that Walter Baker's work, his concern and his commitment had a great deal to do with the quality of the reports produced by the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure. This Committee provided me with the unique opportunity of working with a great parliamentarian in the person of Walter Baker. Throughout his career Mr. Baker and I, when we sat on both Government and Opposition sides, occupied different positions in the House where we had to adopt and defend Party positions. Never once in all those times did the work we carried out on behalf of our Party policies ever interfere with his honour, integrity and the feeling of friendship that he had with myself and many other MPs. We shall miss him, and this institution will be the lesser for his regrettable passing away.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, as a constituent of Walter Baker and a long time friend, I would like to add my personal tribute to his family and himself at this time.

• (1125)

You mentioned that he was born in Cardinal, which is indicative of the fact that he came from the Valley. He also knew that I was married to a woman whose family goes back to the original settlers of the Valley, going back to the veterans of the Napoleonic wars. He constantly came to me to talk about the roots and the views of these people because he knew I had some knowledge of the history of the County of Carleton. It was his deep understanding of these people which carried him through many a decision. He had a deep appreciation of the background of these English, Scots and Irish who came here after the great wars in Europe to settle the land, break the ground and clear the bush.

Even though I lived on the outskirts of his riding in Manotick, almost every week he would ask me: "What are the bus drivers saying?" This was our way of learning through the school children what was going on in the homes.

I think that background should be put on the record because Walter in his public life was not only interested in the affairs of the nation, but he was interested in the views, feelings and hopes and aspirations of every person in the whole area he represented. As was said before, he was the kind of Member of Parliament that all of us would like to be. Along with others here, my sympathy goes to the family.

Mr. Roland de Corneille (Eglinton-Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, I have the temerity to rise at this time not to add to the excellent expressions of tribute which have been made, because my words could not do that, but to try to suggest that words can now be brought into action. Perhaps our concerns as we have expressed them concerning our affection and love for

Walter Baker may in this case be put into action by a non-partisan approach to the subject of parliamentary reform, which was so dear to him. I hope this event will provide us with that added incentive to make a reality that which was such a part of his life's work.

The second way in which we might be able to express our feelings, those of us who are not given an opportunity to take part in this tribute, is to ask that before this period is brought to an end and we begin Orders of the Day, we might have an opportunity to stand for a moment of silence together.

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parkdale-High Park): Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening I was returning home by car from a Latvian function commemorating the sixty-fifth anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Latvia. The Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) knows which function I am speaking of because he was the keynote speaker. As I pulled into the driveway I heard the announcement over the radio and I stopped the car halfway up the driveway and my first words were, "Oh no, not Walter."

We did lose a great parliamentarian and I would like to take this opportunity to express sympathy to his wife and children on behalf of Canadians of Estonian, Lithuanian and Latvian descent. I think most of us sitting in this Chamber know that every year we have a function here called the Baltic Evening. Walter always co-chaired that evening with a Senator. I know Canadians of Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian descent would want me to express condolences to Walter's entire family.

Just last summer young Lithuanians from around the world were having a conference in Canada, with a one-day program here in Ottawa. They were looking for someone on the Government side and someone from the Official Opposition to co-chair this function. I called Walter and he immediately said: "Yes, Jesse, no problem." I could not make that function because of my commitment with Bill C-155, but Walter attended. Even though he was getting treatment for his cancer, he gave up the day to join these young Lithuanians from around the world to shake their hands and say hello. That was Walter. He always co-operated.

• (1130)

When we had our Standing Order 43s in the House, I knew that if I ever wanted unanimous consent on any issue dealing with human rights, all I had to do was go to Walter, especially when he was House Leader, and I knew it was granted. On behalf of Canadians from the Baltic States and all Canadians, I too wish to add my condolences to the entire Baker family.

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I will speak very briefly because words are difficult. I would like to join in paying tribute to our late colleague. Walter Baker was an outstanding Canadian, a great advocate of this city and a dedicated Member of the House.

His legacy is one of parliamentary reform. I know that he would want that to be ongoing because this institution, as it lives, must be involved in reform. Freedom of information is also an outstanding legacy.

This House has lost a dedicated, outstanding parliamentarian and I have lost a friend.

Mr. John Evans (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is hard to add more to what has already been said here today but I think I have to add the words that I have inside of me over the loss that we have experienced with Walter's passing. We all know that Walter was a very highly respected parliamentarian in the House. He was seen as that not only in his riding but in the City of Ottawa and across the country. He loved Canada.

He could always be counted on in the House to add to the debate and add a Canadian and national perspective which had meaning to all of us. He was loved and he loved the people of his constituency. That perspective was always brought to bear when Walter spoke here or when he spoke in his riding.

My constituency, as does yours, Mr. Speaker, borders on Walter's. Like you, when we had joint events which we attended—which was often—Walter could always be counted on to be concerned about the people who were there, what their problems were and how he and I jointly could help those people. He could always be counted on to do so in a totally non-partisan and co-operative fashion. He was a great constituency man and will be greatly missed in his constituency.

When I was first elected, even though Walter came from another Party, he was always at my assistance, counselling me on what it meant to be a Member of Parliament. I have learned a great deal from Walter about how I could deal with my constituency, better serve my constituents and how I should conduct myself in the House. Walter was a great model for us and a great example for all parliamentarians now and in the future. I hope he will be remembered as such. He was a role model for us. He will be deeply missed as a friend, colleague and national leader. I want to express my deep regrets and sympathy to Lois and the family and to let them know that Walter will be fondly remembered here as a model for all of us.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Robert Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier): Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I wish to join the previous speakers in offering my sincere sympathy to Lois, David, Jeffrey and Nancy. Walter first became a Member of Parliament in 1972, the year I started in the House of Commons. Since then, we often worked together on issues concerning the National Capital Region, and in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the House, very briefly, that Walter was not only sensitive to the problems of the people of his riding but also profoundly aware of the more general problems encountered by minority groups. I would like to add that he was also very helpful in dealing with issues concerning federal public servants. He was constantly asking questions on the floor of the House. He made enquiries and was always well informed on the problems of Canada's public servants. That is why, because of his co-operation and his ceaseless endeavours in the past eleven, nearly twelve, years during which he served this country, Mr. Speak-

er, we have lost a great Canadian. I have lost a friend, and I offer Lois and her family my heartfelt sympathy.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): It is with a great amount of sadness that I rise today as a result of our long time colleague, Walter Baker, having passed away. When I returned to the Ottawa Valley after being absent for many years, it was with Walter Baker that I articled. Five years later we both came to this place at the same time.

I think people must reflect and consider that Walter was probably one of the most positive people and was never negative. If there was a way to bring people together, Walter would do so. I think everyone has considered today that he was a joyful influence and could perhaps even be referred to as a happy warrior. He enjoyed life, loved people and loved this Parliament. Along with others, I would like to express my regrets and sympathy to Lois and his family.

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, in my constituency there is a private school that is older than this country. That school counts among its alumni many famous and well known people, one of whom was Walter Baker. Being a member of its Board, I should say that I have heard of many of Walter's activities during his school years in addition to those things we have heard here. He was a normal teenager, full of spirit, pranks and other things. Since his graduation he has kept in his heart a place for Albert College. He was on the Board of Directors.

On behalf of the Chairman, the Headmaster and all of the students who paused this morning to pay tribute to him, I want to extend their condolences to the Baker family.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would it be appropriate at this time to ask Members to rise for a minute's silence in tribute to a former colleague, Walter Baker?

[*Whereupon the House stood in silence for one minute.*]

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

AGREEMENT NOT TO SIT ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I propose, with the consent of the House, that the House suspend its present sitting until 2 p.m. later this day. I also propose that the House do not sit on Wednesday, November 16, 1983.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until two o'clock this afternoon.

S.O. 21

SITTING SUSPENDED

At 11.40 a.m. the sitting of the House was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PRIME MINISTER'S PEACE INITIATIVES

Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 21 I would like to call to the attention of the House that the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has just returned from a trip of immense importance to Canada and the world, a mission of peace to European capitals. The Prime Minister presented four points that are part of a strategy of peace, including a call for a five-power nuclear conference to negotiate nuclear arsenal limits, and the expansion of the non-proliferation treaty. It is encouraging to know that the Prime Minister has returned from Europe with a consensus among leaders there that these peace initiatives should be supported.

The Prime Minister has begun the task of moving the world back from the brink of nuclear holocaust and international tensions which increase the likelihood of war. I was moved by his statement yesterday and I draw this particularly to the attention of Canadians. He said:

> We can without effort abandon our fate to the mindless drift toward nuclear war. Or we can gather our strength . . . . to turn aside the forces bearing down on us.

Canadians have made great contributions to mankind. Canadians could make no greater contribution now and in the future than working for the preservation of mankind. I call upon all Members of this House and all Canadians to support actively the Prime Minister's peace initiatives and his efforts both here in Canada and abroad.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—CANADIAN PEACE-KEEPING ROLE

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, recent discussions about the possibility of Canada participating as a peace-keeper in Grenada brings to mind another peace-keeping role in which this country is involved. I am speaking of Cyprus, where Canada has sent peace-keeping troops for 19 years. Our mandate for maintaining a peace-keeping force in Cyprus comes up for renewal in December. Certainly one cannot and should not advocate a troop withdrawal simply

because our peace-keeping role in Cyprus has not brought about a resolution to the country's peace talks. But the stalemate in negotiations is cause for concern.

One has to wonder whether Canadian peace-keeping troops in Cyprus are as much a part of the problem as a part of the solution in that our presence there makes it easier for the stalemate to continue. Some 500 Canadian soldiers are in Cyprus, and most soldiers do a six-month tour of duty. It is a tremendous strain on our manpower and resources, so perhaps the time has come to review carefully our role as peace-keepers in order to ensure that we are as effective as possible.

I therefore suggest a parliamentary review, a white paper on Canada's peace-keeping commitment, with particular emphasis on our role in NATO. Canada has every right to be proud of its reputation as a peace-keeper. However, if we are to maintain that reputation we must ensure that our peace-keeping role is practical and effective.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SHIPBUILDING

DAVIE SHIPBUILDING YARD IN QUEBEC—IMPORTANCE OF SETTLING SITUATION QUICKLY

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, the situation at the Davie shipyards remains disastrous. In spite of the contribution of the Canadian government to the construction of the CN Marine ferry in the amount of $121 million and to the repairs of a few other ships, the workers will soon have to face the hard fact that as of mid-1984 there will be nothing on the order book. Nearly 1,000 employees who are already out of work will see their unemployment insurance benefits replaced by welfare payments before Christmas. This problem at the largest employer of the Quebec region must be solve quickly.

Recently, we have heard many comments and questions in this regard and I urge all parties involved to reply to them jointly. First, why have the Davie shipyards lost all the major contracts awarded recently by the Canadian Government, even though the average hourly rate at Davie is lower than at Marine Industries Limited of Sorel, for instance? Second, are the workers satisfied with their productivity? Is there something to prevent Davie from being the lowest bidder for these contracts? Third, does the Quebec Government, through the SGF give unfair support to one shipyard at the defense of another? All interested parties will have to jointly answer everyone of these questions in order to solve this urgent problem.

[*English*]

THE ADMINISTRATION

CALL FOR HOLDING OF GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Ron Stewart (Simcoe South): Mr. Speaker, in August, 1969, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated, "We would be on the road to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control."

Since that time government spending has increased 693 per cent, and it has cost every Canadian taxpayer over $10,000. The net national debt at the end of the last fiscal year was $119.2 billion, but the Auditor General believes that this has been understated by $14.5 billion. This year interest on the debt will cost each Canadian taxpayer more than $1,700.

The result of all this has been continuing high interest rates, slow economic growth, low productivity, and high unemployment rates. Unemployment Insurance Commission benefits in 1982 were equal to $8.5 billion, more than the combined government spending of the four Atlantic Provinces.

The magazine *Euromoney* ranks Canada's over-all economic growth since 1974 at sixty-second in the world, our inflation performance is rated twenty-fifth, and our balance of payments performance is rated twentieth. It is an economic record that only a Liberal Government could take pride in, a Liberal Government led by a Prime Minister who has stated unequivocally that he would choose Cuban or Chinese socialism as the national model for Canadian society. But the polls indicate that Canadians have not been fooled. The Prime Minister should call an election now and give them an opportunity to show that Canadians do not choose Cuban, Chinese, Liberal, or any other form of socialism.

* * *

[*Translation*]

YOUTH

PROPOSALS PRESENTED BY FEDERATION OF CANADIAN STUDENTS

Mr. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, a group of about sixty young students from almost all Canadian provinces is in Ottawa today on behalf of the Canadian Federation of Students to make representations to their elected representatives and to express concern about the problems of youth unemployment, postsecondary education and access to educational institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I know that about one hundred Members of the House have welcomed the recommendations of the Canadian Federation of Students, and I hope that this sympathetic reception will be translated into a non-partisan and common will to act. The current critical situation of young Canadians is well known, and surely no one would want to see a generation disillusioned because of a lack of political leadership. In that respect, I am convinced that the representations made today by those sixty young students will have strong

repercussions on the political programs of all parties in the House. Mr. Speaker, I hope that you and other Members who have yet to respond to that invitation will do so later today so as to become aware of the problems of the groups involved.

* * *

[*English*]

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

DEMAND THAT GOVERNMENT CHANGE POLICIES

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, while the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has been visiting several European capitals as a self-appointed pilgrim of peace, the nuclear arms race, abetted by Canada, continues, and war close to home is imminent.

No matter how highly respected an individual might be in world councils, an individual's globe-trotting efforts are all for naught if his own Government's policies and actions support the nuclear arms race. It is not enough for a political leader to go on a peace-making mission if his Government's policies do not fulfil basic peace-making objectives.

While the Prime Minister talks nuclear age peace, Canada continues to prepare to test nuclear weapons delivery vehicles for the United States Air Force. And while the Prime Minister implores other Governments to abandon the nuclear arms race, Canada, thanks to federal financial subsidies, builds components for new nuclear weapons systems. Canada must, itself, practise nuclear arms restraint if the Prime Minister is to be a credible messenger of peace.

Finally, the Prime Minister rightly deplores the increasing use of violence in international affairs, yet says nothing about the imminence of war on our very doorstep in Central America. The escalating U.S. military presence in the region, and the mounting threat of a U.S. backed invasion of Nicaragua, demand a firm and immediate protest from Canada. We wait anxiously for changes in the Government's nuclear arms policies, and we wait anxiously for Canada's efforts to prevent a U.S. inspired war in our own hemisphere.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE ECONOMY

PRINCIPAL OBSTACLE TO RECOVERY IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

Mr. Pierre Deniger (La Prairie): Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Quebec has taken a new tack by revealing in advance the contents of the mini-budget to be brought down tomorrow evening by the Quebec Minister of Finance, Mr. Jacques Parizeau.

Interestingly, the leader of the Quebec Government managed to announce a spectacular recovery plan while at the same time giving Quebecers the impression that the federal

Government had not played a role in creating many jobs in this province.

Mr. Lévesque wants to speed economic recovery without, however, getting rid of the factors that inhibit investment. The House will recall that the Leader of the Quebec Government did not announce he was repealing the anti-scab law, that the sliding tax on gas would be removed, that he would be maintaining special tax measures to make Quebec more attractive than Ontario for business executives, or that municipalities would be allowed to accept grants from the federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the principal obstacle to genuine economic recovery in Quebec remains, and that is the ongoing, neurotic concern for independence the Lévesque Government maintains today and will continue to maintain as the main element of its party program.

As was pointed out not long ago by our Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), for every job we create, we lose three every time the Government of Quebec talks about independence.

Mr. Speaker, we can only hope the Premier of Quebec will give the question some thought and finally give Quebecers the Government they deserve.

* * *

• (1410)

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

ACTION URGED TO CONTROL GASOLINE EMISSIONS

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, automobile exhaust contains gases called nitrogen oxides. These turn into nitric acid in the air and contribute in a significant way to acid rain. It is disturbing to me and to many of my constituents in Parry Sound-Muskoka, as well as to other people throughout the country, that our gas emissions are three times higher than those permitted in the United States. Does this not make it easier for the Americans to point an accusing finger at us? Who are we to complain about them when we are unwilling to cut our gas emissions?

I urge the Government to initiate and approve legislation in this regard to bring our gas emissions into line with United States standards. I also urge that this action be considered for the 1985 automobile model year and that both Ministers responsible, Environment and Transport, present the seriousness of this to their cabinet colleagues.

S.O. 21

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT

QUEBECAIR FARES

Mr. André Maltais (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I have just come back from a visit to the riding of Manicouagan. I went from Fort Chimo to Blanc-Sablon, and I was asked to bring to the attention of the House the problem of air fares at Quebecair. I would like to take this opportunity to stress the excellent work done by Quebecair employees, and I would also like to ask the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) to give Quebec another chance, to see if something can be done with Quebecair and Nordair or Air Canada or some other way, because right now, a return ticket Lourdes-Blanc-Sablon-Montreal costs $700. Needless to say, there is no first, second or third class—there is just one. Mr. Speaker, this issue is very important to the people I represent, on the Middle and Lower North Shore, the people in Port-Menier and the Magdalen Islands, Baie-Comeau and Schefferville—there still are people in Schefferville. The Leader of the Opposition will be interested to know that the day I stopped there, there was a power failure in Schefferville, Gagnon and Fermont. In French, the word "vol" is often used to mean flight, in aeronautical terms, but in our part of the country, Mr. Speaker, the rates for those flights are "du vol", meaning highway robbery. Since the federal Government is subsidizing air transportation on the Middle and Lower North Shore, I would ask the Minister of Transport to study very carefully the possibility of economic amalgamation, because that is what people on the North Shore want, not just political symbols.

* * *

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

CHEMICAL POLLUTION OF GREAT LAKES

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, in its report on Great Lakes water quality released a few weeks ago, the International Joint Commission reported that chemical pollution in the Great Lakes, after ten years of decline, was on the rise again, this at a time when 66 per cent of Canadians surveyed in a recent Gallup Poll, more than ever before, said that the water quality of the Great Lakes was of critical concern to them.

To compound the problem, and this is something those Canadians surveyed were kept in the dark about, there is the result of scientific testing of public beach waters in the Great Lakes. Reported over four years ago was a potentially deadly germ in those waters that could survive the ordinary municipal chlorine water process. This microscopic amoeba is harmless in drinking water, but could be fatal to swimmers by going up noses to their brains.

What can be done? A major step forward would be to toughen up the 1978 Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. What is needed is a firm re-commitment by the Government to the goals of that agreement. Over 20 million people use and enjoy the Great Lakes. Their protection is not something that should be bargained with; and their lives should not be subject to timetable delays. Will the Minister reflect the will of the Government by initiating meetings to achieve that purpose?

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PRIME MINISTER'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH UNITED STATES PRESIDENT ON PEACE INITIATIVE

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. The House will, of course, welcome the Prime Minister's return to Canada following the first leg of his peace initiative, and wish him well on the second phase as he undertakes it. I quite understand why he is not with us today.

Can the Secretary of State for External Affairs inform the House whether a reply has been received from President Reagan with respect to the letter on certain peace initiatives sent by the Prime Minister to the President and, if so, what was the nature of the President's reply?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not have the details of that reply in my memory at the moment, but I know that the Prime Minister did correspond or was in touch with the President with respect to a conversation on a future meeting on the question of East-West relations. As I recollect, the President had made a suggestion that such a meeting would be arranged between the President and the Prime Minister some time following the President's return from his trips abroad.

NATURE OF CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if one ought to conclude from his remarks that the communication from the Prime Minister to President Reagan was with regard to a possible future meeting and did not deal with the substance of any specific peace proposals?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition knows, the Prime Minister had a number of discussions in the past week with European leaders, in particular with respect to East-West relations and the peace initiative. The same substance of the Prime Minister's concerns has been conveyed to the President. I do not have the

correspondence with me, nor do I have access to it. However, the Prime Minister will be in the House tomorrow. I think he can provide further details as to the substance and content of these exchanges.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH RUSSIAN AND CHINESE LEADERS

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in light of the response of the Secretary of State for External Affairs that the Government would have no reluctance to table all communications in this regard in the House—and I look forward to the possibility of his doing so at his earliest convenience—can the Minister indicate the contents of the letter? I ask the question inasmuch as public reference has been made to it on some occasions by the Prime Minister, most lately in Montreal on Sunday. Can he indicate the content of the letters containing the peace proposals sent by the Prime Minister to the Soviet leader and to the Chinese Premier, and indicate as well whether he has received replies? If so, will he table such replies?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I will draw those requests to the attention of the Prime Minister, both with respect to the possible correspondence with the Chinese and Soviet leaders. He will determine tomorrow if he wishes to make them available to the House. It is not usual to table communications of this type. In fact, it would be quite unusual. However, that is a matter that can be discussed.

REPLIES FROM NUCLEAR POWERS

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I recognize the general validity of the comment made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I would not ask were it not for the fact that the Prime Minister made specific reference to it yesterday at a certain dinner in Montreal. In light of this, and pursuant to the same document, has the Government received replies from any of the Big Five powers relating to the Prime Minister's specific proposals, to which he made direct reference yesterday, for reducing world tensions and creating an atmosphere favourable to disarmament? If he has received replies from any of those Five, would he table any documentation in relation thereto for consideration by the House?

● (1420)

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has already had discussions with, for example, the President of France, and I would assume that the Leader of the Opposition has France in mind as one of the five nuclear powers. Obviously, that discussion dealt with a number of elements to which the Prime Minister referred yesterday, and obviously the Prime Minister will be able to tell the Leader of the Opposition, if he wishes and quite apart from the correspondence, the nature of the conversations he has had with European leaders and particularly with the President of France. My understanding is that the Prime Minister did receive a very positive response from the European leaders, and that the President of France in particular was greatly interested in and supportive of the thrust of the Prime Minister's proposals.

REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER MAKE STATEMENT IN HOUSE

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would ask a final supplementary question for clarification purposes. Would the Secretary of State for External Affairs, inasmuch as we all wish the Prime Minister well as he undertakes the second leg, indicate whether we could expect a report that is as full and complete as is humanly possible to be given to the House of Commons prior to his departure, as opposed to having him make statements outside the House? I think all Members would welcome a full and complete statement made by the Prime Minister.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think the Leader of the Opposition has raised a good point for the Prime Minister to consider. The Leader of the Opposition knows that the practice of giving statements in the House on foreign policy has fallen into disuse.

Mr. Crosbie: Why?

Mr. McDermid: Disarray.

Mr. MacEachen: The reason it has fallen into disuse is because what ought to be serious discussions on foreign policy usually become rather intense political brawls. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition can change that practice and bring back a system that prevailed in the House for quite a long time, which was to have the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister make statements in the House on foreign policy questions following their trips abroad, and then to have serious discussions in the House rather than the partisan, political attacks which we have seen in the House for quite a long time.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

POLAND—EXIT VISAS FOR FAMILIES OF LANDED IMMIGRANTS

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same Minister. I presume that he would agree that it is better to make those statements here in the House of Commons than it is to make them at some partisan Liberal fund-raising brawl in Montreal.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Speaker, my question relates to the ten landed immigrants from Poland who are currently conducting

a hunger strike in front of the Polish consulate in Toronto in order to try to gain the exit visas that would allow their families to come to Canada. I am sure the Minister is aware that six of these exit visas have been granted. Could he tell the House today about the status of the four remaining applications and the efforts the Government is making to help these people in Toronto?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are pleased that six of these cases have been settled and that family reunification can proceed. There are still four cases remaining. Today I instructed the officials in our embassy to make further representations with respect to these four remaining cases. We will strive to achieve the same results with those four remaining cases as were achieved with the six earlier cases, and we are also drawing to the attention of the Polish authorities additional family reunification cases that are a matter of concern to the Government.

DEPARTMENT'S TREATMENT OF APPLICATIONS

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Immigration, my second question is directed to the same Minister. While he has been making these efforts in support of these exit visas for people from Poland, the Immigration Department has been thwarting the efforts of literally hundreds of Canadians of Polish origin in Canada who are attempting to have some members of their families come to Canada on vacation. Let me give the Minister one brief example.

I understand that officials in the Immigration Department have so far rejected the application of a family to invite their five year old nephew and his grandmother to come to Canada. The parents of that young lad will stay in Poland, so there is no question of him staying here permanently. Could the Acting Prime Minister explain this double standard?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot explain anything about the case until I examine the details of it. Questions on the Orders of the Day usually do not provide a very good vehicle for a detailed discussion on immigration cases. I think it is a matter that should be raised by the Member directly with the Minister.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR FORCES TALKS BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND SOVIET UNION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister, who clearly had time to speak to a Liberal fund-raising gathering about disarmament but not to appear in the House of Commons today, I would like to direct my questions to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In his speech in Montreal the Prime Minister did indicate that he had certain broad proposals concerning the future with which anyone concerned about disarmament and peace would agree. We all wish him well with those proposals. However, they are concerned with the long run and the distant future.

My question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs concerns certain matters which are very pressing now. As the Minister knows, the United States and Soviet Union INF talks, which are very important to the immediate future, have become bogged down. Could he tell us if the Prime Minister made any specific proposals concerning those talks and, if so, what they were and what response he got?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the Hon. Member when he describes the Prime Minister's specific ideas as being far distant and in the future. The Prime Minister raised, for example, the question of the MBFR talks in Europe which have been stalled for quite some time, and the possibility of providing them with new political impetus. I cite that as one specific example of the Prime Minister's proposals being quite timely and centered on the present.

Specifically in reply to the Hon. Member's question, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the Prime Minister has made specific new proposals to be laid on the table at the Geneva INF talks. There does not seem to be any lack of proposals or ideas. As the Hon. Member knows, many proposals are being put forward, not only at the INF talks but elsewhere as well. What seems to be more urgently required is some improvement that would enable the INF talks and talks in other fora to proceed in a better political atmosphere. I do not think the Prime Minister had in mind making any specific proposals for discussion at the INF talks.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to discount the Prime Minister's proposals because they are important for the long run, but I believe the Minister knows that the Prime Minister's proposals overwhelmingly emphasized the future and were not concerned with immediate and pressing problems that could lead either to regional wars of a non-nuclear kind or to a nuclear holocaust. These immediate problems do concern a great many people right now.

NICARAGUA—POSSIBILITY OF INVASION BY UNITED STATES FORCES

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to another specific issue cited by the Prime Minister. He referred to the increasing tendency of states to resort to military solutions for problems that should be addressed by peaceful political means. Considering that for the past week there has been talk in Washington and Central America regarding the possibility of an invasion to be launched against Nicaragua, and considering that two senior American officials, one a security adviser to the President himself and the other an emissary of the President to Central America, have indicated as recently as the past 48 hours that

the United States might support a military course of action against Nicaragua, what will be done? Will the Secretary of State for External Affairs put into action some of the nice words, by assuring the people of Canada that we will expressly convey our opposition to such military action by the United States or any other state in that region?

● (1430)

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have already stated quite clearly what we think about military action in Central America. We have stated that in our view, as the Hon. Member indicated, the situation does not lend itself to a military solution. We have repeatedly urged all those who are present in the area with arms or armaments, with armed personnel or advisers, to leave. That is our policy, and we can repeat it again to the United States. I have already made that clear to Mr. Shultz earlier this year. It can be made clear again that that is our policy with respect to Central America. That is why, the Hon. Member will know, we have supported the efforts of the Contadora Group. An essential component, probably the essence of that plan, is demilitarization of Central American states, and we support that.

Mr. Broadbent: As the Minister will know, we are not dealing with some abstract, hypothetical possibility that may not occur. We are discussing the possibility of an invasion, according to informed sources, which could take place within a matter of days, not in general in Central America but against a particular country.

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT MAKE REPRESENTATIONS TO UNITED STATES

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, considering that the Government of Canada expressed its opposition to military action in general in Central America, will the Government follow up specifically by indicating to the United States, one of the great powers of the world in the region, that the Government of Canada wants it to make a public commitment that it will not take military action against Nicaragua, nor will it support such action?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member asks that we make our views known to United States authorities. I think that has been done and can be done again. Tomorrow I will be meeting with Mr. Dam, Mr. Burt and Mr. Madas, who will be in Ottawa to discuss a series of international questions. One which may come up will be the question of Central America; Grenada will also be on the list, as will East-West relations. It will provide an opportunity for Canada to make its views known on these issues as early as tomorrow.

EDUCATION

FEDERAL FUNDING FOR POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Government House Leader. He will recall that last May the Government brought forward Bill C-150 which would reduce federal support for post-secondary education funding in Canada. In light of increasing enrollments, up 7 per cent in 1982 and continuing to rise, the Government has received many representations against this action. Today representatives of the Canadian Federation of Students have been meeting with Members of Parliament. Will the Government be amending this legislation, or has it decided to abandon totally Bill C-150?

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-150 is on the Order Paper. I will have a House Leaders' meeting later this week. This Bill, as is the case with others, is always subject to negotiation. If the Hon. Member has representations to make as to the substance of the Bill, I would suggest that he talk with the Minister responsible for the legislation. Certainly in our parliamentary process any Bill dealt with is subject to amendments. We have accepted over 80 amendments to Bill C-155. I do not see why this Bill or any other bill could not be improved after reasonable debate. Without agreeing in advance to any change, I certainly invite my hon. colleague to talk to the Minister responsible for the legislation.

As far as dealing with the Bill itself in the House is concerned, it is on the list to be dealt with any time, with the consent of House Leaders. It is part of the process of dealing with different Bills. I will have my regular meeting, and if the Hon. Member has representations dealing with this Bill, we are openminded.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question, which also relates to students, is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. The Minister will be aware that unemployment has increased by four percentage points over last year among students between the ages of 20 and 24 who returned to post-secondary institutions this Fall. The students who are speaking to Members of Parliament today are concerned about their future and about making plans. In his Department's planning for the 1984 summer student program, have these details and this increase in student unemployment been taken into account? When will the details for the coming Summer be released by the Minister's Department? How do students go about applying?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes. Of course it is not simply a question of student unemployment but of unemploy-

ment among young people generally. We are extremely concerned. It is a major preoccupation of the Government to try to improve the delivery systems and the programs available in an attempt to ensure that young people have a better chance of getting into the job market than has been the case over the past few months, indeed during the past year. The details of the various programs we will want to present, the strengthening of existing programs, and perhaps a reprofiling of some of them, are subjects which I hope we will be able to discuss in the context of the next Speech from the Throne.

* * *

SPECIAL RECOVERY CAPITAL PROJECTS PROGRAM

NUMBER OF JOBS CREATED

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Economic Development. Since the Minister of Finance introduced his budget on April 19 there has been considerable speculation as to the number of direct and indirect jobs which will be created by the Special Recovery Capital Projects program. Will the Minister confirm reliable estimates which place the total number of jobs at something like 50,000 and that, in particular, in the present fiscal year there will only be 10,000 direct jobs or 10,000 personyears of employment produced, which will reduce the unemployment rate by less than .1 per cent?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, it is not altogether clear to me where the Hon. Member is deriving his numbers from. At the time the specific program was introduced, there were 277 work sites across Canada in villages, hamlets and major centres. Many of these major projects, as Hon. Members know, have ongoing significance in terms of building economic infrastructure.

Frankly, the number of jobs in the long term is inestimable at this time. What contribution will the biotechnology centre in Montreal make to bringing industries into that sector or to creating economic stimulation in that sector? Similarly, what about the toxicology centre and the pulp and paper institute in Vancouver? The Hon. Member is aware that many of the projects are taking place in his own Province. At the same time shovels are in the ground, cement is being poured, and steel girders are being erected all across the country. Clearly direct construction jobs are being created. The national procurement program, covering the waterbombers in Canadair. defence electronic equipment purchases, frigate and Coast Guard vessel programs, and shipyards that are filled with work because of the program, is creating thousands and thousands of jobs.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think the Hon. Minister has answered the question.

PROJECTED CREATION OF JOBS

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows that the Minister of Finance called this program an integral part of an action plan to generate more jobs. In fact the number of jobs to be created can be estimated at something like 10,000 for the present year and 50,000 over the full three-year to four-year duration of the program. Will the Minister confirm these figures and that in fact the cost to produce each job is approaching $50,000? Will he also confirm that his own officials pointed out that these jobs were capital intensive rather than labour intensive, and that this is why the Minister of Finance refused to divulge these figures?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, quite the contrary. Although I do not know upon what the Hon. Member's numbers were based, I would say that they are very modest in terms of the number of jobs sites and the nature of the work being undertaken. Clearly many jobs are being created. When the Minister of Finance rose in the House to deliver the budget, he pointed out that this part of the program was to fill an investment vacuum, that the private sector was not responding in terms of investment and that this investment was necessary to create the much needed economic infrastructure which, in the long term, would provide a very sound basis for economic recovery. These projects are projects of recovery; that is specifically what they are.

• (1440)

The Hon. Member knows, for example, that in his own riding of Richmond-South Delta $7 million is being put into the airport to improve that facility. This is something which I understand the local residents, his electors, have wanted for some time. Is the Hon. Member suggesting that project is not a valuable one, that it will not create jobs and is not going to improve activities at the Vancouver terminal, and that it is not—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I believe the Minister has answered the question.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

EMPLOYMENT PRIORITY

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Economic Development as well. In spite of his recent reaction, he will know that the Minister of Finance last week stated there is nothing inevitable about a strong and continuing recovery. As a matter of fact the Minister will also know that groups such as the Economic Council, Statistics Canada, and the Conference Board all have pointed to specific government policies which have acted to hinder economic recovery, specifically, the real—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please ask his question?

Mr. Riis: My question, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of State for Economic Development is: would he not agree that it is now time for the Government to move its attention more away from the fighting of inflation, which has been the number one priority, and that, as the winter months approach, job creation and putting Canadians back to work should become the number one priority of the Government?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, putting Canadians back to work and the creation of jobs have always been the number one priority of this Government.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Johnston: If the Hon. Member would go back to the issue of inflation, he would find that inflation was directly related to the problem of interest rates and the lack of investments which were going to create jobs. Interest rates have now been brought down and investment intentions are improving. Jobs are being created every day. The Hon. Member knows very well the number of jobs which have been created over the past year, and that trend is continuing. However, those purveyors of gloom and doom will always see the glass as half empty rather than half full.

Mr. Fraser: We are paying for a full glass.

Mr. Johnston: It seems to me that the economic recovery is well under way and that the expectation of Canadians—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of State for Economic Development will know that the number of jobs in Canada last month shrunk by 25,000. Those are statistics from his own Department.

EFFECT OF INTEREST RATES

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, with more attention now being turned to consumers in terms of leading the recovery, will the Minister not agree that real interest rates have tripled since the beginning of this year, from 1.5 per cent to 4.5 per cent? Will the Minister not agree with that? And, if that is the case, why will the Government not take action to drop those interest rates in order to encourage a consumer led recovery?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, we again have the same old song which is sung by the New Democratic Party, the control of interest rates. I presume the Hon. Member would be putting forward as well the imposition of foreign exchange controls—

Mr. Broadbent: Ask Herb Gray.

Mr. Johnston: —at a time when international capital flows are so important, when our relationships with our trading partners are so important. Is that what the Hon. Member is suggesting, that foreign exchange controls be imposed, because there is no other way, as Hon. Members have in the past admitted, and as his Leader, I believe, has admitted, that it could be accomplished without the imposition of foreign exchange controls?

With respect to interest rates, certainly real interest rates are too high. That has been a problem in the United States and in Canada. However, our real interest rates—at least the last numbers I looked at—indicate that our real interest rates are in fact lower than they are in the United States at this time.

Mr. Broadbent: Tell it to Herb.

Mr. Johnston: That is how successful the anti-inflation program has been.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GOVERNMENT'S POLICY ON MIDDLE EAST

Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs. The Minister recently travelled to five Middle East countries. A number of reports have suggested a shift in Canada's Middle East policies, and have—

Mr. Stevens: Order.

Mr. Peterson: —raised serious concerns at home and abroad.

Mr. Crosbie: Straighten it out, Allan.

Mr. Peterson: Will the Minister assure the House and many concerned Canadians, first, that recent events demonstrate that higher level contacts by Canada with the PLO are out of the question; second, that the simultaneous withdrawal from Lebanon of all foreign forces, including PLO and Syrian, and not just Israeli, is a precondition for peace in Lebanon, and third, that all countries in the Middle East must recognize Israel's right to exist as a sovereign and independent nation?

Mr. Crosbie: Give us the Syrian speech, Allan.

Mr. Nielsen: You never expected that question, did you? It is a very good question.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the

Hon. Member has asked a series of questions about Middle East policy.

Mr. Crosbie: We agree.

Mr. MacEachen: The first general response I would like to make is that, in the course of my very useful visit to five Middle East countries, I have stated Canadian policy, as it has been stated in the House of Commons, before the Senate Committee, and in various speeches I have made as long as I have been Foreign Minister. With respect to the first question raised by the Hon. Member, namely, the upgrading of contacts with the PLO, I would remind him that on February 17 I indicated that there was no intention on the part of the Government of Canada of recognizing the PLO. That policy still stands. I did say that Canadian Government officials had contacts from time to time with PLO representatives and that I was considering the possibility of upgrading those contacts—

Mr. Crosbie: So you went to Syria.

Mr. MacEachen: I repeated that statement in reply to a question from a journalist in Damascus.

Mr. Crosbie: Order.

Mr. MacEachen: I also added, Mr. Speaker—and this is very important—that any such upgrading would depend upon the circumstances and the requirements. It is rather self-evident, with the struggle which is currently going on within the PLO, that the time is not quite propitious to give implementation to that particular policy question.

Mr. Crosbie: Go to Tripoli, Allan.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

SUDBURY-TIMMINS-ALGOMA MINERAL PROGRAM

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed the the Minister of Employment and Immigration. On September 19 the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt announced on the Minister's behalf the establishment of the STAMP Program, short for the Sudbury-Timmins-Algoma Mineral Program. The Program was announced in order to put some of the hundreds of labourers back to work in their career-related field. However, after speaking with officials within EMR and the Minister's Department, I have been told that the $1.4 million program has become a "bureaucratic nightmare" because it was announced prematurely by the Hon. Member for Nickel Belt.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please ask his question?

Mr. MacDougall: Mr. Speaker, the STAMP Program, because it was announced too far in advance, has been forced to reorganize, and employees who were supposed to be hired for 29 weeks have had the time dropped to 26 weeks. This has happened because of political and bureaucratic ineptitude. Can the Minister tell the House today what he is going to do for those other three weeks in which those employees should be working?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to say that the STAMP Program was not announced prematurely. There are people working today. I say with some regret that we lost one of our employees in the STAMP Program today due to a car accident. However, there are people working. The Program has been received enthusiastically by prospectors and by people involved in the mining industry. I am, quite frankly, shocked, Mr. Speaker, that this—

Mr. McDermid: You are shocked at every question asked you.

Mrs. Erola: —Hon. Member would find time to criticize a program which is taking place on his doorstep. It is finding jobs for people in his riding.

LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, my question was directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. What is he going to do about the three weeks which those employees lost because he was playing politics—not the 29 weeks, the 26 weeks?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is anything I can usefully add to the answer just given. Quite clearly, the Hon. Member does not have anything useful to add to the question.

* * *

● (1450)

ENERGY

FUNDING OF PETROLEUM INCENTIVES PROGRAM

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Energy, who has been in his seat but has disappeared behind the curtains.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Miss Carney: Mr. Speaker, the Government's April fiscal plan indicated the Minister would be asking Parliament for an additional $200 million to cover approved PIP grants this year. We now learn from the Supplementary Estimates that he wants $484 million, twice his earlier estimate, which will bring the total for this year to $1.6 billion. Can the Minister assure this House that there is some limit to the hand-outs he is prepared to give the oil and gas industry? Is he prepared to cap this Program which has become a financial running sore to Canadian taxpayers?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think for the Hon. Member to complain that I am in the lobby when she has not been in the House for a couple of weeks is a bit exaggerated.

One problem we are having with this program is that it is working very well. The oil and gas industry is drilling in the north, the Newfoundland offshore, and the Nova Scotia offshore. There is a lot of activity in the Canada Lands and that is why it is costing the Government money. In fact we have a grant program because we wanted to give an opportunity to Canadian industry to participate and drill in the Canada Lands, not just the multinationals. We have replaced a tax incentive with a grant program which favours Canadians because we want to Canadianize the industry.

In terms of the Government's balance sheet, it is exactly the same, because if the drilling were done under the old rule of super depletion the cost to the Treasury would be exactly the same as the cost through grants. If the Program is successful we are on the way to attaining self-sufficiency in Canada, and I am very pleased to know that the Tory Party is opposed to being nice to the oil industry.

Miss Carney: Mr. Speaker, may I say that I was representing this Parliament at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association meetings along with two of his colleagues.

POLICY OBJECTIVES

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, oil and gas companies in Canada tell us they are being squeezed by the Government's contradictory energy policies. On one hand, the Minister's Department is telling the industry to keep the lid on run-away frontier exploration costs, and on the other, it is telling the industry to utilize Canadian services which may be uncompetitive. How does the Minister propose to resolve these conflicting objectives so the industry can get on with the job of tapping new energy resources?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think it is possible to achieve these two goals. We want the industry as much as possible to use Canadian goods and services. That is the policy of this Government. But at the same time the Canadian Source has to be competitive. We have to pass judgment there. Of course, when it is not competitive we have to have services or equipment come from abroad.

There are some Members of our own Party who always complain because, for example, some rigs are coming from abroad and they are not made in Canada. So we are passing judgment on this. When Canadians are not competitive, we will let the rigs come from abroad. In every case I put a cap on the amount which can be spent. When the Hon. Member says the cost is too high, it is the duty of the Minister to make sure the costs are as low as possible, but at the same time to attain in Canada the self-sufficiency and security of supply that the Canadian economy and Canada as a whole must achieve.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE

AMWAY CORPORATION FRAUD—DROPPING OF CHARGES AGAINST EXECUTIVES

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for the customs service. When ordinary Canadians fail to declare goods at the border they often have the book thrown at them by customs officials, yet when the giant Amway Corporation systematically defrauds Canadian taxpayers of millions of dollars for 15 years, charges against the individual corporate executives are dropped in a glaring example of the double standard in the Canadian justice system.

Will the Minister indicate to the House his views on this travesty of justice, and will he assure the House that in the pending civil action by his Department there will be no deals whatsoever with these corporate crooks?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows perfectly well that the Department of National Revenue has filed a statement of claim against this company before the Federal Court. There are a number of technical problems to be settled with the Appeals Division of the Federal Court before we can go any further, but we have no intention of dropping the proceedings.

[*English*]

AMOUNTS OWED BY CORPORATION

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I learned this morning from a source within the Minister's Department that negotiations are now under way between his officials and Amway to make a cozy deal on the $150 million civil lawsuit. Given Amway's guilty plea in the criminal proceedings, will the Minister clearly assure the House his Department will seek full recovery of all amounts outstanding, with penalties and prejudgment interest, and that there will be no more cozy deals made with that great bastion of Conservative free enterprise, the Amway Corporation, which has shown such contempt for Canadian law?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I have previously indicated to the House the procedures provided under the Customs Act in similar situations. We have filed our statements of claim. The company in question may submit new evidence, and under the arbitration procedures provided under the Customs Act, this new evidence is taken into consideration but it certainly does not mean the company will be allowed to escape the normal application of the laws of our country.

[*English*]

TRUST COMPANIES

INVESTIGATION OF INTEREST RATE CHARGES

Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Minister's Department has had an investigation under way for something like six months into the high interest rates charged by trust companies. I understand officials have interviewed over 1,000 people. The Minister said she was going to release the report. When will it be released?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is quite right. Our Department has been investigating reports of so-called misrepresentations made to people who have been buying mortgages. I would like to point out to the Hon. Member that this is a rather exhaustive study. We have to investigate each report, and it has taken some time. I would like to assure him, though, that we will not be able to release the entire report because this matter, of course, is confidential, but we will be producing the results of this investigation very soon.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SPORTS

DRUG-TAKING TESTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

M. Irénée Pelletier (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for Fitness and Amateur Sport who announced not long ago, in an exclusive interview, that she intended to make it compulsory for Canadian athletes taking part in the Olympic Games in Los Angeles to be given drug screens before they go back to Canada. Does the Minister intend to make the tests compulsory only for the games in Los Angeles or will the decision cover all international competitions where Canadian athletes will be participating?

Hon. Celine Hervieux-Payette (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. gentleman for his question. In fact, after recent events in which athletes taking part in international competitions abroad were arrested upon their return to this country on a charge involving prescription drugs—I am not referring to drugs like cocaine or otherwise—we now have an interdepartmental committee which, with the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Canadian Olympic Association, the Medical Council of Canada and our national sports organizations has set up a task force which, by the end of this year, will be formulating measures to be taken by the Government in this respect.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I can assure Hon. Members that tests will be compulsory for international competitions of Olympic caliber, including Sarajevo, Los Angeles, the Pan American Games and the Commonwealth Games.

As for other international competitions, as soon as we have the facilities, I can assure the hon. gentleman that consumption of this kind of drugs is absolutely prohibited by my Department.

* * *

● (1500)

[*English*]

TRUST COMPANIES

RELEASE OF REPORT ON INTEREST RATES

Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. When the Minister stated that she would not be releasing the full report on interest rates charged by trust companies, stories began to circulate that a considerable amount of pressure has been put on her Department by certain financial institutions to scratch this report. Would she comment on that please?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there have been no such pressures. We have been able to pressure some of those institutions into doing something about their practices.

* * *

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petitions, with the exception of two, presented by Hon. Members on Thursday, November 3, 1983, meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

The petitions presented by the Hon. Members for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Wenman) and Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) do not meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to designate tomorrow as an Opposition day, and ask my hon. colleagues to bear this in mind.

[*English*]

POINT OF ORDER

MR. McGRATH—QUESTION ON UNEMPLOYMENT ANSWERED BY MRS. EROLA

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, a very brief point of order. If you will take the time to examine the record today you will note that you allowed the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola) to answer a question dealing with an unemployment matter in northern Ontario, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) was in the House. Is Your Honour now allowing Members to ask Ministers regional questions in their capacity as regional Ministers?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will examine the record. The Chair has followed the practice of allowing the Minister seeking to answer a question to do so. The Chair would like to reserve on the point raised by the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath).

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

MISS JEWETT—POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that post-secondary education must be acessible to all, that adequate funding should be available to ensure quality education, that appropriate measures should be taken to reduce the high level of student unemployment.

Wherefore the undersigned, the representatives of the Canadian Federation of Students, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to request the Government of Canada to act immediately to ensure that post-secondary education is accessible to all, that adequate funding is available to ensure quality education, and that appropriate measures be taken to reduce the high level of student unemployment. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. HOVDEBO—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and the duty to present to the House of Commons in Parliament assembled the petition of undersigned residents from almost every Province of Canada, more than 700 residents in all. This presentation is made up from 21 different

petitions, all indicating their opposition to changing the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. These petitioners add their names to more than 75,000 Canadians who have already indicated their opposition to the Crow change by this Parliament. The undersigned humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the Crow rate in perpetuity as presently guaranteed by statute. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. FLIS—HUNGER STRIKE OF POLISH CANADIANS

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parkdale-High Park): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour and duty to present the petition of approximately 800 undersigned residents of the constituency of Parkdale-High Park and other regions of Ontario who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned citizens strongly support the hunger strike staged by ten Polish Canadians and urge the Canadian Government to help the spouses and children of the strikers to join them in Canada. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ALTHOUSE—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions on two or three different topics. The first petition has to do with the Crow rate issue.

To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled the petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient anmd undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party, that the Crow rate must be maintained, and that therefore the railways of all of Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate but which will provide upgrading to the railways. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. ALTHOUSE—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): I have a number of petitions from various points in my constituency with basically the same message. I will read the first one. To the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned residents of the town of Allan—and there are some several dozen other towns mentioned as well—in the Province of Saskatchewan, who now exercise their right to present a grievance humbly sheweth that

they are opposed to testing the Cruise missile on Canadian soil and call upon the Government to refuse to test the Cruise missile. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Vic Althouse (Humboldt-Lake Centre): The last petition is from the Province of Alberta. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Alberta. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Alberta, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that the Crow rate is an important benefit to western Canada and one of the earliest incentives granted to settlers; that the changes of the Crow rate will reduce farm incomes contributing to the breakup of communities on branch lines and increase trucking and road costs; that three royal commissions have recommended retention of the Crow rate.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the Crow rate in perpetuity as presently guaranteed by statute. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) I have several groups of petitions. The first has 80-some signatures of citizens of Canada in Unity, Lashburn, Lloydminster, Maidstone, Swift Current, Mortlach, Mossbank and Moose Jaw. The undersigned have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the New Democratic Party, that the Crow rate must be maintained, and that the railways of all Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New Democratic Party alternative plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate.

Mr. Speaker, I have another petition signed by 17 people in places like Luseland, Scott, Rockglen, Humboldt, Wilkie and Kelliher, in which they humbly petition the House of Commons assembled to present their grievance that the changing of the Crow rate will reduce farm incomes, contributing to the breaking up of communities on branch lines and increased trucking and road costs, and that three royal commissions have recommended retention of the Crow rate.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the Crow rate in perpetuity as presently guaranteed by statute.

Mr. Speaker, I have a group of petitions with 237 names from Saltcoats, Stornoway, Roxton and Churchbridge. They humbly petition Parliament assembled that western farmers have paid $131 million to move export grain in the 1981-82 crop year, that this grain contributed $6.3 billion to the balance of trade, the undersigned believe this is the farmers' fair contribution to the Canadian economy and that western farmers will pay one times the Crow rate. Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory grain rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

● (1510)

Mr. Speaker, I have a group of petitions with 330 names of residents from Glentworth, McCord, Mankota, Swift Current, Waldeck and many other communities in Saskatchewan. The petition is addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petitioners state that they too believe that the $131 million to move export grain is their fair contribution to the Canadian economy and that western farmers will pay one times Crow. Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory grain rate.

Mr. Speaker, I have a further group of petitions with more than 1,000 names, addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now exercise their right to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that they have examined the New Democratic Party alternative plan. Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory grain rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. BENJAMIN—POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina West): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by a number of citizens of Canada addressed to the honourable House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petitioners humbly sheweth that whereas the federal Government has stated that it is committed to ensuring that post-secondary education is available to all Canadians, that the problem of our youth has now reached crisis proportions as thousands of qualified students have been refused entry to universities and colleges this year because of inadequate financing and a lack of space, wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament assembled that the federal Government live up to its commitment to the goal of accessibility by immediately establishing an emergency fund with the Provinces to deal with this crisis. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. KRISTIANSEN—RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a petition signed by a number of people in the agricultural community from Cut Knife, Saskatchewan addressed to the honourable House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that Your Honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that they have carefully considered the alternative plan presented by the NDP and that the Crow rate must be maintained, and that the railways of all of Canada must be

upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transport system.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the NDP alternate plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass freight rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

I also have a group of petitions signed by some 200 residents of Swift Current, Saskatchewan; Shamrock, Saskatchewan, Chaplin, Saskatchewan; Cut Knife, Saskatchewan; Hodgeville, Saskatchewan; Morse, Saskatchewan; Enfold, MacNutt, Rush Lake; Main Centre, Saskatchewan and some residents from both the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance, humbly sheweth that western Canadian farmers paid $131 million to move export grain under the Crow freight rate in the 1981-82 crop year, that this grain, in turn, contributed $6.3 billion to the balance of trade, and the undersigned believe that this is the farmers' fair contribution to the Canadian economy and that western farmers will pay one times Crow.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to maintain the present statutory Crow rate. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray. I hope someone over there is listening.

* * * * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions. The Chair now has to ask for unanimous consent of Hon. Members to dispense with the reading of a rather lengthy series of motions.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we might follow the past practice in this case as well. Rather than dispense with them, the Chair could simply ask if any Hon. Member wishes to call a motion standing in his name. He might stand to do so; otherwise we might pass on to the next order of Routine Proceedings.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I just cannot agree to that today. We have had those motions standing on the Order Paper for some time now. I am reluctant to allow a precedent to be established. I mentioned the last time we sat that I felt we were establishing a precedent. Therefore, I would prefer that you deal with them in the normal fashion.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) might reconsider that, since it is quite a lengthy list and there is some very important fisheries legislation before us waiting to be discussed. Perhaps we could follow past practice without establishing any precedent, as the Chair so stated, so that without prejudice to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain taking the same stand he seems to be taking today at some other time, we could proceed in order to allow us to get on with the fisheries legislation. It is clear that it would not establish a precedent, particularly if we were reassured to that effect by the Chair.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the intervention of the Opposition House Leader. I have given some thought to what he has had to say since rising previously. However, I think we should follow the normal practice and read the motions in the way they are intended to be read.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I shall go through the list.

Motions stand.

* * *

• (1520)

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,913, 5,014, 5,136 to 5,232, inclusive, and 5,304.

[*Text*]

INCOME TAX—CANADA-GERMANY

Question No. 4,913—**Mr. Deans:**

1. How many residents of the Federal Republic of Germany derive income or capital which may presently be taxed in Canada and in the Federal Republic of Germany?

2. How many residents of Canada are at present required to pay tax in both Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany on profit, income or gains arising in the Federal Republic of Germany?

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): The Department has no statistics on these two subjects. To obtain them, it would be necessary to re-examine all personal income tax returns since there is no other way of isolating only those relevant to this issue. Since there are 15,000,000 personal income tax returns in a year, the cost would be prohibitive.

CONVERSION OF CUSTOMS TARIFF TO METRIC MEASURE

Question No. 5,014—**Mr. Herbert:**

Is it intended to convert tourist exemption provisions of the Customs Tariff to metric measure and, if so, what will be the date of the change?

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Bill C-90, which was approved by Parliament on December 16, 1982, provides the Government with the authority to introduce the metric system into the Customs Tariff by Order in Council. Officials of the Department of Finance have begun drafting amendments to the Customs Tariff in consultation with interested parties, including officials in this Department. Imperial measures which appear in the personal exemption tariff items will be converted to metric within the next few months.

Order Paper Questions

FIRMS HIRED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Question No. 5,136—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Peter J. E. Cole, of the firm of Wiens & Cole, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,137—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to W. C. Middleton, Q.C. of the firm of Middleton & Boni, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,138—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Warren G. Barber, of the firm of Meighen, Haddad & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,139—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Garry T. Miller of the firm of Hirschfield, Hunt, Fjeldsted & Miller, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,140—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Joseph A. Mullally of the firm of Carroll, Mullally, Paterson & Midwinter, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,141—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to James H. Treble of the firm of Treble & McRae, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,142—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to E. W. Hawkins of the firm of Hawkins & Sanderson, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,143—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Sydney Perlmutter of Hamiota, Manitoba, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,144—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Duncan E. Geisler of Ashern, Manitoba, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,145—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to D. D. St. John, Q.C. of the firm of St. John & St. John, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,146—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Kenneth R. Hanssen, of the firm of Duncan & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,147—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to G. David Greenberg of the firm of Greenberg & Greenberg, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,148—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Orest W. Pressey of the firm of Miller, Miller & Pressey, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,149—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Marcel J. J. R. Gregoire of Roblin, Manitoba, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,150—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Ernest R. Goossen of the firm of Plett, Goossen & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,151—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Robert P. Smith of the firm of Smith, Neufeld & Stewart, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,152—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to C. W. Buckingham, Q.C. of Virden, Manitoba, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,153—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Alain J. Hogue of the firm of Teffaine, Monnin, Hogue & Teillet, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,154—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Morris Kaufman of the firm of Margolis, Kaufman, Cassidy, Zaifman & Swartz, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,155—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to E. M. Shewchuck of the firm of Monk, Goodwin & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,156—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to P. W. A. Westbury of the firm of Inkster, Walker, Westbury, Irish, Rusen & Hughes, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,157—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Paul Lewans of the firm of Lewans & Associates, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

● (0000)

Question No. 5,158—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Roderick MacDonald of the MacDonald Law Firm, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$2,439.50	$7,993.10	$4,913.50	$470.02	

Question No. 5,159—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to James I. Ulmer of the firm of Coxworth & Ulmer, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,160—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Paul D. Elash of the firm of Kohaly & Elash, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,161—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Dennis P. Ball of the firm of Hill, McLellan, Ball, Cundall & Bridges, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,162—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Louis E. H. Stringer of Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,163—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Marilyn Scott of the firm of Sutherland, Behiel & Scott, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,164—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Donald J. Roberts of the firm of Roberts & Setrakov, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,165—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Edward A. Komarnicki of the Komarnicki Law Firm, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,166—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Alex G. Robertson of the firm of Robertson, Baynton, Moskal, Stolniuk & Strilchuk, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Question No. 5,167—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Raymond G. Cariou of the firm of Cariou, Partyk & Francis, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$490	$4,250.25	$1,110.23	$652.25	

Question No. 5,168—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Jacob Eisner of the firm of Eisner, Eisner & Associates, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$968.09	$622.50	$1,732.41	$310	

Question No. 5,169—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Grant Carson of the firm of Carson & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	$4,300	$2,292.25	$490	—

Question No. 5,170—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to John D. Hillson of the Hillson Law Office, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,171—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to C. Mervin Ozirny of the firm of Ozirny, Wrubell, Fisher & Tourney, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Order Paper Questions

Question No. 5,172—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to John D. Cooper of the firm of Grayson & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	$4,911	—	—	—

Question No. 5,173—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Roy A. Dickinson of the firm of R.A. Dickinson & Associates, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	$1,784.84	$1,136.46	$4,875.85	—

Question No. 5,174—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Terrance W. Ocrane of the firm of Chow, Ocrane, Walper & Hagan, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	—	$336.71	—	—

Question No. 5,175—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Donald J. Osman of the firm of Goliath, Osman & Gardner, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	—	—	$1,036.29	—

Question No. 5,176—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to James Eremko of the firm of Eremko & Eremko, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,177—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Brian M. Fitzpatrick of the firm of Taylor & Fitzpatrick, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Question No. 5,178—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to R. Dennis Maher of the firm of Maher, Lindgren & Blais, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$3,838.30	$5,860.47	$6,648.06	$2,126.25	

Question No. 5,179—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to David W. Shury of the firm of Shury, Migneault & Miller, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,180—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Calvin J. Clark of Outlook, Saskatchewan, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,181—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to J. H. Clyne Harradence of the firm of Harradence, Longworth & Zatlyn, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,182—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to D. E. Wayne McIntyre of the firm of Balfour, Moss, Milliken, Laschuk, Kyle, Vancise & McIntyre, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,183—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Ian McLellan of the firm of Gerrand, McLellan & Mulatz, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,184—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to E. F. Anthony Merchant of the firm of Pedersen, Norman, McLeod & Todd, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,185—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to William James Serne of the firm of Serne, McKenzie & Miller, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,186—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Tom Malloy of the firm of MacDermid & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,187—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to John A. Stack of the firm of McKercher, McKercher, Stack, Korchin & Laing, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,188—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Donald J. Dermody of Shaunavon, Saskatchewan, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,189—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Warren J. Holland of Swift Current, Saskatchewan, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Question No. 5,190—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Donald K. Krueger of the firm of Krueger, McLaughlin, Forrester & Rittinger, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	$1,152.45	—	—	—

Question No. 5,191—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Frank A. MacBean of the firm of Wilson, MacBean, McIntosh, Wiebe & Tessen, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$677.59	$7,502.42	$8,249.31	$243.33	

Question No. 5,192—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Harold T. Hepting of Unity, Saskatchewan, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,193—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to James E. Young of Unity, Saskatchewan, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,194—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Philip L. Kotyk of the firm of Kotyk & Zawislak, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,195—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Thomas A. Schuck of the firm of Nimegeers, Schuck, Wormsbecker & Bobbitt, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,196—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Walter Bieber of Wilkie, Saskatchewan, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,197—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Walter Paulson of Wynyard, Saskatchewan, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,198—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to W. Arliss Dellow of the firm of Dellow & Greenhorn, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Question No. 5,199—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Stanley G. Kyba of Yorkton, Saskatchewan, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$5,095	$12,788.49	$17,454.42	$11,273	

Question No. 5,200—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Wayne M. Rusnak of the firm of Rusnak, Balacko & Kachur, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Order Paper Questions

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$191.10	$456.50	$1,267	$475.50	

Question No. 5,201—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to R. B. Logan of the firm of Logan & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	—	—	$250	$204	

Question No. 5,202—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to E. P. MacCallum of the firm of MacCallum & Ritter, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$2,544.80	$9,693.43	$16,627.97	$3,502.99	

Question No. 5,203—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Dale Wilson of the firm of Fraser & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Question No. 5,204—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Kenneth W. Lutes of the firm of Crerar & Lutes, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	—	—	$90	—

Question No. 5,205—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to G. J. Burrell of the firm of Walsh & Young, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$125,126.45	$476,661.08	$457,656.81	$88,665.97	

Question No. 5,206—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to G. R. Knaut of the firm of Knaut, Johnson & Sawle, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$1,158.75	$4,068.42	$5,301.35	$200	

Question No. 5,207—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to W. Harry Gough of the firm of Ross, Todd & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,208—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to R. G. Wheatley of the firm of Wheatley, Sadownik & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Question No. 5,209—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Stuart Campbell of the firm of Cox, Trofimuk & Campbell, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	—	$2,404.75	$18,715.28	$1,100	

Question No. 5,210—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to David J. Cooke of the firm of Cooke & Thompson, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,211—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Gerald Eherer of Fairview, Alberta, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,212—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to J. W. Freeland of the firm of Freeland & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): in so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Question No. 5,213—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Charles A. MacDonell of the firm of MacDonell & Sutcliffe, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	—	$635.49	$1,420	—

Question No. 5,214—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to D. B. Todd of the firm of Ross, Todd & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Question No. 5,215—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to R. H. Scammell of the firm of Johnson & Ming, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$610.77	$1,097.61	$804.44	$865.44	

Question No. 5,216—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to James Dixon of the firm of Herbert, Fielding & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	$18,611.87	$17,316.90	$11,619.02	$5,990.28	

Question No. 5,217—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to P. G. Flanagan of the firm of Flanagan, Sully & Surkan, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,218—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to J. I. Boras of the firm of Boras, Hogan & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,219—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to F. S. Peta of the firm of Huzil & Peta, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Question No. 5,220—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to D. J. MacLean of the firm of MacLean & Wiedemann, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	—	$327.14	$320.50	—

Question No. 5,221—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to D.L. Wilkins of the firm of Pritchard, Lerner & Company, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	—	$332.50	$791.47	$200	

Question No. 5,222—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to G. C. Mathieu of the firm of Campbell & Marceau, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84	to June 17
	—	$15,554.13	$23,017.46	$971.55	

Order Paper Questions

Question No. 5,223—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to J. W. Fowler of the firm of Fowler & Cardwell, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,224—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to J. F. Ulan of the firm of Ulan & Associates, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,225—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Richard Holeton of the firm of Holeton & Langager, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,226—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Charles A. Webb of the Charles A. Webb Professional Corp., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,227—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to D. P. MacNaughton of the firm of Sloan & MacNaughton, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

Question No. 5,228—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to J. A. Blonsky of the firm of Blonsky & Co., or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	—	$100	—	—

Question No. 5,229—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Duncan Crerar of the firm of Reynolds, Crerar & Hurdle, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: Yes.

(a)-(d)	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	1983-84
	—	$177.11	—	—

Question No. 5,230—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to Alex G. Robertson of the firm of Robertson & Baynton, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,231—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to David Mercer of the firm of Nickerson, Roberts & Hilborn, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Question No. 5,232—**Mr. Benjamin:**

Were funds payable by the Government to P. L. Adilman of the firm of Adilman, Sirrs & Watson, or to the firm itself, with respect to any work rendered for or on behalf of the Government (a) in 1980 (b) in 1981 (c) in 1982 (d) from January 1 to June 17, 1983 and, if so, in each case, what was the amount?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No.

TERMINAL ATTACHMENT PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Question No. 5,304—**Mr. Young:**

1. Does the Department of Communications plan to encourage international standards on magnetic compatibility between telephones and hearing aids and, if so, in what manner?

2. Has TAPAC indicated its willingness to deal with questions of compatibility between hearing aids and the telephone?

3. Does TAPAC have any mechanism for consulting with hearing impaired consumers and, if so, what is it?

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): In so far as the Department of Communications is concerned, the reply to the above question is as follows:

1. The Department of Communications (DOC) has supported and will continue to support the development of domestic and international standards or mechanisms which will ensure universal access to the telephone networks by hearing-impaired persons. Canadian industries and laboratories, with the assistance of DOC, also actively participate in various domestic, North American and international activities. As an example, participation in The International Electrotechnical Commission and the Electronic Industries Association is aimed at finding technical solutions to the problems encountered by hearing-aid users.

2. As encouraged by the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) in its Telecom Decision 82-14 regarding the attachment of subscriber-provided terminal equipment to the networks of the federally regulated common carriers, the Terminal Attachment Program Advisory Committee (TAPAC) is monitoring domestic and international technical developments in order to assess additional means by which the access of hearing-impaired persons to telephone service can be improved. TAPAC is primarily involved in the development of technical standards for telecommunications equipment which is connected to the public switched telephone network; such standards must ensure adequate protection to the network against potential harm. To the extent that compatibility standards relate to network protec-

tion, TAPAc would be mandated to deal with this particular issue.

3. Hearing-impaired consumers or any other interested party may make representations to TAPAC or attend TAPAC meetings as a mechanism for consulting.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Evans: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*English*]

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary to a question I asked on June 1, 1981. The question is No. 2,568. It is a very simple question. It reads:

What was the increase in real terms in the Department of National Defence's expenditures, including statutory costs and expressed in percentages, for each fiscal year 1970-71 to 1979-80?

In budget terms it means that question is three years old and I would have thought that in three years the Department would have been able to figure out how much it spent even in the most recent of these years. Would the Parliamentary Secretary be kind enough to chase that question up?

At the same time, to make his day, I would like to tell the Parliamentary Secretary that starred question No. 4,336 about which I have spoken to him several times and which has been on the Order Paper for a year and a half, has now been resolved outside of this jurisdiction. I would like that question withdrawn from the Order Paper.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, I would also draw the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary to question No. 3,216 which I asked on October 23, 1981. It reads:

Did the Prime Minister travel to New York in March 1981 and, if so, what was the total cost of the trip and what percentage will be paid by the taxpayer?

Could the Parliamentary Secretary indicate now after three years whether there is any particular reason why his office could not have given this information?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, first, if the question was asked October 23, 1981, I think it is two years and not three years.

Mr. Stevens: Just two years.

Mr. Evans: The former President of the Treasury Board should know that.

With regard to question No. 2,568, I will get on to that one immediately. I understand the Member's concern that it has not been answered in the period of time, given the nature of the question. I will see what I can do about it.

I am not sure what the procedure is concerning the request that question No. 4,336 be withdrawn from the Order Paper. I think we have to go through the Chair or the Table Officers for that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It needs the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Nielsen: No, it does not.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is related to this question?

Mr. McGrath: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could the Parliamentary Secretary explain to the House why it would take a year and a half for the Government to answer a starred question which, by tradition in this place, is not only answered orally but on an urgent basis?

Mr. Nielsen: In 48 hours, it used to be.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, here we go around that mulberry bush again.

Mr. Nielsen: It is a Grit bush.

Mr. Evans: As we have indicated before and in looking through the precedents, there is no precedent that a starred question is treated any differently from another question other than the fact that when the answer is given it is read orally in the House. That is what Beauchesne says and that is the precedent that has been before this House.

Mr. Nielsen: Rubbish.

Mr. Evans: There is no precedent whatsoever that requires that a starred question be answered on any more urgent basis than any other question. The Government tries to give as urgent attention to these questions as possible in order to get answers back to Members. We have up to this point answered 85 per cent of all questions that have been asked. I think that is a very good record for the Government, Mr. Speaker. Certainly we will do our best to make sure that all these other questions are answered as soon as they possibly can.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, as we are talking about the question I asked which had to do with a lieutenant the Department of National Defence was refusing to readmit to the reserves, let me say that I took the matter up with two Ministers and two Parliamentary Secretaries and the problem was eventually resolved to my satisfaction.

I care little whether the question is withdrawn by a motion of mine, by unanimous consent or by waiting for this interminable session to end, because the question will disappear from the Order Paper one way or the other.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member for Victoria to withdraw from the Order Paper the question to which he has made reference?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is a follow-up to the original point I raised with the Parliamentary Secretary. The Prime Minister's trip was almost three years ago. I asked the question a little over two years ago. Is the Parliamentary Secretary aware that in our frustration we went to the access to information and privacy co-ordinator of the Privy Council office? His officials have now informed us that the Prime Minister's trip in 1981 cost $5,607.75. If he is aware of that,

will he indicate to the House why they have chosen to withhold this information from the House? It is the co-ordinator under the access to information laws of this land that has made the information available.

• (1530)

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member has the answer to the question, I cannot see the urgency of standing up here today and asking when it will be answered. He has the answer.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible reflection of the attitude of the Parliamentary Secretary and the Government toward this House with respect to the answering of questions. The thrust of my question is whether the information that we now have, the $5,607.75 cost given to us by the co-ordination for access to information and privacy, is correct, or is there some information to be added to his report? In short, why will the Government not level with this House concerning not only these questions but the cost of other trips by the Prime Minister? Do we have to go through the same co-ordinator to obtain information which, incidentally, we received within two months?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, as I said, we will do everything possible to answer the Hon. Member's question. I will certainly check why the answer was not available in the House and tabled at an earlier date if in fact it was available through the information commissioner. I will check on the other questions and see if that information is available through the commissioner. If it is, it certainly should be tabled in the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the point of order which was addressed by the Parliamentary Secretary a moment ago with respect to the practice of answering starred questions. The Parliamentary Secretary, who seems to view this whole exercise of denying information to Parliament very gleefully, would not in my view know a precedent if he tripped over it, like he does with most things. If he would get his nose out of Beauschesne and out of the Standing Orders and go back over the debates of this House, he would learn that starred questions were, at one point, before the changes for the worse were brought about by the practices of the present Government, answered in 48 hours. At the very latest, they were answered in three days. That has been the practice in this place. He and I have had this exchange before. Madam Speaker has taken it under advisement. She was going to look at it and get back to us. You, Mr. Speaker, have been around here long enough to appreciate the significance of starred questions. They do have some significance. The significance that attaches to them is that any normal self-respecting Government would treat them as urgent and bring forward the answers on an urgent basis, not hide them for a year and a half, as in the case of the question of the Hon. Member for Victoria. Otherwise, there is no purpose for starred questions. They are there for a purpose, the purpose is urgency. Rather than changing the practice, we should abide with past practices and distinguish urgent questions from those which require in some cases volumes of statistical information which takes time to produce. A question as simple as the one the Hon. Member for Victoria starred certainly could have been answered within three days, but was not.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on somewhat the same point of order to ask the Parliamentary Secretary about Question No. 5,038 regarding the number of ships permitted into Canada under special authority to participate in offshore oil exploration.

The question was starred because it was anticipated that the Government would in fact add additional revenues to the PIPS Program. We noted today in the House the question by the Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre and the response by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. If we had had the answer that I sought on September 21, we would have been in a much better position to evaluate the Minister's response to the Hon. Member.

In the years that I have spent in this Chamber, the practice of starred questions was to identify those questions which Members felt were urgent, topical or pertained to business either before the House or shortly to come before the House. This practice has not been abused. From a random review of the last 10 or 15 years, we find that the practice of starred questions has not been abused. That procedure has not been abused. It is a procedure used by Members in an attempt to obtain information which they believe to be of importance and necessity concerning matters currently before the House. With regard to the Parliamentary Secretary's attempt to indicate to the Chamber that there is nothing in the Standing Orders, Beauchesne's or House rules to indicate urgency with respect to this, I join with the Hon. Member for Yukon. If the Parliamentary Secretary does not want to do it himself, he can have someone else look up the practice of this Chamber over the past 40 or 50 years. He would perhaps then have a different view and would appreciate that the procedure is not one that Members have traditionally abused.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to go back and look at the last 40 or 50 years of practice in this Chamber. In the last 10 to 15 years, it certainly has not been the case that they were considered to be a matter of urgency. They were read here in the House. The Hon. Member for Yukon certainly has a means, if he wishes, to change the procedure from the way it has been for the last ten years or so. He can raise this with the House Leaders. If that is a practice that the House wishes to undertake and the Chair agrees it is proper and the House Leaders can agree, I am sure it can become a procedure. That is not the way it is done now and it has not been done that way for some time.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to this point of order as well. I find offensive the attitude which the Parliamentary Secretary takes on behalf of the Government with respect to the responses he has given on behalf of the Government to written questions on the Order Paper. I find it offensive for two reasons. First, if one listens to what the Parliamentary Secretary is saying, one finds he is trying to

find every device to avoid the responsibility to answer. He does not take an affirmative point of view with respect to disclosure of information. He says he has been searching precedents. That is for the purpose of finding why there should be no early or immediate response to questions on the Order Paper. There is a second and more serious problem. During the course of discussion on access to information legislation, the direction of the Government to all Government Departments was that, in terms of answering questions, the principles to access to information legislation were to be observed even before the Act was passed—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair has listened attentively to the Hon. Member. The Chair has a concern at this point about the point of order. The point of order concerns delays in answering questions. The Parliamentary Secretary indicated that he would do his best to reply. The whole question of Government policy enunciated at other times, in other ways and in other places which the Hon. Member is raising, raises a difficulty with the Chair. The Chair has to proceed on the statement of the responsible officer to the House, in this case the Government spokesman, that an effort will be made to answer the questions. The Chair has difficulty entertaining a point of order beyond that point.

● (1540)

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My point is that asking questions on the Order Paper has become something of a joke in the House of Commons. In other words, when my colleague, the Hon. Member for York-Peel, points out that he has had a question on the Order Paper for over two years and then puts in a request under the freedom of information legislation and gets a response in something less than a few weeks, we must ask ourselves whether this demonstrates contempt on the part of the Government with respect to a very serious and integral part of our responsibilities here. We ask serious questions in order to disseminate publicly information with respect to Government activities.

I believe that the point of order I am raising, Mr. Speaker, is very germane and appropriate. More and more Members of Parliament are simply not using the opportunity afforded to them of asking questions on the Order Paper because of the derelict way in which the Parliamentary Secretary and his colleagues have dealt with these matters. Questions have been on the Order Paper year after year and I can cite those questions chapter and verse.

I ask the Parliamentary Secretary if his guidelines with respect to answering questions on the Order Paper from Members of Parliament are the same as those guidelines indicated in the freedom of information legislation. In other words, can we in the House of Commons expect attention that is at least as urgent and immediate as the attention that is paid to inquiries made under legislation that is available to all Canadians? When asking questions on the Order Paper, we do not have the power to have an information commissioner require the Parliamentary Secretary to comply with any requests for information here in the House of Commons. The only thing we can do is to point out to the Parliamentary that he is not fulfilling his function and that the Government is reluctant to give this information. We can only take a political approach on the floor of the House of Commons because there is no other way that we have—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has made his point. It is difficult for the Chair to oblige the Government to answer questions. The Hon. Member appears to have a grievance but it is difficult for the Chair to entertain it as a point of order. I think the Hon. Member has made his point on the *Hansard* record.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say briefly that it seems to me that if there is a point of order, it might well be taken under advisement. As you know, Mr. Speaker, today we are attempting to deal with a very important fisheries Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deans: I would very much like to see the House deal with that Bill as quickly as possible.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary could not tell me when he intends to answer my starred question. Can he tell me whether it will be answered now or at some remote time in the future? If it is not answered shortly, I might follow the lead of my dear colleague, the Hon. Member for Victoria, by having the question withdrawn. Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary might respond and tell me precisely when he will answer that question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair had earlier recognized the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East on precisely the same point of order.

Mr. Forrestall: No, but he did not answer my question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will not recognize the Hon. Member again on the same point of order.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, I will look into the matter and I will try to have the question answered at the earliest possible moment. The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West indicated in his tirade that the Government did not take this issue seriously and that it was not putting forward answers. There are now, or have been in the past, 5,361 questions on the Order Paper. The Government has answered 85 per cent of those questions. Some questions are more difficult to answer than others; some questions take more time to answer than others. Perhaps administrative problems have occurred while answering other questions. However, the Government will do—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair asks Hon. Members to bear in mind that there seems to have been a lengthy debate on this

matter. The Hon. Member for Mississauga South is seeking to be recognized. I ask him to be brief.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be brief. Three weeks ago, I raised the matter of Question No. 1,741 on the Order Paper, a question of November 20, 1980, with the Parliamentary Secretary. At that time, he said he would contact the CNR immediately with respect to the passes and gifts from Air Canada for its directors and what was paid for those passes. Three weeks have now gone by and I would have thought that the Parliamentary Secretary would now have that answer, particularly in view of the fact that the question has been outstanding for nearly three or four years.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I have looked into that matter. I have put a tracer on that question in order to find out why it has not been answered. To this point, I have not heard back.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Stand.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

ATLANTIC FISHERIES RESTRUCTURING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABISH

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans) moved that Bill C-170, An Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishery enterprises, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

He said: Mr. Speaker, speaking on second reading of Bill C-170, I wish to seek the support of the House for this Bill. I would say it is not merely a Bill but a historic milestone, if we consider the impact the legislation will have on the future of our Atlantic fisheries. I would even go so far as to say that this Bill is as important as the Fisheries Act and the measures taken in 1977 to extend our jurisdiction over fisheries to the 200-mile zone.

This legislation must also be seen within the historical context of our Atlantic fisheries, part of which goes back several decades, while another part has materialized during the last six months. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to dwell at length on past history. Nevertheless, I think we could usefully review some aspects of the history of our Atlantic fisheries over the last ten years, to illustrate the sequence of events that has brought us to the present situation, and to explain how the measures that are about to be taken by the Government of Canada, with, we hope, the support of all parties of this House, are a logical consequence thereof.

First, a quick look at our Atlantic fisheries at the beginning of the seventies. Hon. Members will recall that at the time, the fisheries were in a crisis situation as they are today. Foreign fishing fleets were devastating the fish stocks off our coasts. The abundant stocks of groundfish that had been the mainstay of the fishing industry for generations were threatened with depletion. The federal Government was called in and provided very substantial assistance in keeping the industry afloat, as it were.

We were aware that the fish stocks that formed a vital part of our economy in the Atlantic provinces were in very serious danger. We were also aware that this was due to uncontrolled fishing. On the basis of our experience of international controls, we knew that the only answer to these problems lay in establishing Canadian sovereignty over these resources.

Let us now look at the year 1977, when Canada proclaimed its authority over the 200-mile zone and we started on the long and difficult task of rebuilding the resource that forms the basis of this industry.

We find our next historic milestone in more recent years, namely, 1981, when our country had been exercising control over fish stocks within the 200-mile zone for five years. I think we may be proud of the manner in which we have discharged this responsibility. Our success both in safeguarding and re-establishing fish stocks is undisputed and worthy of mention. In fact, our achievements in this area have been cited the world over, and rightly so, as prime examples of excellent fisheries resource management. In 1981, however, we were once again facing a very serious situation in the Atlantic fisheries. Companies were on the verge of bankruptcy, fishermen and processing plant workers were laid off or about to be, shareholders were worried and businessmen reluctant to invest. However, there was no shortage of fish, there was no overfishing by foreign fleets and no operation of factory ships beyond our control.

There is a paradox here that is clear to even the most superficial observer. Here we have an industry that is fortunate in being able to draw on some of the richest fisheries resources of the whole world. It is located nearer the United States, one of the main markets for this product, than any of its competitors. We have people whose fishing and ocean-going traditions are as good if not better than anyone else's. We have a country that since 1978, in terms of volume, has become the biggest exporter of fish and fish products. Nevertheless, the industry was once again in dire straits and in danger of disappearing once and for all.

The obvious question is: How can an industry that has so much going for it manage to get itself into such serious trouble? More than once, my predecessor at the Department

of Fisheries and Oceans reminded the industry that by extending our jurisdiction, we had acquired new borders but lost one excuse. We could no longer blame our problems on overfishing by foreign fleets, and so if our problems continued and would not go away, we would have to change our own procedures. In other words, we would have to look at the problem from within.

Mr. Speaker, it was clear that we now had an entirely different situation. Financial assistance would have been justified when there was overfishing by foreign fleets. However, in the 80s, this reason was no longer valid. The time had come to define our international problems and try to correct them. That is why the Government established the Atlantic Fisheries Task Force headed by Mr. Michael Kirby. As Hon. Members are aware, the terms of reference of the task force were not only to describe the symptoms but to establish the cause of the disease. Furthermore, this could not be done in a vacuum but required frequent consultation with industry, fishermen, and the provincial governments concerned.

● (1550)

[*English*]

The task force made its report early this year. Its findings were sobering and instructive, but they were also basically very positive, very upbeat. As other studies before it have indicated repeatedly, this one found that whatever Atlantic fisheries might lack, they were very rich in potential. This, the task force confirmed, is a Canadian asset of immense and renewable value. The task force also found—and observers within and outside the Government have agreed with the finding—that although external influences were involved, the industry's problems were structural. They stemmed from inherent defects and internal causes. The boat had not capsized just because of the storm; it capsized because it was not built to withstand heavy weather.

Since early this year, as Hon. Members know, the Government, along with the Governments of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, the large deep sea companies and financial institutions, has been attempting to come up with a plan to keep the industry afloat. In the Province of Quebec the large co-op, United Fishermen, which has for the last two years been promised financial assistance by the Quebec Government, at the end rightly despaired. So it came and struck a deal with my Department also.

The agreements we have reached with Newfoundland and Nova Scotia and with this large co-op in the Province of Quebec reflect to some extent the recommendations made by the task force. They envisage work on many fronts.

Mr. Crosbie: To what extent, Mr. Minister?

Mr. De Bané: If the Hon. Member would just give me the chance to finish my speech, I will gladly answer any questions he may have.

Mr. Crosbie: Aren't you going to answer that in your speech? It is very important.

Mr. De Bané: The partners in these consultations agree that the industry needs to change. It needs to improve its marketing arrangements. It needs to become leaner and more efficient ashore and afloat. However, more basically, it needs to be a different kind of industry. It is not enough to beach the existing vessel and patch it up for another voyage. The industry needs a new design, one with enough built-in strength and stability to stay afloat even when the economic barometer falls.

The Bill which I have the honour to bring before the House represents one major step in that process. In the course of long, sometimes difficult negotiations this year, I reached agreements with the Governments of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, with the industry and with financial institutions on a plan to reorganize or restructure, as the Bill puts it, the Atlantic fisheries.

The plan calls for, among other things, a substantial investment of Canadian taxpayers' money. The purpose of the Bill is to authorize the federal Government to play a major part in a co-operative effort to restructure the industry. Specifically, it would authorize the Government of Canada to invest in the industry and to make loan guarantees.

Before discussing the Bill itself, I want to tell Hon. Members why the legislation is necessary and desirable. Of course, the most basic reason is that without action the industry will go under. There is a funding vacuum. No private investors have come forward to fill it. Given the industry's present financial state, it is simply not able to take that kind of risk.

Let me begin my review of the situation with Newfoundland. All observers, Government and private, agree that without exception the deep sea processing companies in that Province are in a state of terminal financial distress. Several at this point are already in receivership. As Hon. Members know, the Governments of Newfoundland and Canada signed an agreement on measures to restructure the Newfoundland deep sea industry. The agreement was not easy to achieve, but we have it now. It was signed in an atmosphere of cordiality and united resolve. I understand that the Government of Newfoundland and labrador is at the moment discussing in the legislature of that Province a Bill, the object of which is to ratify the agreement which has been reached between our two Governments. I might add that it has been hailed by the Premier of that Province as the most important bilateral agreement reached between that Province and the central Government since its entry into Canada in 1949. I am happy to note that, like all other major achievements in Newfoundland, it was done under a Liberal Government in Ottawa.

● (1600)

What our Governments hoped to accomplish together is summed up very concisely in the preamble to that agreement. That document says, Mr. Speaker, that our objective is to find a just and lasting solution for the rebuilding of the deep sea

fishery, one which recognizes the fundamental role which the fishing industry plays in Newfoundland and Labrador.

In the course of consultations which led to this agreement, practical measures were agreed upon by both Governments and by the financial institutions which will provide part of the funding. It was agreed specifically that the logical and effective course would be to combine the assets of John Penny and Sons, the Lake Group Limited, North Atlantic Fisheries, Fishery Products and some other companies. Certain assets of H. B. Nickerson and Sons in Nova Scotia would be merged with these Newfoundland elements to achieve a balanced mix of products.

In our opinion, and those of our partners in these consultations, this would produce the basic structure for an economically viable company—lean, efficient and able to compete with any fishing nation in the world. One component of the new structure would be an operating company. The other would be a holding company.

In Nova Scotia we have reached an agreement in principle with the provincial Government and with the Bank of Nova Scotia. In this case we are talking about consolidation of two main elements, National Sea Products and certain parts of the H. B. Nickerson and Sons operations, into a restructured National Sea Products Company. In this case, financing will be achieved by conversion of some debt to equity by the Bank of Nova Scotia and by the Province, and injection of new cash for equity by the Government of Canada.

A presentation was made to the board of directors of National Sea Products on October 17 on behalf of the federal and Nova Scotia Governments and the Bank of Nova Scotia, proposing a merging into National Sea Products of certain Nova Scotia fishing assets of H. B. Nickerson and Sons. This proposal includes provisions for an estimated $90 million of common share equity to restructure the balance sheet of National Sea Products. The equity is to be provided by a consortium composed of the two Governments and the bank through a company which will, as a result, probably own in excess of 75 per cent of the common shares of the restructured National Sea Products. The exact percentage will depend on the price at which the new common shares will be issued.

As Hon. Members will know, National Sea is a publicly-owned company with publicly-traded shares. The board of directors of that firm is considering the proposal submitted to it and will be seeking the approval of its shareholders for any recommended response. I should also add that discussions and negotiations have taken place which will result in the sale of the total H. B. Nickerson and Sons interests in fish processing operations in Atlantic Canada—including a controlling interest in National Sea Products—to a company owned by the two Governments and the Bank of Nova Scotia. The Nickerson assets located in Newfoundland, plus the Riverport, Nova Scotia facilities and 12 scallop vessels, will be transferred to a company to be incorporated in Newfoundland as per the agreement made between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador on September 26, 1983.

I remain hopeful that we can secure full agreement of all parties involved in the Nova Scotia restructuring plant in the near future, and that implementation of the agreements can proceed.

[*Translation*]

With respect to Quebec, the situation is quite different. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have in the Province a huge co-operative—Pêcheurs-Unis—which represents close to 50 per cent of plant workers of Quebec's fishing industry and accounts for nearly 40 per cent of catches in terms of volume. As everyone knows, for two years now this leading co-operative which is affiliated to the Desjardins group has been promised by the provincial Government that it will solve those problems and provide assistance. The simple truth is that in the past two years the Canadian Government, represented by my predecessor the former Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. LeBlanc) and myself since last year, has made it possible to rescue Pêcheurs-Unis during the last two fishing seasons, those of 1982 and 1983, twice in a row. In my opinion, the Pêcheurs-Unis case is one of the most telling examples of Canadian federalism. Those fishermen and plant workers had been told by the provincial Government that it would help them and solve their problems, but they finally realized that if they really wanted action, if they really wanted a solution, they had to ask the Canadian Government. However, I must admit that certain aspects of the Pêcheurs-Unis case remain unclear to this day. Under extreme circumstances, one can understand why the Government of Quebec would refuse to shoulder its responsibilities, but what is impossible to understand is why that Government not only denied help to Pêcheurs-Unis but did everything it could to destroy, even to the extent of questioning the personal integrity of their leaders, even questioning the personal integrity of one of the senior Desjardins officials. The Government even made references to police investigations and threatened fishermen who sought the assistance of the Canadian Government with the loss of their rights—and these are Quebec taxpayers—which belong to all Quebec fishermen.

Why is that? Mr. Speaker, I confess that I do not understand, just as the fishermen and those who looked into the case of Pêcheurs-Unis do not understand either. In any event, the Canadian Government did rescue Pêcheurs-Unis during the last two fishing seasons. Should anyone ask me why, I would answer simply that it was our duty to intervene.

History will note that in the case of all those commercial undertakings which I mentioned—National Sea Products Ltd., Nickerson, Fishery Products, Penny & Sons, North Atlantic, Pêcheurs-Unis—hundreds and thousands of creditors agreed to wait and did not take any action because they knew that we were trying to find a solution. The one and only creditor who behaved like a common finance company and who seized the assets was the Quebec government. The one and only creditor! Of course, I could not let this opportunity pass by without

thanking all the creditors, large and small, who have demonstrated considerable patience over the past two years, especially towards the *Pêcheurs Unis*, and I am sure I am speaking on behalf of all hon. members when I say that I cannot understand how the Quebec government, which is supposed to be closer to the taxpayers, could be, of all the creditors, the only one to seize the assets of the *Pêcheurs Unis*. And as everybody knows, it seized Madelipêche, a plant, most shares of which belonged to the *Pêcheurs Unis*.

I have examined the contract which the Quebec government had forced at the time upon the *Pêcheurs Unis* whereby, for all practical purposes, the Quebec government was buying the Madelipêche assets for a ridiculously low price. Mr. Speaker, you have there an example of the great social conscience of the Quebec government. It has done something which no financial company would have dared. In so doing, the Quebec government has attacked the personal integrity of the *Pêcheurs Unis* leaders as well as the Desjardins movement, and it has passed a legislation to take over the assets of the *Pêcheurs Unis*; it has even threatened the fishermen and the plant workers with retaliation if they accepted the offer of the Canadian government, and in spite of all the threats and intimidation tactics, I am happy to report that all those concerned, namely, the fishermen, the unions, the plant workers, the creditors and the leaders of the Desjardins movement, have accepted the offer of the Canadian Government. As evidence of this, I should like to read into the official report the letter which Mr. Pierre Lefebvre, my Assistance Deputy Minister in charge of the *Pêcheurs Unis* file, has just received from Mr. Jean-Paul Paradis, the fisherman who is the President of the *Pêcheurs Unis* of Quebec, and I quote:

Dear Assistant Deputy Minister;

I have acquainted myself with the results of the 2nd Information Meeting which was held with you in Newport last Tuesday evening, and I feel that these results are very satisfactory.

I emphasize the words "very satisfactory", Mr. Speaker.

Some 25 fishermen in attendance thus reasserted their agreement to the restructuring plan of the Canadian government, which means that they do not question the value of the first consultation in which they had taken part last October 19.

Up to now, the official and private consultations going on in Newport indicate and lead us to conclude that a major part of the local fleet still supports your restructuring proposal.

Indeed, we are speaking about a cooperative where each member has one vote.

In addition, the members of fisheries cooperatives throughout the northern Gaspé area still maintain their acceptance of your plan, while our organized workers continue to have a very favourable response.

However, some confusion seems to subsist as to the firm desire of your government to proceed with this plan, which confusion is encouraged by those who oppose it.

I therefore wish to reaffirm our full and complete acceptance of your offer as made last October 16 in Gaspé, and I sincerely hope that you will submit in the near future the contractual agreement sealing the transaction through which the assets of Pêcheurs-Unis will be transferred to a new corporation, still to be established and in which your government will probably have a majority of shares.

Sincerely yours,

Jean-Paul Paradis
Chairman
Pêcheurs-Unis du Québec

I would like to say to the chairman of Pêcheurs-Unis, as well as to all the fishermen, all the plant workers, the unions, the Desjardin movement, the small and the large creditors, all those who stood up to the threats, the blackmail, the overstatements—and I see that my hon. predecessor is coming in, he who has done so much in relation with Pêcheurs-Unis—I would like to tell all those people who stood up to all that and to these attacks on their reputation, that the Canadian government will not abandon them and that we shall do exactly as promised by my predecessor, the Hon. Minister of Public Works. We are going to act and to establish this corporation which will also make its marketing services available to all other Quebec businesses. When I think that this is being called an ideological conflict! Mr. Speaker, we only have to look at what was done in the case of Madelipêche. This company was not seized, taken over or appropriated to be given back to the people of the Magdalen Islands. The Quebec government appropriated the company for itself. This goes much deeper; we might as well recognize that it is an ideological conflict. The Quebec government is refusing to behave as a government which favours dialogue. As avidence, the Canadian Saltfish Corporation Act provides for one representative to be designated by the Quebec government to defend the Quebec viewpoint. That seat is still vacant, and this goes to prove to what extent the Quebec Government is ranking its ideology above the welfare of its fishermen.

The case at hand is a good example of how much federalism benefits Quebec fishermen more than 95 per cent of whom have supported the Canadian Government program that was sprinkled with no threats, arm-twisting or upmanship. When I think of the Quebec Minister of Fisheries and Minister of Agriculture going to Rivière-au-Tonnerre to offer them $800,-000, ten times more than he offered last year! This is what he offered them to try and get their support. Despite everything, I invite them for the last time to accept the Canadian Government's offer and become a shareholder as all other partners did, in that new organization which we are going to set up.

● (1610)

[*English*]

Some elements of restructuring the Atlantic fishery are specific to the Provinces involved but some are common to all, and I would like to touch on some of these principles now. This is not nationalization. This is not the beginning of nationalization. We are not creating Crown corporations. All of the Governments involved hope their participation is temporary. We are convinced that the interests of the industry and the

communities which depend on them will be best served by returning the Atlantic fisheries to the private sector as soon as possible. This is our stated and explicit aim. Indeed, we would be ready to do so immediately except that at this low point in the fortunes of the industry no private investors are willing to take the risk alone.

In entering into this agreement, the Government is acutely aware of the need to consider the situation of smaller companies in the five Provinces and the way they will relate to these three new large entities. These three new companies will be among the largest fishing industry enterprises in the world, particularly those whose headquarters will be in Halifax and St. John's. They will be doing business in all four Atlantic Provinces and Quebec, which are home also to a number of much smaller independent companies. Some of these are watching developments with a certain degree of uneasiness. I understand their concern, Mr. Speaker. They want to know that this restructuring exercise, conducted after all in part with their tax dollars, will not work against their interests.

• (1620)

Our message to these independent companies is clear. From the start of negotiations we have kept their interests in mind. This Government believes that a vigorous and independent small business sector is indispensable to the long-term health of the Atlantic fisheries. We need a balanced mix here as much as we need it in, for instance, the airlines. The use of Government support and participation to create an unfair advantage over small and efficient companies will not be permitted. Certainly, great size will endow the new entities with new strengths, but we are taking steps to ensure that those advantages which are derived directly from size are made available to the smaller companies. One area in which size confers a strong advantage is in marketing capabilities. The three new companies would be required to make their marketing capability available on request and on mutually agreed terms to smaller independent companies.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the action we are proposing offers the best hope we have of containing financial disaster before it spills over and engulfs the independants too. It is not hard to imagine the chaos, the shock of unemployment, economic slow-downs and the dumping of fish inventories at distressed prices which would follow a total collapse of the larger companies. This Government recognizes its responsibility to consider the social as well as the economic side of the equation. We also recognize that the new companies formed under this agreement must compete effectively in world markets. To do this they will have to plan and perform in conformity with business realities. Their decisions must make commercial sense. There is an implied division of roles and objectives here to which we give explicit recognition in this plan. If actions such as keeping a plant open that loses money are required for social reasons, then Government, not the company, will pay the cost of the action. Those companies will have to be run as efficient businesses.

We decided to follow the path I have outlined because the others, upon examination, led either nowhere or back to where we started. One such option was to make loans or guarantees to the companies in distress. This was impossible. The companies in question are incapable of carrying more debt. What is the use of more loan guarantees to those companies? They are already overburdened with debt. For obvious reasons, we rejected the use of public funds as grants to bail out shareholders and banks because there is no rationale to take taxpayers' money and give it to some companies without making the same favour to the 700 plants in eastern Canada. We cannot give grants to some when we are using taxpayers' money. As I was unable to extend that largesse to all companies, that band-aid could not be considered. It would not have gone to the root of the problem. It would have been another bail-out.

We rejected the option, if we can call it an option, of sitting passively by and watching the Atlantic fishing industry go down the drain. Such a course would be socially irresponsible and economically insane. If those companies had to go under and their huge inventories sold at distressed prices, as in any bankruptcy, it would have a domino effect of bankruptcies that would have touched and affected hundreds of other plants in eastern Canada.

The need of the hour is not only to rebuild a devastated industry but to rebuild sorely damaged confidence. The industry needs a reasonable degree of certainty about the seriousness of our commitment to restructure. The people in Atlantic fishery, fishermen, plant workers, managers, shareholders, investors, all need to know that the new structure rests on a solid base of public agreement. They need to know that the decisions made today are not subject to political shifts of the wind. We have made a strong start toward building that confidence in the agreements with Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and United Fishermen, that large important co-op in the Province of Quebec.

By coming to the House with a Bill which expresses clearly, specifically and openly what we plan to do, we build on that base. We certify that commitment with the seal of the Parliament of Canada.

[*Translation*]

It has sometimes been stated, Mr. Speaker, that periods of severe crisis were also periods of unequalled opportunity. As Arnold Toynbee suggested, a crisis is in a way a spur that stimulates healthy societies to new summits. The difficulties faced by the Atlantic fisheries already have prompted two positive responses. One is a commitment to study the underlying causes, the second is the willingness in various public and private sectors to work together to bring about changes and improvements that cannot be realized in isolation. To that extent, we can state that what appears to be a troubled period for the Canadian fishing industry can also be viewed as a period of unprecedented opportunity. This is how we are viewing the situation. We have the fish, the markets, the expertise, the willingness to work and the traditions. And now,

for the first time, we also have the means to put all those assets to intelligent use.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would have this to add. If we seem to be viewing this legislation with some sense of urgency, it is because it is indeed a matter of urgency. Much time already has been wasted. We would have preferred debating the question in this House six months or even three months earlier. The industry has been in a difficult situation for quite some time. Each day has added its burden of economic hardship and anxiety for those in the industry. But the fact is that only a few days ago could we reach with our partners and Pêcheurs-Unis in Quebec the agreement that was needed to act. As long as that agreement was not forthcoming we could not place the project before the House as long as we had no precise knowledge of what would be needed, or how much co-operation our efforts would be met with. We now have those answers, and we have a plan of action. Mr. Speaker, we know what must be done and how it must be done. I urge this House to deal with this Bill within the shortest possible timeframe.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order please. I see at least two Members rising with the intention of asking questions. May I remind them that, following the speech of a Minister on a Bill, the Standing Orders do not provide for the usual ten minute question and answer period. Perhaps the Hon. Members might like to seek unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. McGrath: I wanted to ask if the Minister would permit a question on the speech.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Member from St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) seeks unanimous consent, and so does the Hon. Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell), that some limited questions, in terms of time, be asked of the Minister. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of his speech the Minister spoke of urgency. Indeed, the Newfoundland legislature, which has before it a similar Bill, is treating it as a matter of considerable urgency. I understand the Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland is coming to Ottawa with the expectation of appearing before a committee this week. Would the Minister tell the House why the Government is not proceeding with this Bill tomorrow? As the Minister knows, his colleague, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard), announced today that tomorrow would be a designated Opposition day.

• (1630)

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker, I wish to confirm to the Hon. Member, who is one of my distinguished predecessors, that this Bill is indeed a very high priority. The reason is very simple. Until it is passed, I am unable to invest the substantial amounts of money needed to restructure those companies. Since that amount of money is fixed and cannot be increased, the longer we delay the longer we will have to pay interest rates to the financial institutions. Therefore, I urge the House to pass it very quickly.

With respect to the Hon. Member's question, I think I will have to relay it to my colleague, the President of the Privy Council. But I am sure that all Members will have ample occasion to prove their dedication to this Bill and have it passed this week if they want.

Miss Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the unanimous consent. My question deals strictly with the problem of the small, independent processors. I noticed that the Minister did mention them and I will be discussing this matter later when speaking to this Bill. However, in reference to page 3 of the agreement with the Province of Nova Scotia, why has the Minister not made any mention of the fact that there will be a multimillion dollar Nova Scotia fisheries developing program to assist the fishing industry in a major effort to assist the smaller sector of the fishing industry? I raise this because there are as many small companies hurting today as there are large companies. Although this Bill gives the Minister wide power to provide financial assistance to the large companies with restructuring, I do not see any provision in the Bill for the small companies.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that my colleague, who is also Chairman of the parliamentary committee, has mentioned one particular clause of the agreement I signed with Nova Scotia. She is absolutely right. I could have told her of other very good agreements reached with the Government of Nova Scotia but the Speaker was pressing me to conclude.

The example given by the Hon. Member is one among others of things I am committed to do. The assistance I would like to give the small independent processors will go to all of them in all of Atlantic Canada. I see in the House my colleague, the Chairman of our subcommittee, the Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston). We are committed to helping the independent sector in Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec.

This Bill will enable the Department to establish a general program that will apply to all of the industry in Atlantic Canada. As well, those companies will have to put their marketing capability at the service of the independents who request it. I am also committed to signing an agreement on development of the fisheries of Nova Scotia with the Government of Nova Scotia.

Therefore, those are some of the reasons I think it is imperative that Members, particularly of the Official Opposition, give speedy passage to this Bill.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity this afternoon to speak to Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in the Atlantic fisheries for the

purpose of restructuring that industry. I do so more in sorrow than in anger, for the fishing industry over the years has been the hallmark of private enterprise. It was known as the one established industry which had been the hallmark of our private enterprise system and one that was established and survived because it was built upon what we in Atlantic Canada call wooden ships and iron men.

In my hometown of Lunenburg we are known as bluenosers. We carry that name with pride. We do so because it not only describes a breed of independent master mariners, it is also a name that was carried by the fastest sailing schooner in history, the *Bluenose*. It continues to sail on, on the back of Canada's ten-cent piece.

Our forebears worked hard to build up the fishing industry. They gave little quarter and asked for none. In the early days when codfish were caught, the fleet left port early in the New Year. The codfish were caught and brought back to port where they were dried in the sun. Later in the fall, these same codfish, now dried, were taken in the same ships that caught them out to the Caribbean where they were traded for molasses, salt, tropical fruits and sometimes even rum. Barter and trade was the order of the day. There was no thought of involving provincial or federal Governments in any of these operations, other than for the provisions of shipping and customs regulations.

All this has changed over the years. Many old mariners, or old salts as we like to call them, must be turning over in their graves today over the nationalization of Canada's fishing industry.

Despite what the Minister has stated, the Bill that is presently before the House calls for the total nationalization of the fisheries in Atlantic Canada, not just Nova Scotia or Newfoundland, but New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec as well, as witnessed by the wording in the interpretation of that Act in Part II, page 2. If there are any doubts about this nationalization program, they are completely dispelled when we read of the immense powers that are being given to the Minister in paragraph 4 of page 3.

I know that the Minister does not like the nationalization term. However, the incontrovertible fact is that within one week $75 million was pledged for the fisheries in Newfoundland, and $70 million pledged for the fisheries in Nova Scotia by the federal Government alone. The provincial Governments added some $60 million and the Bank of Nova Scotia added an estimated $100 million under guarantees from the federal Government. It is no wonder that Mr. Kirby, who seems to carry more force and strength with the Government than the Minister, when commenting on what I call fisheries "mission impossible", is reported as saying, "Whatever happens now, what we have pulled off, namely restructuring the industry and at the same time creating a new federal fisheries policy, can never be undone". Is it any wonder that the private operators and Canadians generally, especially those in Atlantic Canada, are afraid?

• (1640)

Some people are asking when all this began. The Minister gave a good outline. According to the record on September 26, 1983, both the federal and provincial Governments in Newfoundland signed a restructuring agreement. They heralded it as the most significant agreement signed between the two Governments since Newfoundland joined Confederation in 1949. Time, Sir, alone will tell. Then on September 30, 1983, a federal-provincial agreement was announced in Port Hawkesbury indicating both Governments would co-operate in restructuring two major Nova Scotia deep sea fishing companies. When I read both agreements I could not help but be concerned for the people of Newfoundland, for the people of Labrador and for the people of Nova Scotia. I would remind the people of both Provinces that it was the Liberals who initiated a process that led to complete federal control over the salt fishing industry in Newfoudland, and that same process led to the destruction of two or more major salt fishing companies in the Province of Nova Scotia.

It seems to me that the present group of Liberals in office have now indicated a process that will ultimately lead to the complete takeover of the fresh and frozen industry in all of Atlantic Canada as well as Quebec. I am concerned because it is obvious that this Government cannot run the railroads. It cannot run the post office. It cannot even manage its own bureaucracy. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House that this Government cannot run the fishing industry because, more than with all the other industries in Canada, it requires the expertise, the initiative and the hard work of each and every individual connected with it.

The Minister may not look like the great white shark in the movie version of Jaws, but his teeth must be rather sharp because in the last few months he has gobbled up more fishing companies, enough to make Jaws look like a piker—perhaps since we are talking about fish I should say, a pike.

Both restructuring agreements contain a clause to the effect that the Governments intend to return the fishing industry to the private sector as soon as economic viability is achieved. Let me repeat, "As soon as economic viability is achieved". I would caution provincial Governments and private shareholders that granting this federal Government a major voting position on their boards of directors may introduce such inefficiencies into their companies' operations that privatization will become an ever receding goal, a mirage, a goal more difficult to attain as time goes on. If you have any doubts about that statement, Mr. Speaker, just look at what has happened to Canadair, to de Havilland, to Consolidated Computer and to other private companies taken over by this federal Government.

Our Party certainly recognizes the serious need for a restructuring of the fishing industry because many years of Liberal mismanagement have finally overwhelmed that industry and has left it no alternative. The Government is now forced to pour hundreds of millions of Canadian tax dollars into the fishery because the Government has failed, and failed miserably, to provide a consistent policy environment that

would allow private enterprise to flourish and provide meaningful jobs for Canadians.

To be factual, Canadian companies got into debt over their heads and provincial Governments licensed too many new fish plants. But I ask, who was behind it all encouraging this madcap expansion of the industry? None other than this federal Government. And if co-operative federalism had not been dead and if there had been greater consultation between federal Government and the Atlantic provincial Governments, this economic misery, heartbreak and heartache certainly could have been avoided.

With the fishery policy based more upon politics than upon sound resource management, the Liberal Government freely doled out fishing licences and it freely doled out DREE grants for plant construction and other largesse, can anyone really wonder that the Provinces, the fishermen and the companies took advantage of these handouts? So today our fishing industry is burdened with massive debts, constricted by government regulations and crippled by an inability to market all of its product.

One of the most important problems faced by Atlantic Canada's fishing industry today is, I submit, fear—fear of big government. In fact, the political influence on these new companies in Newfoundland and in Nova Scotia is today much greater than previous Government influence over the private companies. The Newfoundland super company, for example, is 85 per cent owned by Government. Eight of the 11 members of its board of directors are Government appointed. The chief executive officer is a joint appointment by both Governments. So-called significant corporate decisions are subject to the veto of the federal and provincial Governments.

Most critical of all was the fact that management must consult both Governments and the Governments consult with each other before the company's business plan may be submitted to the board of directors. Think about what I have just said, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you will agree that this represents nothing more than confusion confounded.

The Minister told us of the companies he had bought out. But I ask him what did he pay the Lake group; what did he pay the Penny group; what did he pay the shareholders of Fisheries Products of Canada; what did he pay the Nickerson group for what was little more in many cases than co-operation for transferring their huge debts to the new company? Is it any wonder the secret methods that have been employed by this Government are causing independent companies and taxpayers some concern and many sleepless nights?

Throughout all of this confusion the Minister keeps saying, bragging in fact, that what he has established is not a new Crown corporation in Newfoundland or Nova Scotia. Of course, it is not. We understand that. Crown corporations have more independence than these new companies, including the ability to set up their own business plan. In a highly political industry, like the fishing industry, this Government is more likely to be concerned about jobs and about votes than about economic viability. This is what is worrying us. We in our Party do not believe that this Government exhausted every available possibility of securing equity capital, either from Canadians or from foreign interests, before nationalizing the Atlantic coast fishery. To follow this course would not fit in with this centrally minded Government that wants to control all Canadian industry. However, I am led to believe that private capital was available from Canadians—

Mr. Tobin: Where?

Mr. Crouse: —and from foreign countries, foreign interests, but little or no effort was made to tap these sources. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister calls out, where. I will take him aside some day and tell him something about the fishing industry.

Mr. Tobin: Tell the House.

Mr. Crouse: Through the work of its Foreign Investment Review Agency and its ideological hostility to private industry, both foreign and domestic, this Liberal Government has ironically left the Atlantic fishery with nowhere to turn for aid but to the federal Government that helped drive it to ruin in the first place. That, to answer my young friend, is why there was no foreign capital brought forward. Take the teeth out of the Foreign Investment Review Act and then see what happens to some foreign capital. In fact, I am confident that if a proper search had been made, it would be found that Canadian capital was available. After all, we are only talking here of a couple of hundred million dollars. That is peanuts in an industry the size of the one of which we are speaking, an industry that represents to foreign nations, to European countries and to the Americans, a massive resource that has not really been tapped.

In my opinion, it is only through a fundamental shift in Government policy that stability and certainty can be returned to the fishing industry, thereby creating an environment in which free enterprise can survive. Unless this is accomplished, Sir, and I say this in all seriousness, similar problems to those which this Bill seeks to address cannot be avoided. Moreover, without the creation of a more positive business environment, private investors, either Canadian or foreign, will not risk their capital in the Canadian fishing industry. Those who remain in the industry do not believe in this Government and they do not believe that the present Liberal Government is genuinely committed to the eventual privatization of the two new restructured companies. They believe that you are only making such statements to reduce opposition to your actions and to hide your real intentions which are, in effect, in time to nationalize the entire industry.

● (1650)

I will give this Government a way out. In the event that it is acting in good faith and wishes to allay the fears of smaller companies and wants to make the commitment to privatization meaningful, it must establish from the very beginning a clear schedule for divesting itself of ownership in the fishery. This schedule should either be written into this Bill or at least written into agreements with the Provinces. If the Government

wished to take the strongest step along these lines, it could commit itself to holding only non-voting shares in these companies.

Once this step is taken, the smaller processors and fishermen would no longer have the same fears about unfair Government-controlled competition. This would also have the effect of making investment in the two companies more attractive to private investors, because the two companies would be seen as private enterprises run along sound business lines.

As private investors bought the Government's shares, they could be turned into voting shares. This would ensure that the buying out of Government shares was an attractive investment. It would also ensure that the people of Canada would recover their money. They have a stake in this too.

Another approach would be to require by law that the Government annually sell, regardless of the price, 20 per cent of its shares to the public. This would ensure that at the end of five years the two companies would be fully privatized. At the outset, the Government would not recover its investment because the share prices would be low, but under that system there would be a requirement for them to make these companies economically viable and profitable. If they did that, by the end of a five-year term the increase in equity share value would give the Government back the money it is now putting in, which is what I call pump-priming money.

At the present time, our Party intends to support this Bill at the second reading stage. However, we want to make sure that there is a full hearing on the restructuring program in committee in light of the major changes that it threatens to impose upon the Atlantic fisheries, and in fact the entire Atlantic economy. In our opinion, the Bill raises more problems than it solves.

I thought there were only 500 independents. The Minister told us today that there were 700 independents in Atlantic Canada who do not as yet come under the socialist umbrella of this Liberal Government. They are very reticent about making public statements about the effects of this restructuring plan. They fear reprisals—imagine, reprisals from the federal Government.

I asked them what were their fears. They said that the Province grants them a licence, but the federal Government has the right to carry out dredging operations in their area. It has the right to set the fishing quotas. It has the right to determine, yes or no, whether it will repair a decrepit federal wharf which has not been repaired since 1962 when the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker was in power. They fear that if they make objection to what is being done, there will be reprisals against them in that regard. This fear demonstrates that Canadians have lost some of their basic freedoms.

At present most of these independents are relatively sound financially. They quite rightfully ask how they can compete with this monstrous tax-supported Government-financed conglomerate. The bail-outs buried in this Bill and the secret agreements are not fair and they are not above-board. The federal Government is not a minority shareholder. No matter what this Government calls its actions, in my view it is nationalization of the fishing industry. The big unanswered question is, what is the time frame for de-nationalization? Search as you will, you will not find the answer to that question in this Bill.

It is not my intention to pre-judge entirely the outcome of the restructuring that has taken place in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. I simply wish to remind the provincial Governments, the fishermen and the industry throughout Atlantic Canada and Quebec that negotiations have really just begun. There are many pitfalls ahead. For example, I cannot help but wonder how the Government proposes to develop a large cooked fish production line at Burin, Newfoundland, when the present plant in my home town of Lunenburg and the one at Lachine, Quebec, can supply the total Canadian demand for cooked fish products while operating at only 50 per cent capacity.

International tariffs on cooked fish are so high at present that these products cannot be exported. I remind the Minister that unless you increase the market for cooked fish products, any increase in employment in Newfoundland in this field will only be at the price of further unemployment in Nova Scotia and Quebec.

This, of course, cannot be considered progress in the industry. I cannot help but wonder as well what will happen to the fishermen and the industry which evolves around the large dragger fleet based just six miles from my home town in a small place called Riverport, Nova Scotia. The Minister stated today that a new company is being formed and these ships will be transferred. I wonder as well why that action is being taken. In light of what I have said, is it any wonder that the independents and the communities in which they are located are very much concerned? They have many sleepless nights over the many aspects of this Bill. The pressure on them is already taking its toll in different forms. They ask what will be the extent of their quotas and their licences and how they will replace their aging ships.

The banks have already given the independents a signal. They have cut back on loans to independents in the fishing industry. Instead of lending them 75 per cent of their working capital, they have been told to cut their loans to 50 per cent. This is literally putting some, not all, of the independents out of business.

I ask the Minister, what is in this Bill to protect the independents? I have read it from cover to cover and I see nothing. They are saying that if you are going to nationalize the fishing industry, take our business now while it is worth something. The independents are comparing the Liberal actions in this Bill to those they would expect in a police state. They are asking, who is going to pick up the losses for the restructured companies? What if these companies are not privatized? What if these companies are not run on a commercially viable basis? What is the Government's definition of economic viability?

The independents are asking, since those who have been inefficient are being bailed out, what are the rewards for those

of us who have been viable? Is this to be a society where the incompetent are rewarded and the competent are penalized? I would like to hear the answer to that question. They ask, are you, for example, going to reform the tax legislation for independent processors and fishermen and give them a better opportunity to write off some of their valid expenses and their excessive fuel costs?

I wonder how many in this House realize that a trip from my home town of Lunenburg, to the St. Pierre area and return costs $6,000 for fuel oil. A trip from that same port to the Hamilton Bank off Labrador costs double, or $12,000 in fuel oil. There has been no change. That almost doubles the landed cost of the catch for that crew of 18 men on a 150-foot ship. When is the Government going to recognize that and give these fishermen an opportunity to write off valid expenses and their excessive costs which are driving up their costs for landing fish and lowering their net return? When some of these questions are answered either in the House or in committee, we will all have a better understanding of this Government's real plans for the future of the Atlantic fishing industry.

• (1700)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): As I indicated earlier, there is no allowance for a ten-minute question and answer period following lead speakers. However, as I also indicated, if Members wish to seek unanimous consent for an exchange of questions and answers, the Chair will put that to the House.

Is there a wish on the part of the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary that the Chair seek unanimous consent for questions to be put?

Mr. Tobin: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I thank Hon. Members of the House for allowing me this opportunity to ask a question. I ask this question bearing in mind the tremendous respect that I have gained for the Hon. Member opposite during the many hours we have shared on the fisheries committee. However, I have a great concern that the partisan nature of his speech would call into question an action which was deemed not only appropriate but absolutely necessary when introducing this Bill at this time.

I would remind the Hon. Member that, although he uses partisan phrases and describes this action as a form of nationalization or socialization, this Bill results from an agreement reached between the Government of Canada, the Government of Nova Scotia and the Government of Newfoundland. I think that that is all that needs to be said. However, if we must be partisan, Mr. Speaker, and I do not suggest we should not—

Mr. Crosbie: Where is the question?

Mr. Tobin: I have a question. I do not suggest we should be partisan. I would remind the Hon. Member that two of those Governments are Conservative Governments. I would then ask my question quite seriously. We come to this stage of this Bill because there are no other options.

Some Hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Tobin: I say to the Hon. Member opposite that if he believes there to be private capital out there, I can assure him we would gladly avail ourselves of it before taking this action. Can he now tell us categorically where that private capital is?

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that these last remarks constitute an abuse of a privilege extended by the House. Those remarks were debate much more than they were a question. I would be very happy to give unanimous consent to a question.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the Hon. Member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) and I waited as patiently as I could until he finally got around to asking his question. I regret that the Hon. Member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe was obviously not listening to what I said. I know that there is Canadian investment capital available and there is Japanese investment capital available to invest in the fishing industry. There is American capital that is willing to invest in the fishing industry, and those countries are afraid to invest on account of the teeth in the—

An Hon. Member: Oh, the bogeyman.

Mr. Crouse: No, there is no bogey-man. The facts hurt those people opposite. They cannot stand the truth, and that is the trouble with them. I say through you, Sir, to the Members opposite that there is plenty of money available in Canada for investment in properly organized and taxed companies. However, there exists the heavy hand of the tax man who is so greedy for tax dollars that he must come down on the sharesmen from a fishing crew at the rate of 60 per cent in order to get a few dollars to keep this decrepit and ailing Government operating. That is the problem, Sir. Change the Government, put us in power, and we will cut the teeth out of the Foreign Investment Review Act and see that that foreign money is invested in the fishing industry. We will privatize the industry at that time.

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise and discuss what is certainly the most important fisheries legislation dealt with in this session of Parliament. The Bill has been placed before us at the end of this session and the House of Commons must deal with it with a certain amount of haste. It is a Bill of a mammoth nature that will affect Atlantic Canada and its fishing industry governed by the federal Government.

I believe that Hon. Members of all Parties understand the critical nature of a Bill that will provide $138 million to Atlantic Canada in terms of capital investment in Nova

Scotia, Newfoundland and the other Atlantic Provinces. However, Mr. Speaker, this Bill gives an all-encompassing power to the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) when dealing with almost all aspects of federal involvement in the fishing industry and therefore gives him both direct and indirect involvement in capital funding and control over the fishing industry. This Bill really does require a great deal more attention than the Government seems to be prepared to give to it at this moment.

It is necessary to proceed with this Bill because the future of the next fishing season in Atlantic Canada relies on it. If this Bill is not passed, if there is not a restructuring of the industry and if a board of directors is not appointed to the new companies in Altantic Canada, there will be a great deal of uncertainty about markets and our ability to sell the product that is harvested over the next year. As well, the matter of negotiations between the fishermen's unions and the company for contracts in Atlantic Canada depends upon this Bill and suppliers must know whether the debts that are owed to them at the moment will be repaid. There are a great many other uncertainties in almost every community in Atlantic Canada and hundreds and hundreds of those communities are dependent upon the fishing industry.

The restructuring of the Atlantic fisheries industry through the Kirby task force was done in a great deal of secrecy. We are dealing with a Bill that arises out of a task force that was set up on January 8, 1982. It is now almost January, 1984, and we in the House of Commons are expected to deal with a Bill without a great deal of past involvement.

Hon. Members of Parliament who represent ridings in Atlantic Canada have gone through two years of uncertainty when dealing with the fishing industry. Plants have been shut down and whole communities have been out of work for over a year in some instances. We must now in the next few days deal with a restructuring Bill which requires a great deal of debate and a great deal of input from the people who are most directly involved. I would include in those concerns the concern that was expressed by the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) for all of the smaller independent processing companies that do not have the same kind of economic debt as the major processing companies in Atlantic Canada.

The Hon. Member for South Shore indicated that the failure of the fishing industry is mainly the responsibility of the federal Government and the Liberal Party. I think there is a great deal of truth to that, but there are other failings in the industry in Atlantic Canada. I think it is worth while to look at those failings to see exactly where, if we must put blame, the blame must lie.

I believe that one of the things that led to over-capitalization in the industry was the tremendous expectations of the fishing industry when the 200-mile limit was declared. There were expectations of greater access to stock and therefore greater access to processing capabilities and markets. The economic recession in the 1980s certainly contributed significantly to a reduction in the amount of product that was sold and the prices that were paid to fishermen. Management decisions led to over-capitalization, and those included management decisions made by companies that were attempting to meet their expectations in terms of greater quantities of product and access to a great deal of federal and provincial money to expand the processing capabilities and the harvesting sector. Those expectations and offers of assistance were taken up by fishermen and processors, resulting in over-capacity both in the harvesting and the processing sectors.

I believe that at that time. both the federal and provincial Governments were attempting to create greater employment in the industry and generate greater wealth in Atlantic Canada. However, the expectations were far too high to meet the capacity of the stocks that could be produced. As much as anything else, I believe that the failure of the Atlantic fishing industry can be related to the high interest rate policies that were supported by the Liberal Government when it did not attempt to put any controls on the rate of interest that was to be paid.

• (1710)

Basically, the previous Government followed that policy—a rate of interest set by the Governor of the Bank of Canada which followed United States rates. Those rates themselves had a great deal of effect on how much product in terms of the groundfish resource could be sold to the United States. It soon became apparent that the expansion had gone too far. Companies may have doubled their catch but they also doubled and, in some cases, tripled their debt. Companies had paid little enough attention to increasing the quality of their catch or improving their marketing strategies. This led to a decline in the ability to sell fish and the ability to support the economics of the industry. Again I think the interest rate freeze affected expansion and was a major problem for Atlantic Canada. Companies found it necessary to switch from the goal of expansion to contraction and began to close plants. That has been going on since 1981.

Unfortunately, as always, in areas where one industry dominates, dozens of communities in Newfoundland in particular and in the Maritime Provinces were locked into the economic well-being of these large companies. They were completely reliant on the continued operation of plants and fishing operations for their own economic health. The closure of plants and fishing operations was tantamount to a death sentence for many of these communities.

The Government's response was to launch the Kirby task force, which culminated in this Bill. The process of negotiating the restructuring agreements leaves much to be desired. As I indicated earlier, there was really very little input by Members of Parliament in the restructuring. Everything was done in secrecy. This led to many suspicions between Provinces, between Provinces and the federal Government and, more important, suspicions within the communities, with plant workers and fishermen themselves. The relations among fishermen processors, plant workers, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the provincial and federal Governments, strained at

the best of times, became more strained as a result of the way in which the negotiations were handled.

The Minister is quoted as saying that this was the hardest thing he had ever done in politics. Of course he was referring to the restructuring. I can well believe it, because as well as the incredibly serious and complex problems of the industry itself, the negotiations also had to contend with Governments that could not make up their minds on what they wanted, with one Department or Minister overruling another, with agreements signed then subsequently thrown out, with companies, especially Government-influenced companies like Fishery Products Ltd. controlled by CDC, doing everything they could to torpedo the negotiations.

Under these conditions, we are fortunate to have reached any kind of an agreement on Atlantic fisheries restructuring at this time. The fundamental difference of opinion was over the matter of priorities for the restructured companies. Some left that the number one priority should be the economic viability of the companies. Others felt that maximization of employment should take precedence. Unfortunately, I did not hear about any of the major parties taking a broad enough look at the role of the industry in the context of the economy of Atlantic Canada. They did not realize that these two objectives are not necessarily opposing forces, that depending upon one's parameters, both objectives can be achieved. It is only if one looks at the economic viability of the processing sector in isolation that it cannot include the concept of maximum employment. Unfortunately, if the company is in private hands or is intended to be returned to private hands, the only possible way it can be viewed is in isolation.

The joint agreement announced on September 26 by the Minister and Premier Peckford of Newfoundland and the subsequent agreement on September 30 with Premier Buchanan are far more responsible in this respect than the unilateral announcement of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans on July 4.

The federal Government's insistence on making economic viability its primary concern is somewhat disturbing, in face of the need in Atlantic Canada for massive employment in the fishing industry. I am pleased to see the clause in the agreement regarding the future of those plants which may be deemed uneconomic, although knowing the federal Government's attitude toward these plants in the past, the security of their future and of their communities, the clause leaves a lot to be desired. The most disturbing element of the agreements is the stated objective of returning these companies to the private sector once they have become viable. If the success of these companies is to be measured in such terms that it would be seen as viable to the private sector, then I am afraid that over time we would see the complete dominance of the concept of economic viability over maximum employment. Under the terms of the agreements, the economic viability of the company could be maintained very easily by dumping off its uneconomic elements to one or another of the Governments involved. Other companies do not have this option, so it could be expected that the two new companies would certainly have a distinct advantage.

There is some question as to whether any of the other companies operating in the Maritimes or Newfoundland could stand up over time to the increasing economic and marketing dominance of these two super companies. Many of the smaller companies, as well as the Governments of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, have expressed their concern over the matter. I believe they have legitimate grounds for concern. This is a question which the Minister should address. He should give some assurance to smaller companies that they will not be forced out of the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada, particularly companies that have shown restraint and good management in their operations and have developed markets to continue ongoing employment for the communities in which they operate.

If the Government attempted to sell off its economically viable companies, would it not be essentially selling off a monopoly position in the processing sector of such an important and essential industry? There is no guarantee that both companies could not be acquired by the same buyer, nor is there any guarantee that controlling interests could not be sold to non-Canadian buyers. We in our Party would not like to see the Atlantic Canada fishing industry sold to foreign buyers, even if they were available, as the Hon. Member for South Shore seemed to indicate.

I am concerned about the position the Bank of Nova Scotia holds in these two companies. In the first place, the bank is in the business of lending money, and as such its allegiance is to its shareholders. It has little or no experience in the management of the fishing industry. It has no stake in the success of the industry in terms of the well-being of communities, only in terms of the dollar return on its investment. Yet, it has a veto power the same as that of the federal or provincial Governments when it comes to divestiture of company assets. The union, whose members have more stake in the success of the company than any of the other partners, has no such power of veto.

The Minister seems to be fairly proud of the agreements he has reached with the Provinces of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. Under this Bill he will essentially become the czar of the Atlantic fishing industry. It is all encompassing and gives almost total control to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. The Bill will give the Minister authority to "acquire, hold or dispose of or otherwise deal with shares, debentures or other securities of, or any security interest in, any fishery enterprise". In other words, the Bill does not deal just with the restructuring of major groundfish trawler companies in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia—the agreements which have already been mentioned—but it applies to every fishing enterprise on the East Coast, from the super companies to individual fishermen and everything in between.

In addition to the $138 million specifically allocated and acquired for the restructuring agreements already announced and a further $100 million available for the provision of loan guarantees, Clause 5 of the Bill indicates that the Minister

may, on such terms and conditions as he specifies, make a contribution or loan to a fishery enterprise with no specified limits. Thus it can be seen that with this Bill the Minister acquires almost unlimited powers to become involved in or finance virtually any fishing enterprise in eastern Canada, at his discretion and on his terms.

I have outlined many of the concerns of our Party with this Bill and with the restructuring agreements it is intended to finance. The problems I have mentioned are all potential problems. They are of concern because very few safeguards are built into either the Bill or the agreements. However, these problems do not have to arise. The key is what the Government and its partners do with the powers they have given themselves. I want to make it clear that neither the Bill nor the agreements on restructuring, nor the extensive investigations into the problems of the East Coast fishing industry, have in any way solved the problems of either the industry or the communities dependent thereon. All they have done is to keep the industry alive. The key is what happens from here.

● (1720)

Mention was made in the agreements of such things as the Burin Peninsula development fund, in order to find alternative sources of employment and income for the area, and the northern development fund in Newfoundland and Labrador. If such programs are not initiated quickly and managed in such a way as to produce concrete results for the people of the area—and that includes at least involving the local people in the development and operation of the program—then all of the restructuring work will have been done in vain.

The new company can provide an opportunity for community development, the involvement of the fishing industry and the plant workers. Serious attention has not been paid to marketing in Atlantic Canada to its greatest extent. The new fish company gives us that opportunity, and an opportunity to face and meet a critical factor in selling the product we produce in Atlantic Canada. More attention must be paid to fish stocks and their enhancement. This also includes protection of the habitat, both marine and freshwater, and limitation or restriction of development in areas of sensitivity to these stocks.

It is not only the processing sector which is in severe crisis. The fishermen as well are in desperate financial shape and are in need of immediate help. Such piddling programs as the $15 million Canada works program announced on November 4 by the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) will not even dent the surface of the problem. It is incumbent upon the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to embark now on a program aimed at improving the financial position of the individual fisherman, giving him at least as much attention as was paid to the processing sector.

A long-term plan of action must be developed with respect to the divestiture of the assets of these two super companies if, indeed, the Government is committed to returning them to the private sector. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that once these companies have been formed, it is very unlikely that there will be the divestiture of these companies into private hands, as the Minister indicated this afternoon. I have already pointed out the danger of simply selling these companies off in a block to the highest bidder. To maintain the social benefits of public ownership, while still complying with the free enterprise objectives of the Liberal and Tory Governments and their partner, the Bank of Nova Scotia, plans should be developed for these companies to be turned over to the communities involved, in order to allow them locally and co-operatively to own and control the companies. That is the alternative to turning those companies back to the free enterprise companies which have, partly through their own mismanagement and partly through the mismanagement of Government, failed the East Coast fishing industry and many of those communities which are dependent upon them. Communities such as Burin and Grand Bank themselves have made some initiatives to attempt to get control of their fish companies and to operate them as a co-operative with input from fishermen and plant workers in the community itself.

Our Party, rather than seeing Government investment in the fishing industry, would prefer it be turned back into private industry hands if and when these corporations become profitable and investors are again interested in investing in the Atlantic fishery. We would be far more interested in seeing the possibility of co-operatives developed within Atlantic Canada which operate and control their own fishing industry and their own employment. This, of course, would require the development of local management expertise. However, given time, this could be done through our college and university networks with the development of marine colleges and by tapping the expertise already at hand in many of the communities in Atlantic Canada.

What I am advocating is a comprehensive approach to fisheries management which sees the industry not as an isolated enterprise, which must make it or break it on its own, but rather as an integral part of the social and economic way of life in Atlantic Canada. It can provide long-term economic security as well as satisfaction and social harmony.

We understand, Mr. Speaker, the nature of this Bill and the critical time frame under which we are operating with a Bill of this kind. It is really a Bill which will save many thousands of jobs in Atlantic Canada. We are disappointed that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has not been able to present us with the Bill sooner. He has not given us an opportunity to take the Bill through committee and deal with it in a way in which we could satisfy many of our constituents in Atlantic Canada who have some serious concerns about it. We also recognize, Mr. Speaker, that there are many people in Newfoundland, in particular, who are anxiously awaiting the passage of this Bill, and our Party will not do anything which would unduly delay the passage of Bill C-170. However, we do wish the Minister would be more forthcoming in the future with the House of Commons and the Fisheries and Forestry Committee in presenting us with the opportunity to deal with Atlantic Canada and western Canadian fisheries matters in more detail.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I am aware that the Hon. Member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) has some pressing time requirements. I had indicated that perhaps he or someone representing his Party might consent to an exchange of speakers. At the moment, the Chair will have to recognize an Hon. Member to my right.

Mr. McCain: The Chair appreciates my problem with respect to time and I would ask for unanimous consent to be given consideration at this moment in time, despite the fact that it would involve the reorganization of speakers in the debate.

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, I understand the Hon. Member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) will not be here on Thursday. I will yield my place in the order of speakers on the understanding that I will be the first speaker to be recognized on Thursday.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): That is agreed.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I do want to extend my very sincere appreciation for the consideration which has been given to me. I shall remember it and respect the Hon. Member concerned.

I suppose there is no way, Mr. Speaker, that anyone who has a distinct difference in principle with the philosophy of this Bill, can speak without being accused of being partisan. If principle and basic philosophy make me partisan, then that is what I am, and I acknowledge that before I begin my remarks. I am not a socialist. I do not believe for a minute that a Crown corporation of this magnitude can be established and can operate and manage more effectively and more efficiently than those who have had difficulties with the market, those who have had, for instance, generations of experience in the fishing business and who have floundered in their management practices. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, we will be hard-pressed as Hon. Members of the House of Commons, regardless of the side of the House on which we may sit, to find people with that kind of experience and knowledge of the market to make this a viable operation. From that point of view, I am partisan.

We are looking at more than 100 countries which represent possible marketing capabilities for us. We are looking at a multitude of different products, different trademarks, to which world trade has become accustomed. If we undertake a very major change in management under these circumstances, we may do more harm to our market structure than we may do good.

I look on this Bill, in reflection, as being one which might almost have come by design before this House, by choice of policy, because the policies of the Fisheries Department have not been conducive to the viability of the fishing industry at any level whatsoever. I come from a constituency in which fishing is one of the three major industries. It is not the only one, but it is one of the three major industries. I would like to give you an example of where I think the planning did not go as soundly as it should have. The Government of Canada encouraged everyone to have the highest possible expectations of the impact upon our economy of the 200-mile limit and the management thereof. The Government gave DREE grants to build two herring fillet plants in Carleton-Charlotte. These two plants required a minimum of 11-inch fish to be viably processed in their filleting operations. I guess that in the 11 years it has been my privilege to be here we may have had three or maybe four years in which the supply of herring of that size was adequate to maintain full operations of those two plants and the other plants already in existence. The history of the herring industry shows that the various schools of fish which develop in that ocean do not consistently give you the size of fish necessary to make those two plants viable in the long term. So the expectation was that, with the 200 mile limit, anything we do will be viable.

● (1730)

I come from a constituency in which there are communities whose only source of income is the fishery. Those communities have watched Minister after Minister impose regulation after regulation. They have watched those Ministers issue additional licences for the species fished by my island constituents, to the extent that we had to impose such catch limitation on the island fishery as to make it no longer viable. We now say we have too many fishermen after too few fish, when in fact it was not that bad 15 years ago. But with the extension of fishing privileges and the division of the species among other Provinces and fishermen, the herring fleet which pioneered the industry has now been constrained by regulation to the point where its viability is questioned, even with the 200-mile limit. These are the problems facing the fishing industry, and the area I represent is finding it very difficult to remain viable under those circumstances.

So these regulations have transferred from my constituency to other areas the fishing opportunities which historically belonged to those island communities. This is because in the Minister's office and among his personnel there is the belief that any regulation applicable to the Atlantic fishery is practical for all the Atlantic fishery, but that does not apply to the outports of Newfoundland, or the East and South Coasts of New Brunswick.

We have heard from the former Minister of Fisheries and Oceans that the expectations are such that the fishermen should buy a bigger boat, make a greater effort, put more capital into the plant because there are lots of fish and we are going to nourish and nurture all species. Therefore, there will be markets and you will be rich. But in the process of developing the 200-mile limit we issued international licences and extended to the international fleet the privilege of fishing in our waters, but we did not extract in return a single improvement for ourselves in any market in the world. There might be one possible exception, that of the over-the-side sale of herring. But when we did that, we also gave additional quotas to the Russian fleet in other species, which kept our people sitting on the shore, not working.

Mr. LeBlanc: Species we did not use.

Mr. McCain: You will have your chance, Mr. former Minister, and I have mine. These things have happened.

Mr. LeBlanc: Speak the facts.

Mr. McCain: I am speaking the facts. In your remarks, Mr. former Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, indicate a single market which has been improved, as my colleague, the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) mentioned. Name a single market which has been improved for fillets or for cod. These things have not been improved. What happened? I agree we got larger catches, we expanded our processing capability, but we did not expand our markets, and therein lies the weakness in the policy which has brought us to this point and this legislation.

I want to know, Mr. Speaker, why the hurry? The Government of Canada has put a gun to the head of the fishing industry of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia and said that this is the only way we will help resolve this problem. I submit that is not the way to solve anything, except, I suppose, in a very expensive fashion. The information I pick up is that the Provinces found themselves in such a desperate economic and social position that any proposition placed before them by the federal Government, after its mismanagement of policy, had to be accepted. I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend from Nova Scotia has just said, I know there were people who would have invested private money to revitalize some, if not all, of the fishing industry had it not been regulated the way it is.

I must now come to the independents. Virtually all of the New Brunswick fishery is processed by independents except for one or two branch plants of the Nickerson family of companies which had plants in New Brunswick. These people are giving exactly the same reports as you have already heard, namely that the banks are scared of the fish processing industry, and they will only extend their credit line to the value of 50 per cent of the processors' inventory. That is a one third cut, and I want to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bané), what pressure the Government of Canada is going to put on the banks, or what substitute is it going to offer to the processors who have been treated in this fashion by the banks? The banks are scared. They may be a participant, but once burned, twice shy, and these independents need all the credit they can get to function competitively. I have suppliers to the industry who are asking me questions about whether they, as an independent oil dealer, refiner or whatever, would have an opportunity to get the business of this Crown corporation. Or will they finds themselves out in the cold without even an opportunity to compete with the Crown corporation? Call it whatever you like, but it is controlled by a Crown corporation and the five directors of the board are appointed by the Government. Will the Minister assure us that this corporation will put its business out for tender, that the little guy who has been servicing and repairing boats, or maybe the medium-sized guy, is in fact going to have the same opportunity to tender for work under this corporation? Will it be independent of Government in its allocation of benefits to the supplier to the fishing industry? That is what so many people want to know.

The Minister has said we would be able to compete with any nation in the world. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the companies competing with other nations have run afoul of a great many competitors and run afoul of duties which we are still going to have to pay. As a matter of fact, there is strong reason to believe that we may have more difficulty in trading in some parts of the world with a Crown corporation than we would have had in the private world. The moneys which the Government may be pouring into this structure may make others look at us with a rather jaundiced eye, shall we say, because of the fact it is no longer an independent private industrial competitor but, rather, a government supported competitor.

● (1740)

These people have been the victim of another policy of Government, namely the interest policy. Few, if any, of the small industries in Canada have been able to cope. Those who required huge inventories, in a world oversupplied with product, could not afford the 20 per cent plus interest rates which they experienced, which started the decline and the unprofitable situation in which they find themselves. It was cost of capital as well as cost of operating capital that have, to a large degree, put them in this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we will not have a stream of independents coming before the fisheries committee of the House of Commons saying that they have been put out of business by this huge conglomorate which has been created by Government, as came to us from the western part of Canada in the case of the freshwater fisheries. In that instance, there was no opportunity for a private dealer and little opportunity for a fisherman who did not do business with the Crown corporation. Are we going to find ourselves with another corporation financed by the Government operating under comparable principles? My fishermen are concerned about their markets through their independents. My processors are concerned about the opportunity to do business. They are wondering what additional regulation they may be facing when this conglomorate begins to function.

Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we are faced with an ultimatum. This is the only solution which the Government of Canada offers to put fishermen, processors, processing people, marketers and transporters back into business. This is the only way. This industry was not worthy of the same consideration as the Chrysler Corporation or Massey-Ferguson or even White or Maislin. I am very concerned that this industry was not given comparable treatment in view of the fact that it employs many times the number of people that were employed by Ferguson, White, Chrysler and Maislin all put together. We are going to nationalize this in virtually every situation and we are going to compete with the little guy. What the opportunity will be for the little guy has not been clarified.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am partisan because my philosophy tells me that this is not the route the Government should have followed. This is a palliative which is being applied to the

fishing industry too late. This is a predictable situation which any businessman who had been in the fishing industry would have told you was going to happen. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have to support it because we have so many people that would otherwise be totally out of work and without any opportunity. We are voting for a social reason, but if this company is operated as a social company for social purposes, then all the fears of all the independents are very, very real. The catastrophe with which we are dealing now is minimal as compared to the catastrophe that we will have to deal with if we operate this as a social operation. That would be very alarming.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I indicated earlier to the House that an exchange of speakers had taken place. I would like to remind Hon. Members that on Thursday the Chair will recognize two Members to my right seriatim because of having accommodated earlier the Hon. Member for Carleton-Charlotte.

* * *

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Friday, November 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. Axworthy that Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, be read the third time and do pass; and the amendment of Mr. Mazankowski.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It being 5.45 o'clock p.m., pursuant to order made Friday, November 4, 1983, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the amendment to the motion for third reading of Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof. Call in the Members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Mazankowski) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 465*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Broadbent
Carney (Miss)
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crouse
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hamilton (Swift Current-Maple Creek)
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
La Salle
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid (St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wright
Young—114.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Isabelle
Ittinuar
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—141.

● (1815)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

Accordingly, the next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall I dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Axworthy) which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 466*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Isabelle
Ittinuar
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—141.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Broadbent
Carney (Miss)
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crouse
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)
Hamilton
(Swift Current-Maple
Creek)
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jelinek
Jewett (Miss)
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
Kushner
La Salle
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wright
Young—114.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

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

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I have a serious point of order to raise with respect to what I conceive to be errors in *Hansard*—in recording votes at report stage which I think should be put on the record now so the Chair might examine my observations overnight and perhaps comment tomorrow. Before doing so, though, I noticed there was a second member of the animal kingdom who rose with the Hon. Member for Regina West (Mr. Benjamin). Both were stuffed and I was wondering which vote was counted.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nielsen: In the recording of the report stage votes in *Hansard* of Thursday, November 3, in group C the Speaker read "90A" but *Hansard* recorded it as "98". This is at page 28709 at the bottom right-hand corner. Thus Motion No. 90A is not recorded as having been mentioned. Motion No. 90A is

the amendment of the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) to Clause 43 on the rate freeze.

Secondly, in group E the Speaker called out "160A" but *Hansard* reported it as "168", which is on page 28712. Motion No. 168 was already voted upon and read into the record in group A on page 28707, thus Motion No. 168 is recorded as having been read twice by the Speaker. Motion No. 160A is missing from *Hansard*, which motion is the Government amendment to Clause 59 establishing the inquiry into the method of payment. However, Sir, the actual recording of votes do indicate "90A" at page 28745 and "160A" on page 28768 as having been voted upon.

I leave that with the Chair and the Table for their observations tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I appreciate the effort of the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) in bringing these matters, which are serious, to our attention and they will certainly be investigated.

It being 6.30 p.m. the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at eleven o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 6.30 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 15, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—GOVERNMENT MEASURES

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon) moved:

That this House condemns the Government for having taken high-handed and anti-democratic actions in this session and for having proceeded, without a mandate and through the imposition of closure, to abolish the historic Crow Rate, to impose measures relating to taxes on petroleum and natural gas, to cap old age pensions, to create Canagrex, to limit increases in family allowance payments, to change income tax laws, and to increase public debt through additional borrowing and calls upon the Government to seek a mandate by calling a general election without delay.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this Government has put democracy in this country on trial. Canadians are terribly concerned about where this country is going. In a very few years they have seen Canada reduced from a first rate power to one on a par with newly emerging countries. They have seen a nation with an economy in balance, a nation with high employment, reduced to one with a deficit which is so high as to cause concern even in the IMF and cause wonderment about this country's ability to manage its own affairs. They have seen a country that was pulling its weight in NATO and highly regarded for doing so reduced to one which is no longer trusted in the NATO Council.

• (1110)

The recent episode in Grenada showed the whole world how the present Government is regarded. Canada was not trusted by the Caribbean nations because the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Government of this country have gone out of their way to show softness on Marxism and an affinity for Communist governments which is neither appropriate nor safe in a democratic country like ours.

The Prime Minister went to St. Lucia in the Caribbean last February and stated that Marxist governments would continue to receive Canadian aid. I took him up on this in the House and he repeated the statement. That statement was one of the reasons given by the Prime Minister of St. Lucia as an explanation of why Canada was not consulted about the action taken in Grenada. This Government has admitted it was not consulted about the intervention in Grenada, although its likelihood was the subject of front page stories in the London *Times* and *Observer*, as well as *The New York Times* in its Sunday edition of October 23. Obviously Government Members do not even read the newspapers. Not only did the Government not know about the intervention, but it apparently was not invited to the consultations which took place following the gruesome murder of Maurice Bishop and several members of his cabinet, along with dozens of innocent civilians the previous Wednesday.

In spite of the fact that Canada has been a major supplier of aid to the Caribbean and that we have a long historical involvement in the area because of its Commonwealth membership, this Government neither took the trouble nor showed any interest in being informed as to what was happening.

We had a famous statement by a junior Minister of State for External Affairs a few days after the grizzly events of October 19 on Grenada when he said that after a "decent interval" Canada would likely recognize the gang which gained power by murdering the incumbents. This was a curious concept of Commonwealth parliamentary government on the part of a chief spokesman for the present Government. Is it any wonder, Sir, that the Government, this one, was not consulted? As a matter of fact, it was not Canada which was not consulted; it was this Government which was not consulted, because of its ideological bias which is only too well known.

We had another example of the same kind of bias in the recent pilgrimage of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) when he visited the Middle East and appeared totally oblivious to what had been going on there, what was going on there, and what that struggle is all about. Praising the Syrians for their involvement in Lebanon, an involvement based on maintaining a state of instability in the country with guns, tanks and rockets, while there were 7,000 Soviet troops in Syria and the Soviet has poured in billions of dollars in weaponry, was a new height in naiveté even for this Government. Or was it naiveté? There are a good many Canadians wondering about that question today.

These, Sir, are but a few examples, along with the highest and most persistent unemployment in history and the apparent inability of this Government to distinguish between our friends and allies and our enemies, which have given rise to a growing concern among Canadians as to the direction in which this country is being pushed by the present Government. The spectacle now of the Prime Minister, in a last minute bid for popularity, knocking at the doors of Europe and Asia, portraying himself as some sort of new messiah of world peace, rather than allaying the confusion in our own country, merely serves to increase this concern.

No one can be critical of any sincere and genuine effort toward achieving peace in the world. Such a purpose enjoys universal support. But when, with great fanfare, at a Liberal fund raising dinner, the Prime Minister unveils a master plan for peace, he invites cynicism. No wonder this place, this Parliament, is becoming totally irrelevant in the minds of Canadians. Liberal tactics, Liberal practices, mean announcements not to this House of Commons but announcements to Liberals only, an action described in this morning's written media at best as contemptuous and at worst as downright sleazy.

• (1115)

It is interesting to note, Sir, that of the five proposals—first, a big five summit conference; second, banning high altitude satellite weapon systems; third, expansion of the non-proliferation treaty; fourth, new initiatives in Geneva; and fifth, restricting non-verifiable IBMs—two of these are aimed directly at the capacity of the United States to mount a deterrent against nuclear attack. On the question of reducing conventional forces in eastern Europe, the Prime Minister has not revealed his solution to the 40,000 Soviet tanks stationed there.

These are hard, practical issues that must be resolved before peace proposals, however attractive on paper, can be taken seriously. While in an abstract way it is commendable for the Prime Minister to pursue solutions in finding peace for the world, there remain serious questions at home, among them the highest unemployment rate in our history for which many Canadians would prefer to see this Government produce some answers. The Government has failed dismally to do so and has instead gone on imposing long-distance solutions with little relation to the problems at hand.

That is another reason for the lack of confidence shown in the polls, a lack of confidence so serious that the only solution at the present time is for the Government to call an election. The Prime Minister of course does not want an election because not only is he worried about the support of the electorate, he cannot even count on the support of his own Party.

Many Liberals across the country are deeply concerned about the manner in which this Government has attempted radically to change the shape and direction of our traditional objectives in this country, our purposes and our institutions, changes in the House of Commons which do not go a yard beyond the knowledge of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader. It is 581 days today that this session of Parliament has been sitting, and there have been 16 closure motions in one session—all records, all destructive of tradition.

There is one tradition though in this country, ever since Confederation, and that is an election once in every four years. But I dare say, having regard to the difficulties the Liberals perceive themselves to be in now—*de facto* are in now—they will cast that tradition aside as well.

By allowing interest rates to rise to unprecedented heights, this Government not only tolerated a record unemployment level, it created it. Because he did not dare lead this country into European style socialism by the front door, the Prime Minister has been doing it by the back door. He has created a bureaucracy in this country which an Auditor General has termed a parallel government, a government within a government. He has created a Frankenstein apparatus employing more people outside the Government than are employed within the Government of Canada. He has created an apparatus responsible directly to himself and his Cabinet with no responsibility to Parliament for day to day operations. He has intervened in every aspect of private and public life as no Government has done in the history of this country.

The National Energy Program puts the petroleum industry in a straitjacket, has creamed off profits and put them in the coffers of the Government. It has destroyed the confidence of investors, confiscated 25 per cent of the frontier lands, driven out over $4 billion in 18 months and cost Canada the Alaska highway natural gas pipeline and the tar sands project because outside investors were afraid to work with this Government. It has now entirely frozen development in my own riding of Yukon. Not content with this it set up CIDC and took over 1,400 service stations at a cost of $2 billion. Canadians are continuing to pay for this although all of the obligations have been met. This is the way this Government has been operating and is why Canadians are nervous and confused. Only an election can clean up the mess and clean out the mess.

• (1120)

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: We have had evidence of former Liberal Ministers being granted favours. We have had friends of the Prime Minister appointed to high places. We have had mismanagement in Crown corporations and agencies to the point where Canadians are not receiving the services they pay for. We have had a series of unexplainable episodes in Air Canada indicating mismanagement or carelessness in an organization where pleasing the Government has become more important than doing a job. This is why Canadians are uneasy and want an election.

In this House we have had the traditional Crow rate, one of the guarantees of Saskatchewan's entry into Confederation, swept away because of the Government's decision to impose a paper solution on the West. This Government does not care about the West, nor does it care about the East. Its major concern in central Canada appears to be the big contributors to the Liberal Party. They are the ones who have been doing all right under this Government.

To show this Government's contempt for Parliament and the people Parliament represents, it has run this session on for 581 days without a Throne Speech and with no indication of its plans for the future. It introduced two abortive budgets and one it failed to follow through on. It has brought in imposed solutions to the problems it created and those solutions have added to the confusion and uncertainty in the country.

In each case its policies have been so obviously self-serving that it has only been able to put them through with closure. It went back on its promises to old age pensioners and retired public servants. It shoved the changes in the Crow rate down the throat of western grain producers. It went back on its undertakings to the Provinces to pay 50 per cent of hospital costs. At the same time it spent money like water to support a hoard of Crown agencies which it itself created and which have not yet been approved by Parliament.

It is significant that when the Government took over Canadair four years ago it could have met all of its obligations of $40 million, yet it is now in a deficit position to the tune of over $2 billion. This is directly due to mismanagement by this Government.

The result of this Government's action on the Crow rate is that the western grain producer is now called on to pay for railroad modernization which should have been undertaken years ago out of current revenues. This was not done. The Government will pay enormous subsidies to the railways and extract a proportionate amount from western grain producers in order to compensate for the payments being made to the railways. The Government decided in its usual half baked way to highball through. There is no doubt Canadians will be paying for total confusion in transportation until such time as a Conservative Government can take office and clean up the mess.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to put an end to this Government and the endless misery that it has caused Canadians. Canadians from coast to coast want an election now. There is an unmistakable message. Canadians have had enough of back door socialism, enough of tinkering, enough of experimentation. They have had enough of lost jobs. They have had enough of bankruptcies. They have had enough of the flight of investment. They have had enough of the stagnation in industry. They want this Government out.

● (1125)

The present Government has reduced Canada to a level nationally and internationally reminiscent of the 1930s. It has done this in order to carry out the Prime Minister's ideological proclivities and to enable its members to keep their own jobs. Having heard the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan) trying to explain the Government's position on Grenada two weeks ago and also the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs on the Middle East, one would have taken them for members of Socialist International.

Canadians have shown in poll after poll that they are fed up. Not all of the Prime Minister's posturing and preening on the international stage, which he loves so well, can change the realities of a situation which has left Canada bereft of policy and leadership. Canadians want a chance to make a choice. They want to put Canada back to work. They want the Trudeau Government out.

They want a new Progressive Conservative Government in its place so that Canada can once again begin to realize its full potential so sadly neglected for too many years. If the NDP believe in what they say, they will be supporting us all the way on this motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Questions and comments? Debate.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is always a great pleasure to have the opportunity to listen to the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen). He is one of those individuals who very rarely hides his particular point of view under the sheen or camouflage of what would be considered to be the niceties of parliamentary courtesy.

It is important and useful to have this debate today because we now find out what is at the core of the views of Members opposite. We no longer have the shining images in front of us. We are getting down to the basic goods which are the kind of bar room biases and right-wing rhetoric which they are trying to sell as an alternative to this Government.

We all came to the House this morning with a resolution in front of us dealing with a number of specific issues. What we have heard instead is a great catechism and litany of all the particular prejudices that the Hon. Member for Yukon could drag out from the very depths of his soul. But I think it is worth examining some of these presumptions simply to find out if an election would, in fact, solve the problem that the Hon. Member says it would.

Presumably, an election is meant to offer a choice, not simply to criticize the other side. Let us examine what the choices are. The Hon. Member first initiated a major attack on the position on Grenada taken by this Government. His point was that we were not consulted and that we were objecting to the actions taken. Well, the question we must ask is, what was the position of the Conservatives during this period? Where did they stand on the issue? I saw their spokesperson, the Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens), on television the other night when he was asked where he stood on this issue. He said: "It is a little bit this way and a little bit that way; we do not stand anywhere on this issue". What kind of choice has been offered regarding that particular problem?

The Hon. Member says that our position was based upon some deep attachment to Marxism. That must be the same motivation for Margaret Thatcher's government whom we also know must have a deep attachment to Marxism if she is to take the same position as this Government. Our position raises very serious questions about invading a sovereign country against the rule of law. Great Britain took the right stand when it raised that issue but Members of the Conservative Party did not have the guts to do that because they do not have the guts to take stands on any issue.

An election should offer a choice. What was the choice that the Conservatives offered us? They did not offer any choice. They said: "We are not sure we like what you are doing but we do not have anything to offer in return." That is the real question. But what are the alternatives?

• (1130)

The Hon. Member for Yukon goes on to say that our position in NATO is totally without credibility. If that is the case then I would ask Members of the House why it was, when the Prime Minister undertook his mission of the past week, that the major leaders of those countries not only invited him but welcomed him for that kind of discussion.

NATO itself is an organization not dedicated to war mongering or to sabre rattling, as the Hon. Member for Yukon would like to believe to be the case; it is an organization dedicated to maintaining peace in this world. Those countries recognize there has to be collective security but at the same time they recognize that initiatives have to be taken for arms control and disarmament. Again, I ask the question, where is the Conservative Party on the issue of arms control and disarmament? Where is that Party's proposals, ideas and initiatives?

What do we hear from them as to what kind of solutions the Conservatives would bring to perhaps the most serious, significant issue that faces mankind? Have we heard the new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) give us his plan for peace? Have we heard what kind of proposals he would raise to reduce world tensions and reduce the enormous agglomeration of arms buildup? Not a word have we heard, Mr. Speaker. Not a peep. Not a single sentence has been uttered in terms of the proposals which the Progressive Conservative Party would offer Canadians in searching out ways of dealing with the matter that affects every Canadian deep inside of how we reduce world tension. At least we are trying to do the right thing. We are not hiding behind a barrage of right-wing rhetoric; we are trying to take initiatives that will help people secure some feeling that somebody is doing something. We are not simply allowing a willy-nilly escalation of the arms race; we are trying to use the position of credibility and confidence which this Prime Minister has built up over the last decade and we are trying to develop that position around the world. We are being received and accepted in doing so.

Surely if the question were asked by Canadians as to who has the kind of right and reason to pursue arms control, either the Hon. Member for Yukon or the Prime Minister, we know what the answer would be. At least people recognize that the Prime Minister has won that confidence by his initiatives overseas, not by the kinds of fits of silliness that we have seen displayed by the Hon. Member for the Yukon this morning.

We have also heard about the failure of this Government to deal with unemployment. We recognize and have recognized over the past several years what a serious and tragic consequence that has been. We have also recognized that it is a problem that has faced every single country in the world. We have not been immune to the economic recession that has taken place worldwide. The real issue is that we try to do something about it.

All the Hon. Member for Yukon would have to do is to open his ears from time to time during Question Period and listen to the kinds of initiatives that have been taken by this Government. In the last budget we had $2.4 billion in new capital recovery projects which affect every region of this country regardless of who represents the region. The Hon. Member might be prepared to listen to the initiatives taken under direct employment. It was the government of which he was a Member that abolished direct employment programs. What would have happened to this country if the program of the so-called Conservative Party which abolished direct employment programs had been allowed to be maintained during that period of recession? Who would have helped the hundreds of thousands of people who were given work, support and useful activity through the Canada Works programs, the community development programs and the work sharing programs? What about the billions of dollars that were spent to give people that kind of support when they were out of work?

This group across from us would not have helped. They say they do not believe in that. They are the great free enterprisers. They were going to let the market take care of the problem. We saw how the market took care of it. It simply abandoned those people. This Government is not prepared to abandon those who are unemployed. We did not abolish direct employment programs; we brought them back into place. Thank God we did so that the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who were faced with unemployment in that market system were given some support by this Government.

The Hon. Member for Yukon mentioned this "terrible travesty" of the National Energy Program. We saw the statements by his leader of this last week that he would get rid of it. He would abolish it. Does that mean he would go back to world prices, that he would ask Canadians to pay the full world price?

Mr. Epp: Read the speech.

Mr. Axworthy: Is that what the Conservative Party is going to offer people in an election, that they will pay even higher energy prices? Is that what the Leader of the Opposition was stating last week in Calgary? We are not too sure because the Leader of the Opposition said one thing in Calgary but seemed to change his mind when he got to Edmonton. By the time he got to Edmonton he said: "No, I am not going to abolish it". Then one of his backbenchers here in Ottawa had a different story, which simply means the Conservatives are like a vaudeville team. You hit a new town, you play a new act. It has a different tune and a different song, depending upon the crowd you are playing to.

We would have liked to hear from the Hon. Member for Yukon this morning, in his diatribe against this Party and this Government's energy policy, what his Party stands for. What is his energy policy? Is it to get rid of the National Energy Program and have world prices?

Mr. Nielsen: It is to get rid of you.

Mr. Axworthy: Is it the sell out to the multinationals? Is it to do away with the Canadianization program?

Mr. Forrestall: Let the people decide.

Mr. Axworthy: Is that what his Party is standing for? If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, why do the Conservatives not say so? Why do they not have the guts to get up and say so?

Mr. Nielsen: Have the guts to call an election.

Mr. Axworthy: Why does the Leader of the Opposition keep changing his tune every time he hits a different town and why does he not stand up and say what he believes in?

Mr. Nielsen: Call an election.

Mr. Axworthy: He says call an election.

An Hon. Member: What are you waiting for?

Mr. Axworthy: I thought this resolution couched in the words of the Hon. Member for Yukon is meant to say that we have forgotten Parliament. Has the Leader of the Opposition forgotten Parliament that he has to go to Calgary and Edmonton to give his particular panegyric on the energy program? Is he afraid to come into the House of Commons and tell us where he stands? Is that the problem with him? Is it that the Conservatives do not want to use Parliament as their forum for discussion and ideas? Here is the Hon. Member for Yukon saying that the Prime Minister has avoided Parliament.

Mr. Nielsen: Yes.

Mr. Axworthy: Now we are finding out that the Leader of the Opposition also avoids Parliament. The Conservatives cannot have it both ways. I suppose it is only natural that leaders of parties are going to go across the country and make policy statements. I am not being critical of the Leader of the Opposition; goodness knows, I would not want to. I know how sensitive he is to criticism and how closely he takes it to heart. I would not want to comment on that. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition has the right to make statements in Calgary and change his mind in Edmonton. The fact of the matter is he is showing the same disregard for Parliament, if we use the logic of the Hon. Member for Yukon, as he is castigating the Prime Minister for so doing. What is this debate all about?

Mr. Nielsen: It is the Government that is accountable.

Mr. Axworthy: What is this kind of criticism being levelled at? Is it that political leaders are not supposed to go across the country and talk to groups of people and make their own statements?

Mr. Nielsen: Governments are accountable.

Mr. Axworthy: If that is the case, we would like to see the Leader of the Opposition in Parliament more often telling us where his "Government" stands.

Mr. Nielsen: It is the Government that is accountable.

Mr. Axworthy: Let us go on to some other issues. The Member for Yukon has raised the spectre of the Crow. He said this Government has brought in this piece of legislation without any consultation in the West, that it is going to destroy western Canada with total disregard for Parliament. That is pretty interesting, Mr. Speaker. It was three years ago that two major farm organizations, the Prairie Farm Commodity Coalition and the Western Agricultural Conference, asked that the Crow be changed and said that the real issue in western Canada was the failure to provide for a proper capacity to move grain to market. The kind of threat that we were looking at was the inability of this country's export market to be able to ensure its customers delivery on time at a decent price, and a government must take action to make that come about.

We could have followed the advice of the Conservative Party, which was to take no action at all, to freeze the program. This would have meant that by 1985-1986 we would have had a railway system that could not carry those goods to market. We would not have been able to sell those goods to the customers we have. We had a policy from the Conservative Party of "do nothing", of freeze. That was the word the Conservatives used. Do you know what a freeze is, Mr. Speaker? It is being frozen in position, afraid to make a decision.

Mr. Nielsen: Like Munro has done to the Yukon.

Mr. Axworthy: That is what we had from Hon. Members of the Conservative Party. They were scared of making a decision because they knew there was no unanimity in their ranks as to what the position should be. Their only recourse was to oppose and be obstructive. That was their only recourse. It was not that they had a position; it was not what they were prepared to do to deal with the looming crisis in the railway system. They were going to say: "Let us continue a few ad hoc items; we will buy some more hopper cars here and give a few more subsidies there". What they were afraid of doing was attacking the fundamental, central problem, which is that every bushel of grain that was moved was losing money for the mover of that grain.

• (1140)

That group which says it believes in the market economy should at least have a minimal understanding of economics. One does not invest money in something one loses money at doing; if one makes an investment, one at least has to receive a proper return.

Mr. Nielsen: What about Canadair, de Havilland and Maislin?

Mr. Axworthy: The Hon. Member for Yukon, that great parliamentary advocate, was also the author of some of the most extensive series of obstructions Parliament has ever seen.

Mr. Nielsen: Who, me?

Mr. Axworthy: The Hon. Member indicated that the Government could not bring in a Throne Speech. Which Party was responsible, along with their friends in the corner, for delaying Parliament and holding up parliamentary debate day after day after day? Which Party was responsible for not letting Parliament get to the proper business of the House? We were not

even allowed to debate the Bill because we were engaged in the gymnastics of parliamentary obstruction, the major product of the particular evil genius of the Hon. Member opposite.

Mr. Nielsen: Oh, come on.

Mr. Axworthy: Of course there is a certain cant in all he says. We heard the Hon. Member for Yukon say today that Parliament was being abused, that we were using closure when we should not. All we were doing was what a responsible government should do—make decisions, run the affairs of the country and attempt to overcome the obstructions of Hon. Members opposite.

I would like to quote the words of a self-acknowledged parliamentary expert who, in writing to another self-acknowledged parliamentary expert, said: "Having said that, our understanding of a parliamentary democracy does not allow us to agree with you that a majority government, however bad, does not have the right to govern in accordance with established tradition and precedents". Guess who that parliamentary expert was?

Mr. Nielsen: "Established tradition and precedents"; that is the key.

Mr. Axworthy: I will give the House one guess. Who was it? It was the Hon. Member for Yukon who indicated that the Government had the right to decide and should not be obstructed by the minority. That is the question. If we allowed the House to be so convoluted and overturned by the sort of parliamentary terrorism we faced in the Chamber day after day, we could not continue with the business of the nation and the affairs of the House.

I cite, for the basis of my argument, the very words of the Hon. Member for Yukon when he indicated that the Government must decide. That is what we were doing. We were trying to make a decision in the House which would not only bring about a major expansion of the railways but also address the very issue the Hon. Member said we were not addressing—the question of unemployment. We recognize full well that the way to get the engine of the economy going is by providing some stimulus, some investment and some incentive for the private market to begin to work.

We have not heard lately from the Leader of the Opposition on the subject, but when he first came here he said that his objective was jobs, jobs, jobs. One can understand, when it came time to debate the Crow legislation which talked about over $16 billion of direct railway investment and over 300,000 new jobs and also about the development of new products and markets from British Columbia to Nova Scotia, that we were surprised the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues did not rise and say: "Let us get the Bill passed as quickly as possible". We were particularly surprised because the Leader of the Opposition had just returned from the byelection in his Nova Scotia riding where 800 workers are working today because of payments to the railways under the Crow legislation to build new hopper cars, which is part and parcel of our railway program. Also I was surprised by the lack of gratitude of the new Leader of the Opposition. We were putting people in his riding back to work with our legislation. He allowed the debate to continue on and on without any resolution, until we were required by the dictates to bring the debate to a head with time allocation and reach a decision. If we had not been allowed to do that, what would have happened to the 800 workers in Trenton, Nova Scotia? They would not have had future contracts for work.

The same is true of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). His workers in the steel industry are looking forward to massive production of steel rail for railway expansion. They were faced with the possibility of that work being frustrated.

Mr. Deans: That is not true.

Mr. Axworthy: Similarly, Members of Parliament from British Columbia, when we were looking at new capital investments in that Province alone of $4.5 billion and at providing over 100,000 jobs, rose and read petitions from people in Saskatchewan. Their own people wanted work which we were prepared to provide, but they read petitions from another Province. I admire their sense of national dimension, but I suspect that perhaps some of their constituents have serious questions about how well they were being served during the debate on the Crow rate and whether they were getting full value from their Members of Parliament.

We were not misusing Parliament. We were using Parliament as it should be used. First we were using it as a forum for debate and ultimately as a place where a decision must be taken. It is my belief that Canadians want decisions to be taken. That is why the motion before us today is frivolous, irrelevant and makes no sense.

Mr. Nielsen: Let the people decide.

Mr. Axworthy: We suggest to Members of the Opposition that the Government at least has the willingness and courage to make decisions, not hide behind the kind of rhetoric we heard from the Hon. Member for Yukon this morning.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister. Would he mind explaining whether he has in fact spoken to either or both the steel companies in Hamilton, the Steel Company of Canada and Dominion Steel Foundries, with regard to obtaining orders over and above what they presently have as a result of the changes to the Crowsnest Pass freight rates? If he has, would he then admit what both steel companies have said publicly that they do not anticipate obtaining any additional orders for steel directly as a result of the changes passed in the House?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to answer that question. First, let us look at what is happening now. As the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain would know, there are several hundred hopper cars now being made in the City of Hamilton as a result of the railway legislation. We are talking about an investment program in the next eight years in Ontario alone, particularly in the metal fabrication area—

Mr. Deans: Hamilton, Hamilton.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I am coming to the point. If the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain has the slightest ounce of patience, I will come to the answer. We are talking about an investment of several billions of dollars in his Province alone which will provide in the range of hundreds of thousands of jobs. However, the point is that they must bid for the work. They must show they can make the product. They have to come forward with the sourcing. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, as a good Member of Parliament and as a good constituency man, should go back and talk to the same steel companies.

I remind him of one of the important amendments which was made to the Bill in committee as a result of the efforts of the Hon. Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Bockstael). That amendment requires the railways to source their purchases in Canada as a primary judgment of their performance. If they do not follow that sourcing responsibility, it will go against their performance obligations and allow the Government and the Minister of Transport to withhold payment. At the same time we will not compel companies to bid or to make proposals. We are giving them the opportunity; it is up to the companies themselves to take advantage of that opportunity and to show they can make the product. It is up to the companies to make bids for massive amounts of new rail, locomotives, cars and rolling stock which will be required during this major period of expansion.

Mr. Deans: I think the Minister indicated that in fact I am correct, that the steel companies will not receive benefit directly as a result of the changes to the Crowsnest Pass freight rates. That is their statement. They themselves have done the analysis; they themselves know that they will not obtain additional orders.

• (1150)

The point the Minister makes, Mr. Speaker, is that National Steel Car is building hopper cars. Is the Minister aware that yearly, for as far back as I can remember, National Steel Car has been receiving orders for hopper cars; that in fact, in the current year, the orders are fewer in number than they have been in any previous year; and that in fact they are getting less work and not more?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, the fact that we are trying to point out to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is that the work is there and it is being shared with Hamilton, with the Transcona shops in Winnipeg, which I am sure would interest his colleague, the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Birds Hill (Mr. Blaikie), with Trenton in the constituency of the Leader of the Official Opposition, and with the City of Sorel. There were major orders, not only for hopper cars but for coal cars as well to help move those products. Surely the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, who has participated in this Crow debate for many weeks, would understand that there would be no further orders, no expansion and no development unless that legislation had passed in order to provide for continuity and certainty for the railways.

The time had come to end the ad hoc, capricious, year by year financing. We were reaching a stage where the issue was not simply a matter of having more hopper cars but a matter of not having enough steel rail to move those hopper cars on. We had to expand that capacity to make sure that there would be a continued development of new product and new rolling stock which would benefit the companies in his city.

I would invite Members of the NDP to begin to look at the possibilities for sourcing rather than giving up and surrendering before the legislation is passed. I make the offer in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, that we are quite prepared to meet with them to show them what their opportunities are.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could ask a question of the Minister. In his rather loud speech, the Minister said they were going to expend some $4.5 billion in British Columbia because of the passing of the Crow Bill and that that money would create 100,000 jobs. As this work will go on for several years, can we take it from that that there will be several hundred thousand man-years of work created in British Columbia because of the passing of the Crow Bill? Will that $4.5 billion be provided by the railways or by the Government? When will the hiring start and when will it end? How many jobs can we expect to be created in British Columbia through this Bill in the next 12 months? Will the 100,000 jobs be filled this year, next year or the year after? What is the time frame?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Hon. Member was not more involved in the debate during the course of the examination of the legislation because many of those questions were answered and the answers are on the record. However, perhaps I may be allowed to give him a quick summary.

First, the work is dependent in large part on the starting dates and we are looking at jobs beginning in the construction area. With the passage of the Bill this fall, the CPR, for example, is prepared to initiate work on the Beaver tunnel, which I think will create close to 1,000 new jobs. We hope that that construction will begin as soon as possible. The CPR has been awaiting the passage of the legislation because it could not proceed until that Bill was passed and it was certain of its financing. There are also a number of double-tracking initiatives that will be going through.

The second area is product sourcing, and as I pointed out to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, one of the obligations of the railways under this Bill is to source in the country. The opportunities exist both in basic supply of traditional construction materials as well as in a number of areas that have not yet been explored. Let me give as an example the area of electronics. The railways estimate that some $700 million worth of new electronic signalling transmission equipment will be required. The Government of Canada is now working with the railways and with a consortium of companies in Vancouver, Calgary, Saskatoon and Winnipeg to see how

they could bid on that new electronic equipment, because up to this point in time all of that equipment has been sourced offshore.

Again, it comes back to the same thesis. Much of the work itself will depend on how effective it is for the manufacturer and the business community to respond to those initiatives. The person-years that we are talking about are spread over four or five years of construction, but I suggest that they would be weighed more heavily in the front end—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister a supplementary question. I believe he was just about to answer my question, which was how many of these 100,000 jobs we would see in the next 12 months. He has located 1,000 of those jobs. That still leaves 99,000 jobs.

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I think I have already said that the project itself will be spread over a period of eight years. Perhaps the Hon. Member who represents a constituency in British Columbia is not interested in having those people working over a period of eight years. Of course, the jobs will not all be created in the first 12 months. That will happen over the life of the project.

The fact of the matter is that those construction jobs will, in large part, begin over the next 18 months. Unfortunately, major construction starts were delayed this fall because of a delay in the passing of the legislation.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the Minister and I heard him refer to hundreds of millions of jobs. I take it that was a slip of the tongue and that he meant hundreds of thousands of jobs. However, I would assume from that statement that the Crow legislation itself could, according to the Government's estimates, lower the rate of unemployment by 25 per cent. Since there are two million people unemployed, the creation of hundreds of thousands of jobs would lower the unemployment rate by 25 per cent. I wonder if the Minister would table in the House the precise areas where those jobs will be created and in which Provinces, for what kind of industries and the precise numbers of jobs that will be created. What is the exact estimate of the number of jobs that will be created as a result of the passage of the Crow legislation? Would the Minister table that information in the House?

Mr. Axworthy: Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite refreshing to see that, all of a sudden, Members of Parliament on the Conservative side from British Columbia are beginning to take an interest in the Crow legislation. All of a sudden, after all of the long months of debate, they are coming awake to the fact that it will be of major benefit to their Provinces. I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a little late. Where were they during the debate when we needed them to help get this Bill through?

The information that the Hon. Member requests is already available on the records of the House—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) rises on a point of order, but I should advise the House at this time that the period allowed for questions and answers is over.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister was in the House during the debate on his own legislation, he would know that I spoke on the Crow legislation several times.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to make it clear to the House that we substantially agree with the criticisms contained in the motion put forward by the Hon. House Leader for the Official Opposition and we will, of course, support the main thrust of the motion. I say that so that there will be no doubt in the mind of any Hon. Member about where we stand.

I would like, however, to say that I must confess to having some difficulty in taking the criticism of the Conservative Party seriously. I have looked back over the course of the last two years. I am firmly convinced that the Government has failed to act reasonably in almost every single area of concern to the majority of Canadians and I am prepared to level criticism at the Government for the hamhanded way in which it has dealt with the economy, its neglect of people who are unemployed, its inability or unwillingness to come to grips with high interest rates and its general attitude toward the concerns of the Provinces.

However, I find it very difficult to accept at face value the criticisms being levelled by Hon. Members of the Conservative Party. They have come forward on every side of every issue raised in the House since 1980. They have attempted to be all things to all people on every single area of policy since the House was called into session after the election in the winter of 1980.

It is hard to accept that Members of the Conservative Party are serious about doing anything to try to improve the disaster that has been created as a result of Liberal mismanagement. If you sit as an observer and watch the Tories in action, you cannot help but wonder just what they stand for. They have a spokesman not only for every issue, but a spokesman for each side of every issue. If, for example, you want to see high energy prices, if you are part of the lobby group that is looking for high energy prices, you go to the Hon. Member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre). He will gladly speak for you. However, if you are a consumer concerned about high energy prices, eager to keep the price down so that you can pay for it with your meagre wages, speak to the Hon. Member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Scott). He will gladly get up and speak on your behalf.

• (1200)

If you are in favour of testing the Cruise missile in Canada, the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is your man. He will get up at any time and explain how we must have this

continued escalation of nuclear warfare weapons. If, however, you are one of the groups in one part of Canada or another that is opposed to the testing of the Cruise and you do not want to see it go ahead, just get yourself on the mailing list of the Hon. Member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean). He will be glad to speak for you.

If you think there is some need to cut Government expenditures, contact the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens), the slasher. He will be happy to tell you of all the wonderful cutting that the Tory Party is going to do. If, however, you think that the Government should be spending more in some areas, you can contact the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Member for Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney). He will point out that there are many areas in which he is in agreement with the Government as to spending more.

If you are for six and five, the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark) is your man. If you are opposed to it, the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead is your man. If you would like to see the Public Service slashed because you think there are far too many in the Public Service and some of these people just have to get out of there, the Member for Prince Rupert—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deans: I am sorry. I will settle for Prince Rupert, but I meant to say the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). The day he takes office, he is going to cut 60,000, the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) supporting him all the way.

If you think that maybe we ought not to take that approach, that it is too harsh, that maybe we should recognize the worth of the Public Service, if you were to chat with the Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) I am quite sure he would be glad to point out the value of the Public Service and the good work it does. You do not have to worry too much. If you are on that side of the issue, there is a prominent or sometimes not so prominent Tory who will gladly speak on your behalf.

If you think that high interest rates are just the thing, that that is what we really need, see the Hon. Member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson). He knows about these sorts of things. He said that the high interest rate policy of the Government is the only way to go. He said that we have to follow the high interest rate policy if we want to come to grips with inflation. However, if you think that high interest rates are driving people out of their homes, causing people to lose their nest egg and suffering has befallen the people of the land, the Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) will be pleased to rise and rant on your behalf.

Let me go on, because this is what worries me about the Tory motion. If you are a moderate in foreign affairs and you think there should be a particularly Canadian approach, that we should establish our own policy, go through the process of dialogue and find a common ground, the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) will be glad to rise and speak on your behalf with passion.

However, if on the other hand if you think jacked up diplomacy is the way, march on and trample them underfoot, cut off all dialogue and isolate ourselves from the rest of the world, again there is the Member for York-Peel. He is your man. He will be glad to speak for you.

I could go on. I suspect I could take a whole day and go through the Conservative caucus one by one. You would find on every single issue, no matter what position you take, no matter what side of the issue you are for, no matter how adamantly you are opposed, a Conservative happily standing up to speak for you.

Some people may say that is democracy, that that is the democracy of the Conservative Party, that it shows they really do understand the nation. However, what would be their policy if in office? When you come right down to it, who would win the tug of war? Which of the various Members speaking for the Conservative Party actually enunciates the policy they would pursue? That is the key question that must surely be in the minds of the majority of Canadians.

Canadians are sick up to the back of their throats with this Liberal Government, and quite rightly so. Canadians have seen this Liberal Government for what it is; hard hearted, incompetent, incapable, posturing at all times. However, sick as they are with that bunch, how could any clear minded individual possibly go out and support this rag-tag bunch from the Conservative Party? How could anyone do that?

I have said this before, I think it is true, it was true when I said it the first time and I would not say it again if it were not still true: the Conservative Party have more positions than Masters and Johnson. They do not know what they stand for. All they stand for is getting into government. All they stand for is getting rid of the Grits. I want to get rid of the Grits as well, but I want to put in place a policy that makes sense for Canada. I want to give Canadians a clear and unequivocal choice. I want to afford Canadians the opportunity to vote for something and not simply against something. That is the choice that Canadians will ultimately be forced to make. Are they going to vote simply against a very bad Government as exemplified by the Liberal Government of the last two years? Will they vote against it by voting for a pig in the poke, some kind of take a chance and let us hope that things work out all right?

The Conservatives will not tell us what they are going to do. They ask Canadians to give them a chance and maybe they will be surprised. My God, maybe they will be surprised. I do not believe it is unreasonable to think that the Tory attitude is not at all unlike the attitude of their Conservative friend in British Columbia, Bill Bennett. If the Conservatives were ever to form a Government, and heaven forbid it should ever happen, I would expect to see them follow the exact same line of that heartfelt Premier of British Columbia, that man of compassion who does not respect order, tradition and people's rights, who tramples all over them at every turn and does not give a damn about the impact of his policies. That is their Conservative friend in British Columbia. That is what the

public of Canada will risk getting if it elects a Conservative government.

● (1210)

There are positive things which should be done in this country. What we must do for starters is come to grips with the interest rates being charged by the financial institutions. We must bring that interest rate spread down to a level which will ensure that the people of Canada will be able to purchase the goods they need for themselves and their families. We must bring that interest rate spread down to a point at which small businesses will be able to continue to provide the services which they have historically provided. We must decide now that that is a priority. But neither the Liberals nor the Conservative are prepared to take that measure.

We must begin now to build homes in this country to meet the needs of the people at prices they can afford to pay and, in the process, put people back to work. We must begin now to establish a new transportation policy in order that we not only can build for the future, but can assure that the port facilities inland and on the coast are modernized and capable of meeting the requirements of the next generation. We must start now to make sure that the agricultural implements industry in Canada is refurbished and regenerated so that the farmers of Canada will be able to stay in the forefront of competition.

Let me say now, Mr. Speaker, in order that I do not miss the opportunity, that I intend to move the following amendment just to show the kind of positive things one should expect to see from a new government in office. I move, seconded by the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell):

That the motion be amended by deleting the period after the word "delay" and substituting the following therefor:

"in order that a new government receive a mandate to implement the following program for job creation and economic development; the establishment of lower interest rates and the restoration of traditional interest rate spreads between loans and savings, the introduction of a major housing construction program, the implementation of the Auto Task Force Report, the revitalization of the farm implements manufacturing sector, the upgrading of all vital transportation systems including inland and coastal ports and a new commitment to reforestation and forestry sector development; and the full restoration of public sector and collective bargaining rights.

That is the kind of thing which the Canadian public have a right to expect to hear from those who vie for office, from those who want to govern the country.

There are other things which must be contained in a program for the revitalization of Canada. There are other direct policies which must be supported, not by one or two Hon. Members but by all Hon. Members of whatever party forms the government. We must develop a mining equipment manufacturing industry in this country because it makes no sense that we should be so rich in resources and so poor in the manufacturing of mining equipment. We must utilize in our own interests western Canadian coal and the creation of electrical power in Provinces which are now purchasing it from outside the country. We must develop in Canada a forestry machinery industry because, again, it makes no sense for a country so rich in forestry resources not to have available the most technologically advanced forest machinery industry.

We must complete the East-West pipeline in order that Canadians can be self-sufficient in energy and we can create in Canada a self-sufficiency which will allow us to develop industrially over the course of the next 10, 15 or 20 years. We must work at developing an import substitution policy for Canada so that Canadian manufacturers large and small can be given a direction in which to look to replace those manufactured products which have been brought into this country from offshore which we ourselves could be manufacturing.

There are in this country people who are dedicated to putting those kinds of policies in place. There are people who would like to see full employment in Canada, who would like to see the youth of this land given an opportunity to go to work rather than leaving school only to find there is no work for them in any part of the land.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the public of Canada are not going to receive those kinds of policies from either the Liberals—no matter what they do in terms of their leadership—or from the Conservatives, because the Conservatives are not dedicated as a team to developing a single set of policies which would make sense for the future of the country. The time will come, Mr. Speaker, when the Conservatives will be asked to stand up and be counted on these issues. There will be a time when the public will say to the Conservative Party: "You cannot be on every side. You cannot speak with a forked tongue forever. You simply must say what it is you truly want to see happen."

I suggest that the only Party in Canada which is prepared to make those kinds of categorical statements, and to back them up with action, is the New Democratic Party. I would welcome an election. I would welcome the opportunity to take on this bunch of two-faced, double-talking individuals who refuse to offer constructive opposition and intelligent alternatives to this washed-out Liberal bunch.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The Chair has received the text of the motion put forth by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). The Chair, however, would like to take the text of the motion under advisement and should be in a position to make a ruling on it before one o'clock, I am sure. Are there questions or comments?

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I must say that was an entertaining speech. It reminded me of the 1980 election campaign, which I remember with some pleasure. The Leader of the New Democratic Party was going around the country at the time when the Soviets were moving into Afghanistan. He was saying that Canada had to strengthen its role in NATO. The Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) was saying that the Leader of the New Democratic Party did not understand the New Democratic Party policy on the matter of NATO, that we needed to withdraw from NATO. I would like to ask the Hon. Member whether that Party has ever solved that policy issue within the Party and actually decided who the real leader is.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, unlike the Conservative Party, we have no difficulty in deciding who the leader is. The one thing we do not have any problem with is the leadership of our Party. It is interesting to watch how the Conservatives squirm when the word "leadership" is raised. Those Hon. Members, including the Member who just asked the question, devoted two years to undermining the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead. They worked very hard to undermine the credibility of their own leader. You would never find that happening in this Party.

I want to say to the Hon. Member that if he does not understand the difference between long and short-term policy, then that probably is quite clearly the reason why he asked such a foolish question.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I was also intrigued by the passion in the speech given by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). However, I did notice that one of his key platform planks would be a major reduction in interest rates, especially the spreads between the rate on savings and the rate to borrowers. Does he not understand, Mr. Speaker, that in this country and the United States one of the main problems in bringing down those spreads—especially as it affects the United States—is the huge size of the federal deficit? That is the problem.

Mr. Nielsen: Who is responsible for that?

Mr. Evans: We are not going to have lower real interest rates so long as the United States is going to borrow $200 billion or $300 billion a year to finance a deficit, for example, for defence expenditures.

• (1220)

That is on the one hand. On the other hand, the Hon. Member went on to say that not only would interest rates be brought down under NDP policy, but there would be an expansion of spending for housing and subsidies for new machinery and equipment for the agriculture and forest industries. In all these areas there have to be subsidies of some kind to encourage that kind of production. In the automobile industry, the task force report would be implemented which would mean the cost of foreign cars to Canadian consumers would go up. There would be less consumption because those subsidies have to be paid for from somewhere. If consumers cannot finance those expenditures, then the Government is going to increase the deficit further and does that not fly in the face of the notion that interest rates have to be brought down?

Mr. Deans: That certainly is a convoluted question, I must confess.

Mr. Evans: It is a convoluted position.

Mr. Deans: No, the position is clear. The traditional interest rate spread has been about a third of what it now is. The reason is the wrong-headed policies of the Liberal Government and the Bank of Canada. If the Government wanted to assume responsibility for interest policy in Canada, it has the ability to do so.

As far as the other matters are concerned, would you prefer to pay out $1 billion a month for Unemployment Insurance payments or would you prefer to put the money into creating jobs? It is $1 billion a month now, and with the policies you are following now there are few new jobs being created and we have reached a point where in the last StatsCan reports the numbers of new jobs have gone down substantially compared to the last five years. If you continue you are going to have the overwhelming majority of young people unemployed, those who are supposed to be coming into the labour force. You are going to end up having to raise Unemployment Insurance levels, the cost of unemployment will continue to rise at a dramatic pace as it has over the course of the last 18 months. All of that to keep people unemployed. Surely it makes more sense, if you take into account the cost of keeping people on unemployment or welfare, all of whom would like to work, that the money be redirected and people given jobs instead. If you are telling me that you cannot do that, then I suspect that is one of the good reasons why you ought not to be in Government.

Mr. McKinnon: Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to that rather circuitous route the Hon. Member's speech took, touching every station on the loop. I followed with interest the smorgasbord amendment he submitted to the Chair. In the event it is not found acceptable, I am curious whether the Member and his Party, reunited again since the Constitution debate, are prepared to vote in favour of this motion before the House or are they going to vote again with their friends across the way?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I want to give the Member the benefit of the doubt. I assume he was not here at the beginning of my speech. Either that or he suffers from a serious deficiency. I said at the very beginning of my remarks that we would support the motion and that the motion was substantially correct.

Mr. McKinnon: I did not hear you say that.

Mr. Deans: The fact you did not hear it is neither here nor there. It is quite clear that the thrust of the motion is supportable and we will support it. We find it deficient in certain ways and we have attempted to improve upon it, but there is no doubt in my mind that that bad bunch over there ought to be gone. I am just afraid this bad bunch over here is no better.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cousineau: Mr. Speaker, I have a question. Is there still time?

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mr. Cousineau) rose at just about the same time and there are a few minutes left.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cousineau: Mr. Speaker, in his speech the Hon. Member did not mention bilingualism. I wonder what he thinks about the position taken by some Members of the Progressive Conservative Party, especially the Member for Simcoe-North (Mr. Lewis), the Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie) and their leader, the Member for Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney).

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. To me that question is hardly acceptable because the Hon. Member, by his own admission, refers to a topic which was not raised by the previous speaker. The provisional orders provide that questions and comments must be related to an Hon. Member's speech. The Chair finds it difficult to accept that question but in any case I will give the Hon. Member the benefit of the doubt.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the situation in the Progressive Conservative Party. It is all very confusing.

[*English*]

The problem with the Conservatives, as in all things, is that they would like to be on both sides. Unfortunately it will require many people to explain what it is like when you are on both sides of every issue.

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise and speak in support of this motion. I feel very comfortable about participating because things which have been seen to be normal in the country over the last 15 years have again been brought together this morning in the House. The Liberal/NDP coalition is again complete.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Alive and well.

Mr. Nielsen: Alive and ill.

Mr. Epp: I have not heard a better defence of this Liberal Government's record than that given by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). In fact, if the Liberals have any sense left, they should hire him as their speech writer or, possibly even better, as their campaign manager. It was so interesting to watch the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain talking about this bunch and that bunch, because he did not know in which direction to point any more. Whenever Canadians want a change of Government, and the polls show this now month after month, year after year, the NDP would take a Liberal Government every time rather than a Conservative Government.

The NDP say the Government is a bad bunch and I agree. But it was their motion which brought the Liberals back. The NDP have tried to be the people with a 14 per cent solution, the people who represent the West. They tried that in Mission-Port Moody. What happened there? Oh, they are quiet! Why are they quiet? The NDP went literally on their knees to Mr. Barrett, the former leader in British Columbia, and asked him to run. But he had been defeated so many times he also knew not to do it. So today we have the Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody (Mr. St. Germain) here. Why? Because he represented the people of Mission-Port Moody. That is why the NDP does not have that seat. Even the NDP, no matter what kind of convoluted mathematics they want to use, know that 14 per cent is not a government. Oh, those Liberals, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Nielsen: Jake, they are consulting now.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1230)

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I want to allow them whatever joy and pleasure they might want between now and the election because they are at 5 per cent in Mission-Port Moody. Even the Rhinoceros Party could do better, but maybe they have got more qualifications. The point is that when the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) gets up and tries to speak as a western Canadian and calls it prejudice, he is saying that the majority of Canadians, who in poll after poll have said a change of government is needed and necessary, are prejudiced. He is saying they do not know what is good for them and that they should rethink their position.

The point is that the democratic process in Canada today needs a change of government. What are some of the words we have heard over the last years? I refer to an article that appeared in *The Winnipeg Sun* last Sunday written by Peter Warren. He writes:

> What this country needs along with a good 5 cent cigar—

I might have some question about that.

> —and chicken in every pot is a federal Government that erases a number of words from its dictionary. Words like "mandatory, obligatory, prohibited, no choice". Probably and hopefully history will recall the most distasteful underlying belief of the Trudeau Liberals was the general thought over 15 years: "We know best what is right for the people".

That is the underlying philosophy of this Government. The Minister of Transport through the Crow debate said time after time: "This is good for you in western Canada. You farmers are wrong to be opposed to the changes to the Crow rate. You Chambers of Commerce are wrong to be opposed to the Crow rate. You commodity groups are wrong to be opposed to the Crow rate changes." Mr. Speaker, in the last Throne Speech 581 parliamentary days ago the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said that because the Government did not have sufficient representation from the West, western Canadian Members had an obligation to represent the views of the West and the Government would listen. If that is an example of the Minister of Transport listening, we do not need that type of listening from the West and from this Government.

The Government went even further and said that it would not change the Crow until there was sufficient and adequate consensus in the West for change. Mr. Speaker, the Crow rate changes are not only economic or only extra capacity of rail. It was part of the fabric of the social milieu of western and prairie Canada. They said they would have consensus. Mr.

Speaker, today the Minister mentioned two groups who were in favour. If he checks the record he will find that even those two groups left that consensus.

Why are we to believe this Government, Mr. Speaker? It is interesting to look at what the mandate of this Government is. I went back and looked at the election promises of 1980 because that is a mandate. That is what the Government said they would do and what they were in favour of. Let us take a look at their record and see whether or not they have fulfilled what they themselves said they would do. First they said that energy prices would never rise as high as the Conservative Government's. They said they would never have an 18-cent per gallon tax—

Mr. Evans: We said excise tax. Be honest.

Mr. Epp: Let us ask Canadians what has happened to the price of energy since 1980.

Mr. Evans: Excise tax versus price. Be honest.

Mr. Epp: What has happened to the price of energy? The Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) is now saying they did not say the price of energy was going to be lower only that the tax was going to be lower. Is that what he is saying? Only the excise tax was going to be lower. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the record. They say only the excise tax would be lower. Everything else would be higher. I understand that.

Mr. Speaker, they said that energy would be lower. Every Canadian knows it is higher. They said that interest rates were too high and they would bring them down.

Mr. Nielsen: Or resign.

Mr. Epp: The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) said he would resign. He is a principled man. I accept that. What did they do? We have the highest interest rates in the history of Canada. How high were they? Oh, no answers. Twenty per cent plus. That is what they said was their mandate. They said they would lower unemployment which was unconscionably high.

Mr. Speaker, I give the Minister of Transport the record of the highest unemployment rate in the history of this country. The Government said unemployment would go down. They said lower inflation. Inflation has come down and I will give the Government the amount of credit they deserve in bringing down the inflation rate. It is very interesting to look at the inflation rate.

Mr. Evans: How much credit is that, Jake, according to you?

Mr. Epp: You can define that for yourself.

Mr. Nielsen: About that much.

Mr. Epp: I will tell you how much that is Mr. Speaker. They said six and five. I accept that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The Chair finds that there are more interruptions than usual. I think we ought to listen attentively to the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp).

Mr. Nielsen: It is hurting them.

Mr. Epp: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, even though I accept those interjections. When somebody gets stuck generally they squeal.

If the Government were sincere on the matter of six and five, and let us give them the benefit of the doubt that they were, why are they then asking Canadians to pay for rates of increase in excess of 12 per cent of Government spending? Why does the Government not realize that if it is really in favour of six and five, it must also live within the restrictions it has placed on other Canadians? We accept those restrictions but why do they not restrict themselves?

Mr. Evans: You are in trouble with that one.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, they were going to control spending. They were going to control the spending of Government. They said they would keep it within the nominal growth rate of the GNP. The record speaks for itself. It obviously has been again a promise not kept.

I have no doubt that Canadians want a change of Government. They want a change of Government because of the kind of representation they have been getting from the Minister of Transport. Some very interesting things are happening in that Minister's riding. We have more Members in that riding today and we are getting more money in that riding today because they are girding for the battle. The Minister of Transport holds a seat which Manitobans are going to do everything possible to turn into a Conservative seat and allow the Minister of Transport to go back to the things he does best.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: It is very interesting to be at meetings in Winnipeg South or Winnipeg-Fort Garry and see people who never before were involved in the political process saying they want to get involved. This Minister is not representing western Canadian viewpoints to the Cabinet and in the House of Commons. In fact, it would seem that the voice he is raising is more to get delegate votes for a possible leadership run than to represent the views of western Canada.

Mr. Nielsen: Gimaïel would get more.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, earlier I used the words "mandatory" and "no choice". Members opposite must know that the added increases on the cost of the Crow are going to have serious effects on many farmers in western Canada. How can the Member for Winnipeg-Fort Garry, as a so-called self-ordained westerner, say that this is good for western Canada when in fact the Government had a mandate and a responsibility to put in the extra capacity without needing to change the Crow rate? In fact, this was happening beforehand. The Hon.

Member talks about hopper cars, but when were many of those hopper cars brought in? When the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) was the Minister of Transport the very large increase in hopper cars took place. This was not accomplished by changing the Crow but by sitting down with the railways and the prairie Governments. As a representative of the federal Government he asked them how to solve this capacity problem. Great steps were taken in that respect.

● (1240)

I want to deal with some other issues raised in this motion. Another reason people in this country feel a change is needed is the economic mismanagement of the Government. Today, as a result of the Government's economic mismanagement, roughly 25 cents of every tax dollar collected now goes to service the debt. I found the remarks of the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre rather interesting and I agreed with his views in the way he formed his question. However, the fact remains that the Government has a very serious debt problem. It is not only very serious because of its size and the drain it is causing on the general accounts of Canada, but in my view it is jeopardizing the very social programs which Canadians want to keep in place. That is very serious.

We can be very partisan in the House—and I have been—but I want to say to the Government that we look forward to seeing the Canada Health Act. We want to know what programs the Government will propose. In light of the economic reality we face in Canada, we want to know how the programs which are now in place—which we want to preserve and strengthen but also take cognizance of the realities that we as Canadians must face in terms of the demography of the country—will be able to meet those two objectives in view of the economic mismanagement that we have seen during the last 15 years and which is now seriously jeopardizing many of those safety nets.

While we can talk about many issues which have a public profile, such as user fees, extra billing and opting out, the real issue we must face is the ability to maintain and enhance programs in light of this Government's economic mismanagement over the last 15 years. That is the point. I welcome the proposals from the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) for meeting those two realities.

If Canadian business people or Canadians generally were paying 25 cents out of every dollar just to pay interest on a debt, I know what their bankers would be doing. Their bankers would be calling them in and would want to look at their financial statements. That is what Canadians must be worried about today with respect to the Government.

I want to say to the Government in all seriousness that the greatest negative legacy it is leaving behind is that its economic mismanagement is jeopardizing that which Canadians believe to be right and properly part of their collective protection or safety net in our society. The Government cannot dispute that because those are hard facts. A report on pensions is to be tabled approximately in the middle of December. Pensions are a very serious issue without doubt and we have had a task force on pensions and have had a green paper. In my experience and I am sure in the experience of every Member of the House, one of the most critical problems in this respect concerns widows, especially those between the ages of 55 and 65 who do not have a safety net to fall back on. How do we address this question of pensions while keeping in mind again the economic reality that we face as Canadians as a result of the economic mismanagement of the Government?

We can also talk about the maintenance of health care. The Minister has said that the federal Government has not withdrawn its share of funding in any way. However, when we look at the demography of Canada and the demands in that system, the Provinces which have primary responsibility in that area recognize the need for alternate care, preventive health care, home care and community based care. Where are the Minister's plans? How will we address those questions in view of the economic mismanagement of the Government? Those are the legacies being left behind.

While we can be partisan in the House, and I can possibly be as partisan as anyone in this place, the point is that the Government's legacy is that it has spent money on things for which Canadians today and in the future are being asked to pay when the very fundamental and essential issues which have not been dealt with are now in jeopardy. That is the Government's legacy.

Therefore, this motion calls upon the Government to do the honourable thing and that is to call an election. It is the respectable thing to do. The polls have indicated that many Canadians are absolutely convinced that there is a need for a change in Government. Some have said that my leader and this Party will form the next Government of Canada. I believe that to be the case. But we are not only a Government in waiting, Canada is waiting. The country is waiting for a change. The country is waiting to have confidence returned and to bring optimism back to it. It is not only the Progressive Conservative Party but Canada that is waiting. The NDP do not want a Conservative Government in Canada to the extent that they will do whatever is in their power to return the Liberals and form a coalition and make deals with them.

I will leave this point with you, Mr. Speaker, and with Canadians. I say that Canada and Canadians are waiting. When Canadians want a change of Government, when democracy demands a change in Government and the democratic system must be cleansed, Canadians cannot afford the luxury of voting for a third party, because the experience in Canada for having a third party has always been the return of the Liberals. Therefore, I say that Canadians are waiting for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) to take his rightful place as the Prime Minister of Canada and to bring back to Canada the hope and the potential that should be ours as Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Gimaïel (Lac-Saint-Jean): It was an interesting speech, Mr. Speaker, even if some Opposition Members insist on referring to speeches I made in the House. I am not

ashamed of the fact that I tried to define what a Liberal is, and I shall do so again, because a Liberal, unlike what was said earlier by the Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), a Liberal has a purpose in life, he knows where he is going, not like Progressive Conservatives who cannot decide on common goals and don't know which way to go.

I am getting to the point sure, the Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) likes to bring this up time and time again. He is delighted to have someone tell him what Liberals are like, and although he has been watching them for over twenty years, he still cannot understand why the Liberals have remained in power as long as they have, because to him, a Liberal is not someone who works, but someone who comes here to make pretty speeches for the people of Canada. However, that is not so. The Progressive Conservative Party may be doing just that, but we work here and represent our constituents. To get back to what the Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) said earlier, he was referring to the Government's election promises. The party in power today said during the election campaign that it would double railway tracks in Western Canada. Work on this project would have started long ago if the Hon. Member's own party had not followed its obstructionist policy for two years. They have prevented us from carrying out major projects, and as a Western Canadian, the Hon. Member ought to know that the West was developed thanks to the railways. When this Government wanted to introduce double tracking, the Hon. Members representing the people of Western Canada prevented us from doing so. Yesterday, the changes in the Crow rate were adopted, and they will now be implemented because we have a Government that wants to introduce these changes. No thanks to them, but to the Government.

Since the Hon. Member spoke at length about Medicare, my question is: What does the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) think about what is being done by some premiers, some governments in provinces like Alberta which is all true blue Tories and nothing else? What are they doing to help the poor with Medicare? What about Ontario? It has the highest insurance costs, not including extra billing. Is that supposed to help the poor? When the Hon. Member mentioned Government borrowing, in all fairness he should have told Canadians that 90 per cent of this money is borrowed from Canadian, not from foreign sources, so that the interest is paid to Canadians and not to foreigners. We can therefore say that this country is not getting poorer and poorer, on the contrary. Enough of these misrepresentations!

• (1250)

[*English*]

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to respond to the Hon. Member. I thought he was on very interesting ground when he spoke of what a Liberal was. He has spoken on that topic before in this House. If I recall his comments earlier, he said that a Liberal is all things to all people and he would even be a communist if he had to be a communist.

Mr. Gimaïel: Communists are Conservatives.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I see Hon. Members rising. Are they rising on points of order?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the Hon. Member's speech, as always.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. Perhaps if we had some order the Chair would know what is going on. I thought the Parliamentary Secretary was rising on a point of order.

Mr. Evans: No, with a question, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gimaïel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. I never said a Liberal was a Communist.

[*English*]

Mr. Nielsen: Why did you not say so? The Hon. Member is on the record.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I think if the Hon. Member would go back into the record of *Hansard*—

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Chair is willing to recognize the Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaïel). However, since he has made comments and asked questions, does the Hon. Member want an answer or is he rising on a matter of privilege?

Mr. Gimaïel: I am rising on a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Let the Hon. Member answer my question. I never, I repeat never said a Liberal is a Communist. Let him learn to read or, even better, learn French.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Hon. Member for Provencher will be allowed to reply.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, as I was trying to say earlier to the Hon. Member, if he would read the record of *Hansard* which has his words, not mine, in both official languages, he would find that his definition of a Liberal—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gimaïel: I rise on a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): A matter of privilege? Perhaps the Hon. Member would like to explain where his privilege lies?

Mr. Gimaïel: Mr. Speaker, my privilege lies in the fact that the Hon. Member is attempting to report words I spoke here in the House. He is not reporting them correctly, probably because he failed to read the French version or because the

English version was not reported to him correctly. I would ask him to answer the question and to stop his erroneous reporting—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order! I do not think there is matter of privilege. There is obviously a difference of opinion, but I have seen or heard nothing in what the Hon. Member for Provencher has said or done to justify the Hon. Member rising on a matter of privilege as he did just now. He is merely engaging in debate. It is a matter of a difference of opinion. The Hon. member for Provencher.

[*English*]

Mr. Beatty: Take it up with the Editor of *Hansard.*

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to respond to the Hon. Member. Again, for the third time, if he would check the record of *Hansard*, which all Members accept as the official record of words spoken in this House in both official languages, he will find his own words recorded.

Mr. Nielsen: They leap out.

Mr. Epp: I am sure there are Members—

Mr. Gimaïel: What did I say?

Mr. Epp: —on this side who are going to be digging out those words and the Hon. Member will probably hear quite a bit about them today. I would simply say to the Hon. Member that what he said was that a Liberal must be all things to all people, to embrace all kinds of viewpoints and all kinds of philosophies. Then he said: "And even if necessary, if it is a communist position, a communist philosophy, so be it a communist philosophy or position".

I know the Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaïel) is sensitive on this issue.

Mr. Beatty: He regrets having said what he said.

Mr. Epp: Yes, he regrets having said what he said. I also hear there was quite a debate in the Liberal caucus about this.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Epp: I am saying he is sensitive. We will allow the record of *Hansard* to quote the Member exactly. I accept the record of *Hansard*. I just suggest that he accept his own words and the recording of same.

The Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean mentions the matter of medicare. I would like to tell the Hon. Member that the whole question of health care in Canada has to be addressed from the perspective of the economic reality Canadians face because, as I said earlier, of the economic mismanagement of this Liberal Government, and the ability to maintain those services which we on this side of the House and all polling shows that Canadians universally want to see retained. People want to see universal medicare.

The Hon. Member mentions the Province of Alberta. He checked the record? I am glad he raised this question, because if he will check with the Province of Alberta he will find the greatest amount of spending occurs today for health care per capita in that Province than anywhere else in Canada. In fact, over $1,100 per capita is spent on health care in Alberta. I will not go through all the other Provinces but let me tell the Hon. Member some Provinces spend as little as $600 per capita on health care. The Hon. Member for Lac-Saint-Jean did not raise that. I want to point out to him that in some of our Provinces today over 50 per cent of total provincial budgets are federal transfer payments. Are those Governments mean spirited when they ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare to sit down and examine these questions and also to examine how they can maintain a universal health care system with accepted national standards? Those are the questions the Hon. Member should address. Let us address them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The question period is now over.

The Chair is now prepared to rule on the motion put forward by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans). The Chair earlier expressed some reservations. I am prepared to rule unless Hon. Members wish to comment at this time.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Bring back Stanley Knowles!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): It is with regret that I must inform the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain that I cannot put his amendment to the House. It is out of order as it attempts to introduce a new proposition rather than to clarify or further explain the motion. I refer the Hon. Member to Citation 437(2) of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. It reads:

> An amendment may not raise a new question which can only be considered as a distinct motion after proper notice.

I also refer Hon. Members to Erskine May's Nineteenth Edition at page 387, which reads as follows:

> The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability, or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original question.

I would refer the House also to page 389 of Erskine May's Nineteenth Edition which reads:

> The effect of moving an amendment is, rather, to restrict the field of debate which would otherwise be open on a question.

It is with regret, therefore, that I must reject the Hon. Member's motion. The Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is rising on a point of order?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, given that I moved the motion prior to the end of my speech and would have been able, had the ruling come immediately, to have moved a subsequent amendment, I wonder whether I might be able to do that now?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. First, the Chair sees the clock. It is one o'clock. Perhaps we could take up that matter after the Question Period concludes at three o'clock.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

PENITENTIARIES

PROVISION OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES FOR INMATES

Mr. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, over the past ten years a few Canadian universities have developed a successful, cost-effective, rehabilitation program in several penitentiaries. The Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) has already killed this program in Quebec, Ontario, and the Prairies. He is about to transform the one in British Columbia into something quite different from the successful program it has been. Meanwhile, Canadians are being misled into believing that the university programs will be continued. In fact the educational tinkering of the Solicitor General will result in their disappearance. The Canadian Association for Adult Education recently sent an analysis of the matter to Canadian university presidents.

Also, the Solicitor General proposes to make students pay part of the cost despite the fact a study has found that this will put an end to the programs and to the human and social benefits involved. The Solicitor General has been advised by virtually the entire educational community that he is making a serious mistake. He completely ignores the advice. Why, especially in the field of education in which the federal Government is not particularly competent?

Enlightened Canadians believe that one of the primary purposes of penitentiaries is education or re-education. In view of the arrogance and stubbornness of the Solicitor General regarding this mandated responsibility, I suggest he consult with the Department of the Secretary of State, or with experienced provincial educational officials, with the aim of modernizing his dated approach toward penitentiaries and rehabilitation.

[*Translation*]

THE ENVIRONMENT

ATTITUDE OF UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY TO ASBESTOS PRODUCTS

Mr. Léopold Corriveau (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Standing Order 21, I wish to censure the United States Environmental Protection Agency for its position on asbestos products, because the mere fact of announcing its intention to regulate or even ban such products will be harmful to, and seriously affect, our markets. Consequently, the Government of Canada ought to censure officially the position taken by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Furthermore, the Government of Canada should do the following: express to the U.S. Government its concern about the EPA and its methods; repeat that asbestos cement products, asbestos paper and asbestos vinyl are harmful neither to consumers or asbestos workers; and advise Canadians that the Government of Canada will ask the U.S. authorities not to implement the plans announced and published by the EPA.

Mr. Speaker, I have been living in an asbestos producing area for fifty-eight years, and I must be one of the healthiest Members of this House, for which I am thankful.

* * *

[*English*]

THE PRIME MINISTER

CHOICE OF LIBERAL PARTY FUNCTION FOR SPEECH ON PEACE INITIATIVES

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed. I must admit that I was looking forward to hearing the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) tell the House about his pilgrimage to Europe to discuss his peace initiatives. Unfortunately, these days, any important speeches made by the Prime Minister seem to occur at Liberal functions. Much as I like to hear good rhetoric, I would really feel most uncomfortable attending a function designed for the good Grits of our country. Therefore my absence is understandable, as would be that of the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) who has already stated his abhorrence at receiving invitations to Liberal functions.

My point today is that the Prime Minister should not have chosen a Liberal fund-raising event to disclose details of his efforts to help the cause of peace in the world. Until yesterday, when I heard the news that once again Members of Parliament were the last people to hear important information, I respected him for his efforts. Now it appears quite evident that the Prime Minister is taking the opportunity to add another feather to his cap among his Liberal cohorts. This is definitely not the proper way to go about such matters.

I agree with a daily publication when it indicated that the Liberal movers and shakers got feeling a little cocky and light-headed about all the good press received from the Prime Minister's peace initiatives, that they had to gloat, and that they had to use it to make their troops feel good. The fact that

the Prime Minister failed to make a statement to the House and chose instead to speak to a Grit fund-raising bunfest leaves only one conclusion, that the whole exercise was designed to enhance his shrunken political stature.

* * *

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION BY NEW DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal use of closure to impose Bill C-155 on an unwilling and deeply resentful western Canada underlines how far the Government has strayed from the democratic principles of consent and accountability. We in the New Democratic Party make no apologies for all-out opposition to a Bill that is unwanted, unfair, and undemocratic. We point with pride to a saving of more than $15 million for western Canadian farmers by delaying the freight rate increases which would have been imposed on August 1. We condemn the Government for advising the railways to break the law by ignoring the 60-day filing period for rate increases and imposing higher rates on January 1, 1984.

The Government's action on Bill C-155 was wholly typical. No mandate was sought by the Government to change the Crow rate in the 1980 election. Representations made by electors and elected representatives in the House of Commons were ignored. These representations included 30,000 signatures on petitions filed by the New Democratic Party, and another 7,000 signatures from organizations and individuals who favoured the New Democratic plan to keep the Crow rate and upgrade the railway system.

The then Minister of Transport admitted on May 16 that he had received more than 38,000 signatures favouring Crow retention, and only 69 favouring Crow change. This Act is a testimonial to a Government that puts people last.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING CERTAIN DECLARATIONS

Mr. Pierre Gimaïel (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's *Globe and Mail*, Monday, November 14, it was reported that the Leader of the Official Opposition, in a speech he made in Edmonton last week, mentioned the fact that my constituents did not know me.

First of all, I would like to say to the Hon. Member for Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney) that it is not fair on the part of someone who claims to be the future Prime Minister of Canada to give the impression that Quebecers are idiots by saying that they vote for people they do not know.

My second comment is that at least I run in the riding where I was born and where I have lived all my life.

Third, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition talked to people in my riding, they were probably from Schefferville, the town he himself closed down, so that these people are now trying their luck in the Lac-Saint-Jean area. They probably do not know me yet because it was not so long ago when the Leader of the Official Opposition fired them and made them leave town, but they will know me pretty soon, because I am working with my colleagues and the Government to improve their living conditions. I can guarantee one thing, and that is, that there will never be a Brian Mulroney in the riding of Lac-Saint-Jean to take away their jobs or their town. Never, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*English*]

REMEMBRANCE DAY

USE OF POPPY SYMBOL BY PEACE ACTIVISTS

Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I rise while Hon. Members' memories are still warm after the many ceremonies held this past weekend at cenotaphs across Canada to honour veterans of two world wars and the Korean war. Radical elements of the anti-Cruise missile protest movement had the shabby disrespect to drag the Royal Canadian Legion's symbol of remembrance, the poppy, through the political mud on November 11.

I am sure most thoughtful Canadians who quietly protest Cruise testing in the country would agree with me that Remembrance Day is not now, and never will be, political; the poppy is not political. But these diabolically political and professional protesters simply do not recognize the difference between their peace symbols and the poppy:

In Flanders fields the poppies blow
between the crosses, row on row . . . .
We are the dead.

John McCrae's poem signifies to me, that the poppy is a symbol of remembrance for the fallen. It is definitely not meant as a "peacenik's" peace symbol.

• (1410)

The poem continues:

Take up our quarrel with the foe . . .

To me, Mr. Speaker, that does not mean quarrelling among ourselves in a free Canada. What these unruly protesters fail to remember is that had so many valiant men and women not fought and died for freedom, these peaceniks would not have the democratic freedom to protest against anything at any time.

To hundreds of thousands of veterans across the country the red poppy is the symbol of the blood that was shed in the name of freedom. The poppy must remain the sacred symbol of remembrance of the dead in Flanders fields.

IMMIGRATION

POLAND—PLEA FOR GRANTING OF EXIT VISAS TO FAMILIES OF LANDED IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, at this time there are hundreds of families separated due to the recent crisis in Poland. Individuals who have been granted permanent residence in Canada anxiously await reunification with their family members who are still in Poland. Many of these families have been separated for two to three years and, as a result, are undergoing mental anguish, particularly in the case of the children who are deprived of proper family security.

Many of these individuals have exhausted all legal avenues open to them to bring their families to Canada. Today, ten such individuals are in their ninth day of a hunger strike in front of the Polish consulate in Toronto, and close to 1,000 petitioners have already indicated their support for this protest.

Family members in Poland have met all Canadian immigration requirements. However, they are being continuously refused the appropriate exit documents by Polish officials, which would allow them to be reunited with their families in Canada. Each family has encountered an average of four to six refusals of these exit documents from Polish authorities.

I appeal to the Canadian Government on grounds of human compassion to continue to make successful representations to the Polish Government on behalf of all of these families and other families when the husbands, wives and children want to live together and not be separated.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

CONDEMNATION OF GOVERNMENT'S JOB-CREATION POLICY

Mr. Gerry St. Germain (Mission-Port Moody): Mr. Speaker, economic development planning in Canada is non-existent under the present Liberal Government. The priorities of Canada's most important economic sectors, which are the fisheries, forestry, mining and other resource-based industries, are being totally ignored by the Government. Instead, the Liberal Government is focusing all of its energy on devising band-aid, short-term, make-work, job-creation schemes.

The Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) is now the key player—and I repeat, the key player—in economic development strategy. The Liberal Government has charged the Minister with the duty of obtaining the biggest political boom for the taxpayer's buck.

Federal visibility is now the only criterion for government assistance. Consideration of long-term goals in resource management is a thing of the past. If there is a place for a huge plywood sign to announce the Liberal Government's contribution, then there is a place for federal dollars. That is the way it is seen by the Government opposite.

Billion dollar band-aids only mask the problems. The real cure, Mr. Speaker, is a new government that is committed to job creation through the encouragement of private sector economic development.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

RESOLUTE BAY—DENIAL OF FACILITIES TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, northerners have long sought justice on issues of taxation, food and fuel costs, jobs, and access to federal programs. The voice of the Hon. Member for Nunatsiaq (Mr. Ittinuar) has been silenced, and the voices of the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) and Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) speak in favour of user-pay and market economics, and are now promising to fire at least 60,000 public servants.

A case needing consideration by the House is that of Mr. Smith, a federal employee who is working and living in Resolute Bay. He, along with other workers, is forced to live in a barracks-style doghouse while there are plush, empty rooms available for supersivors, visitors, and government VIPs. According to the federal Government and, to date, unchallenged by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), the reason for this atrocious situation is, and I quote, "it is not practical or desirable to have supervisory and operating staff sharing the same living areas".

Perhaps the Minister will find time to investigate the matter and explain to the radio operators, meteorologists and electronics technicians why the federal Government is running a class system in the North. Perhaps he can explain why the gym, movie house and library at this base in the Arctic Islands remain closed. Canadian northerners would all like to know why certain employees get special privileges, certain northerners get some privileges, and most get nothing.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PRIME MINISTER'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH UNITED STATES PRESIDENT ON PEACE INITIATIVE

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Yesterday the Secretary of State for External Affairs suggested that the Prime Minister might be prepared to make known to the House the substance and content of the various communications he has had with the President of the United States in regard to peace proposals. Would the Prime Minister now be prepared to do so in the House of Commons?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to answer questions asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition about my exchanges with various leaders, but I have no general statement to make.

SUBSTANCE OF CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Prime Minister yesterday, we were discussing the written communications the Prime Minister had, to which he has made frequent allusions in various speeches, including the social speech in Montreal. Inasmuch as reference to those written communications was made in Montreal, I was wondering if the Prime Minister might feel it appropriate that the substance and content of written messages back and forth might be tabled in the House of Commons today.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the matter of whether I have referred to communications or not is completely irrelevant. Communications between heads of Government on various matters are often referred to but never made public. The substance of my message, as is known, was the subject of peace and disarmament. Once again, I am prepared to answer questions on the initiatives that I am attempting to take, but if the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that he be shown the text of a letter sent to a President, or to any one of the other leaders, the answer is that that is not customary and I do not propose to do so.

Mr. Mulroney: Mr. Speaker, we recognize full well that it is not customary, but given the remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs yesterday, we thought that the Prime Minister might like to take the House into his confidence.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: Perhaps he might like to do so, inasmuch as he summoned as much national support as possible for his initiative.

STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO UNITED STATES OFFICIAL ON TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Under-Secretary of State for the United States of America, Mr. Dam, apparently said earlier today that the Government of the United States would have no objection to the correspondence being made public provided it was all right with the Government of Canada. I would again ask the Prime Minister, in light of these circumstances, if he would feel free, inasmuch as he is leaving the country shortly on another major trip, to take the country into his confidence to the extent humanly possible, and tell us what has been going on.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Official Opposition really wants the House to be taken into my confidence, he simply has to ask questions about what I have been doing. He can read my speeches and my statement. However, in so far as tabling letters, or making letters public between myself and other leaders of Government is concerned, that not only is not customary, Mr. Speaker, but it would be breaking every diplomatic rule.

When one writes a letter to another head of Government, one does so in the confidence that the letters will not be made public. Under some circumstances it might be useful after the event to make such letters public. That might arise in this case, but until I finish my consultations, Mr. Speaker, the least I can do is respect the confidence that people expect of me, just as would the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. He once made a great fuss because part of some private exchange between us had unfortunately been made public. He did not like that. Why did he not like that? Did he not want the House to be taken into his confidence? Did he not want his own Party to know what he was saying? There are certain rules of civility between leaders of Government about which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition will have to learn.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER MAKE STATEMENT IN HOUSE

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in reference to the point raised by the Prime Minister, I objected in writing because a member of his staff violated a clearcut undertaking given by him to me. That is why I objected.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (1420)

Mr. Mulroney: Inasmuch as the Prime Minister raised the word civility, there is another word that goes with it, confidence. If he has been relieved of the burden of confidentiality by the Government of the United States with regard to communications between the two of them which affect Canada, and initiatives that he is making on our behalf, and we have already stated that he goes with our good wishes, I would have thought there would have been a little more cordiality and civility coming from the Prime Minister, beginning with some information to the House of Commons. The people of Canada are being kept in the dark. You have to pay to go to a Liberal dinner to get any information. That is unacceptable.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mulroney: Without wanting to intrude on the calm that bedecks the back benches of his Party, given the sensitivity of this kind of issue, will the Prime Minister be making a full statement to the House of Commons on this complex and important issue prior to his departure on another extended trip overseas? Will he do that before he leaves?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition refers to a clear cut undertaking

between himself and myself when we had that conversation. I repeat, there is a clear cut undertaking that one does not make public exchanges of letters between heads of Government. If the President of the United States wants to make his exchange public, and we can find out from the ambassador if he wants to make it public, that is fine. However, I do not intend making my letters public, the ones that I sent to the various heads of Government, because there is a clear cut understanding that that is not the way we are operating. Even when I met the leaders last week, we undertook not to go out and make a detailed report of what we had done. We are waiting for other members of the alliance, the other powers involved, to see what we are talking about. Perhaps later, if there are some possible results, we will make them public, but certainly not now.

Once again, if the Leader of the Opposition thinks he has an undertaking from the American President to make his letter public, that is his affair of course. I do not see how he could possibly have that undertaking, but he says he seems to have it from someone.

As far as discussing the subject and making a report in the House of Commons are concerned, today is an opposition day. If it is so important I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition has not made a speech himself, why he has not made the subject of international relations and peace-seeking the subject of the opposition day. The Leader of the Opposition smiles. His Members are smiling as well. It would be interesting to know what they think about international relations. They have not chosen the subject. It is their day.

I repeat, I am happy to answer questions. As a matter of fact I was surprised that the Opposition Party did not ask any questions in the week that I was here after I made my Guelph speech. A lot of people commented on it. The Leader of the Opposition commented on it outside the House, but it did not seem worthy of the attention of the Opposition. I did not know they would suddenly be interested, but suddenly they are. Good. Let us have a debate on it.

RESPONSES BY NUCLEAR POWERS

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am astounded and dismayed that the Prime Minister would adopt such an argumentative and defensive tone with regard to an entirely legitimate question put forward, one which reflects the concerns of millions of Canadians. Inasmuch as he will not divulge the correspondence, and I acknowledge that there may be good reasons for that, will he at least tell the House if anyone has responded to his letters? We were informed in the Montreal speech that he communicated with the leaders of the five nuclear powers, inviting them in that regard. Have they responded to his letters? If so, were the responses encouraging and positive, or were they otherwise? Has there been a response to his initiatives?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition first comments that there have been no answers to legitimate questions. I put it to him that, except for this last one, there have been no legitimate questions. The Leader of the Opposition has been asking for documents which he knows he should not have. I am happy to answer questions about the MBFR that I discussed, the Stockholm conference that I discussed, the five power conference that I discussed, the asphyxiation premise that I discussed. There are no questions on this. It has all been in the papers.

If the Leader of the Opposition has questions, I will be happy to answer them. Do not let him say that I am not prepared to talk about the subject. The only question he has asked me is the recent one as to whether I have had answers from the various leaders. Yes, I have had some answers from some leaders, some verbal and some written.

CYPRUS—DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY TURKISH CYPRIOTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister who, at his August 30 press conference in Athens, Greece, commented on the situation in Cyprus. As the Prime Minister is udoubtedly aware, there has been a declaration of independence on the part of certain Turkish Cypriots on that island proclaiming a new country with respect to the northern part of Cyprus. What is the official response of the Government of Canada to this declaration of independence, and when in fact was the first time that he learned that such a declaration was going to be made?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the official position of the Government of Canada is that it recognizes the Government in Cyprus which already exists, and with which we have good relations. It is a member of the Commonwealth, and we continue to want to have good relations with that Government. Insofar as the declaration of independence of a part of that country is concerned, we regret it. The Hon. Member asks when we first heard of it. I first heard of it this morning. Perhaps the Secretary of State for External Affairs can elaborate as to the exact moment we were informed of it.

The Hon. Member, being the official critic for External Relations, would know that the possibility or the threat of a declaration of independence by the Turkish part of Cyprus has been mooted for quite a while, certainly for some months. That is why we very strongly encouraged the initiative of the Secretary General of the United Nations toward a compromise between the communities in Cyprus which are in conflict. It is not something that had been unheard of. We regret that the compromise proposals put forward by the Secretary General were not given a chance to succeed before this event happened.

STATUS OF CANADIAN PEACE-KEEPING FORCE—SAFETY OF CANADIAN CITIZENS

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is also directed to the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister indicate whether there has been any

violence on the island? Specifically, have any of the 500 Members of our Canadian peace-keeping force been involved? Does the Government plan any reappraisal with respect to keeping the peace-keeping force on the island, bearing in mind it is up for renewal in December? Finally, can he tell us what number of Canadian nationals are on the island and whether they are in any danger?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, insofar as the peace-keeping troops are concerned, they are there under an agreement with the United Nations. To our knowledge, there is no violence taking place. As the Hon. Member would know, the declaration of independence has taken place on the northern part of the island where the Turkish troops already were. There is no new conflict or no different situation of fact between the various parts of Cyprus. This is merely a new legal situation, with one part declaring its independence.

The Hon. Member asked about the number of Canadians. There is no danger that we know of at this time to the Canadians. There are some 2,000 dual nationals, some 200 resident Canadian citizens, and perhaps about 500 Canadian tourists. There are, of course, 515 troops who are members of the approximately 2,300 U.N. troops. We provide a little less than a quarter of those troops.

* * *

● (1430)

EMPLOYMENT

GOVERNMENT POLICY—MINISTERS' STATEMENTS

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Yesterday the Minister of State for Economic Development said, and I quote, "Unemployment has always been at the top of the Government's priorities." Just about a month ago the Minister of Finance in his economic review acknowledged that the Government's own restraint policies had contributed to the depressed levels of economic development. Would the Minister please explain to the House what appears to the rest of us to be a pretty clear contradiction?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): I am a bit puzzled, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the Hon. Member has suggested that one of my colleagues has made one statement and another colleague has made a second statement. I believe it would be more appropriate to ask those Ministers, rather than myself, to clarify their positions.

Mr. Broadbent: You are the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

Mr. Roberts: In any case, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the Minister of Finance made the statement which the Hon. Member has attributed to him. There is not that difficulty of reconciliation.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I made the naive assumption that the Minister of Employment and Immigration had some kind of responsibility for job creation and, therefore, he might be interested in the contradictory views expressed by two of his colleagues. I point out to him that the Minister of Finance did in fact say what I just attributed to him.

REQUEST FOR ACTION TO CREATE MORE JOBS

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): To get on with the substance of the matter, Mr. Speaker, considering that the restrictive policies of the Government, as the Minister of Finance himself acknowledged, have contributed to a turn-down in the rate of consumer spending, which means fewer jobs, will the Minister now tell the House if the Government plans to continue to take $400 million a year away from taxpayers in increased taxes? And will it re-establish the $300 million cutback in job creation which the Minister announced just a few weeks ago? In short, will the Government abandon its restrictive policies which are killing jobs, and do something to produce more badly needed jobs for Canadians?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as is often the case, the assumptions behind the Hon. Member's questions are inaccurate. I do believe that the policy of restraint which this Government has advocated and promoted has, in a variety of ways, kept down costs in Canada. It has contributed to the competitiveness of the Canadian economy and, therefore, supported and created jobs within Canadian society and the Canadian economy. Moreover, there has been a considerable growth in the Canadian economy, largely stimulated recently by strong consumer spending, which denies one of the other assumptions in the Hon. Member's question.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the Minister simply does not know what he is talking about. The rate of consumer spending is now going down, not up. The fact is we lost 45,000 jobs a month ago, in the Canadian economy. We are not producing more jobs. The reality is that some 21 per cent of our young people are still unemployed in Canada. The over-all effect of all this, as everyone apart from the Cabinet knows, is that the Government has failed to come to grips with the serious issue of unemployment.

REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF NEW JOB-CREATION MEASURES

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister, who said he was going to produce action ever since he assumed his current responsibility, will we get a Bill next week. Will we have some action in terms of new measures before Christmas? If we do not, if we have to wait for a new Throne Speech at Christmas time, there will be no impact from government action until the Spring. Canadians want some action with respect to the economy from the Government, and they want it now.

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think it might be helpful, if the Hon. Member goes back into traction, and if he did acquaint himself with the facts. He declares that I do not know them. He either does not know them or will not express them. The fact of the matter is that the economy has created over 350,000 jobs since last November. The fact is that we are going into recovery. The fact is that the impact of my colleague's budget is beginning to be felt now.

Mr. Nowlan: It certainly has been felt, since the day he brought it down.

Mr. Roberts: There are positive signs for the economy. The Hon. Member does not want to recognize that they are there.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CRACKS IN CF-18 AIRCRAFT ENGINE MOUNTS

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. Can the Minister confirm that serious structural defects, namely, cracks in the engine mounts, have been discovered in the CF-18, Canada's new fighter aircraft, and that just after a few hundred hours of air time four out of 20 of the aircraft so far delivered have had to be grounded? If this is so, can the Minister tell the House who is responsible, and what his Department is doing about it? And when we can expect these very expensive aircraft to be made available to our Forces in fully airworthy condition?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that there have been some cracks found in some engine mounts on aircraft which have flown in excess of 300 hours. I am advised that such a finding is not abnormal—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Blais: —given the newness of the aircraft. They are minimal in nature, Mr. Speaker, and are being addressed.

ARMING OF CF-18 AIRCRAFT

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, can the Minister also confirm that, according to the contract, the airframe is supposed to last 10,000 hours, not 300 hours? Can the Minister also inform the House as to the state of airworthiness of the aircraft, and of their equipment, in view of the fact that by next summer two of the CF-18 squadrons are supposed to be deployed? According to our sources, these aircraft will have insufficient weapons to allow them to fulfil our role in NORAD. If they are flying, they will be flying without weapons unless something is done to address this problem. Can the Minister indicate whether in fact this problem will be addressed?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker, that problem is being addressed now and will be rectified. In terms of the engine mounts themselves, Mr. Speaker, the needed engineering changes will be incorporated within the aircraft which are now entering the production line. There is, as I indicated to the Hon. Member, a fix being put in which will remedy the problem which he has identified.

I want to identify as well, Mr. Speaker, that, as the Hon. Member well recognizes from the briefings he has received, the CF-18 is performing beyond any of the specifications. We are very satisfied with its performance. I want to reiterate that this particular defect is being addressed and is of a normal nature within the developmental phase which is encountered within the CF-18 program.

* * *

UNITED EMPIRE LOYALISTS

FUNDING FOR BICENTENNIAL IN ONTARIO

Mr. Bill Vankoughnet (Hastings-Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. However, in his absence I will direct it to the Minister of State for Multiculturalism. On October 11 of this year I inquired whether the Minister intended to contribute funding for the United Empire Loyalists bicentennial in Ontario during 1984. The Minister of State indicated that details would be made available during the week of October 17. This, of course, was over one month ago. I would like to know if the Government intends to make a statement in the House of Commons, or in the near future, on whether there will be funding available to the United Empire Loyalists' bicentennial in Ontario during 1984.

Hon. D. M. Collenette (Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his question. I do indeed remember the reply given by my colleague, the Secretary of State. He is away from Ottawa for a few days. However, I shall try to get the information so that it is available to the Hon. Member later this week.

* * *

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

LAY-OFFS IN WINNIPEG

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. When we were debating the third reading stage of Bill C-155, the Minister, in support of the Bill, said, "We are talking about 300,000 jobs. We are talking about benefits spread from one end of the country to the other." A few days before the Minister made his speech extolling Bill C-155 and the great benefits which would come from it, the CPR in our home town—his as well as my own—was laying people off at the Weston shops. Would the Minister take up with the CPR the

question of why it is laying people off at a time when it is supposed to be hiring more people and expanding its facilities?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North has now become aware of the major advantages of the Crow legislation for industrial expansion across Canada. I would like to point out to the Hon. Member that in our home town, Mr. Speaker, the CPR is presently investing $15.3 million in a new diesel shop in the Weston area—I am sure we will be glad to invite the Hon. Member to the opening—and establishing a new communications and control system, and, working out of Winnipeg, establishing a new telecommunications line between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg. I will be sure to inform the Hon. Member when that work is completed. Those are just a few examples of the kind of major job-creation activities we are getting as a result of the passage of the Crow legislation.

● (1440)

REQUEST THAT LAY-OFFS BE CANCELLED

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, we are of course pleased that CPR is expanding, but surely the Minister can understand the concern of workers who are being laid off. This is the largest corporation in Canada, a multibillion dollar corporation. We know it will take some time before the so-called benefits flow to the company, but surely it can afford to carry the few workers it laid off until the expansion gets started. I urge the Minister to take up with the CPR the idea that it act in a humane way and not lay people off at this time.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member has a good point in the sense that any company, Crown corporation or private, should be very sensitive to the question of how individuals and communities are affected by changes, either in the marketplace or in the technology with which they deal. That is a subject I intend to take up in meetings with both the railway unions and companies.

In the particular instance the Hon. Member is talking about, what he is really highlighting is how important it is that we get the Crow legislation working now. We have been delayed overly long by opposition in this House, primarily from the Hon. Member's own Party, which has delayed a lot of investment plans. This meant we could not go ahead and get the kind of job creation we hoped to get at an earlier period.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

DEPARTMENT'S LONG-RANGE PLANS

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane-Superior): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and it relates to the report of the Special Committee on Indian self government. In asking this question I want to thank the Minister for his positive comments and response so far to that report.

Is the Minister aware that while discussions are going on concerning the future of his Department, that Department is in the process of negotiating long-term agreements for the acquisition of computers? This procurement is estimated to cost somewhere around $20 million. Will the Minister tell the House what steps he is going to take concerning long-range plans in his Department, and will he, for example, consider imposing a moratorium on all such long-range plans?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I do not think putting a moratorium on all long-range plans would be the answer. Some of those plans will be required no matter what happens to the Department, regarding the rendering of services, no matter who renders the services, be it the Indians themselves or someone else.

Let me just say that we have undertaken, and I personally have undertaken, to consult with the AFN and the Inuit leadership—but directly of late with the AFN—with respect to any plans of this nature now or in the future. That is in keeping with the spirit of the House of Commons report. It also makes good sense from the Department's point of view to have them involved in some of the decisions we are making.

May I also say that no decision with respect to the computers the Hon. Member has referred to has been made by the Department.

* * *

INCOME TAX

DEPARTMENT'S ASSESSMENT OF WRITERS' AND ARTISTS' INCOMES

Hon. David Crombie (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue who will know that less than two weeks ago this House unanimously decided that all matters affecting the taxing of artists and writers should be referred to the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture for discussion. Since that time I have received a number of communications from people affected, telling me the Minister's staff are assessing writers and artists under the old rules. I ask the Minister if that is true and, if so, will he now confirm to this House that he will put a stop to those assessments until the committee has had a chance to review the matter and report back to the House?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, like the Hon. Member, I have also received representations from taxpayers, and especially from artists. The Hon. Member is referring to a study that was carried out by a Standing Committee of this House. I may remind him, however, that any changes that should or could be made in the Income Tax Act are the responsibility of the Minister of

Finance, so that when the Committee submits its report, it will be up to the Minister of Finance, if any changes are to be made in the Income Tax Act, to put such changes before the House, if the Minister so decides. The Hon. Member will agree that until such changes are tabled in the House and approved, we must administer the Income Tax Act in its present form.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR EXERCISE OF MINISTERIAL DISCRETION

Hon. David Crombie (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, surely the Minister understands that the reason the House spoke to the matter unanimously is because those rules are unjust and unworkable. By applying those rules the Government will continue to garnishee wages of people in universities, and it is imposing rules which are no longer acceptable either to this House or to those people.

It is within the Minister's discretion to give relief to those poeple, as he did with the musicians in the Toronto Symphony Orchestra. Will he not give relief to these people who are being subjected by his staff to unjust and unworkable rules? Everyone in this House agrees with that.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when the Hon. Member reads what he said in the preamble to his question, he will wonder how he could have been so careless. The Hon. Member will recall that the Department of National Revenue is responsible for administering the Income Tax Act in its present form, and I am sure that if he took the time to examine the provisions of the Income Tax Act, he would see that there are no special provisions applying to the group of taxpayers to which he is referring. Provisions that apply to this group are the same provisions that apply to other taxpayers in Canada, and at the Department of National Revenue, when applying these general provisions, we take into consideration the particular circumstances of each taxpayer, including artists.

* * *

[*English*]

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

NORTH SLOPE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS—IMPACT OF NATIVE LAND CLAIMS

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. On November 7 the Minister announced that he rejects development on the North Slope of Yukon, citing the lack of land claims settlement as the reason. Does that mean that until the land claims are settled north of 60, there will be no new development?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): No, it does not, Mr. Speaker. There are two land claims which are affected. The leadership of both claimants were on the North Slope project review group which reviewed the North Slope and voted against it because the approval, or otherwise, of these land claims is imminent, and this is not an appropriate time to go against the feelings of the native interests with respect to those land claims. It is not a veto which can be exercised by the land claimants forever, but this particular time is not appropriate, and I emphasized that at the time of the decision.

KING POINT PROJECT

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, if the Council of Yukon Indians threw their support behind the King Point quarry proposal, joining with the Minister's own Department of Northern Development, Industry and Trade, the Yukon Chamber of Commerce, the Yukon Government and many others, would he then change his mind and take a look at this very important project which will offer employment to 638 people, mostly Yukoners, and provide that much needed economic benefit to an economy which, as the Minister well knows, has been dealt a very serious blow because of the closing down of mining and transportation in that area?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member exaggerates quite considerably. I do not know to whom he is referring in my own Department. We had an official of mine on the review group who also voted against the project in the end, so I do not know to whom he could possibly be referring in my own Department. There are other departmental officials and colleagues of mine in the Cabinet who have considerable hesistancy with regard to this project. I can refer to my colleague, the Minister of the Environment. I would also point out that there are conservation groups, including CARC, an organization in the North, that are entirely opposed to this development. If you add all of those people to all the native organizations that have expressed opposition, I believe the list I am compiling is equally, if not more, impressive than the one the Hon. Member is compiling.

* * *

● (1450)

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

TREATMENT OF INDIAN PEOPLE ON VANCOUVER ISLAND

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Solicitor General. In August of 1982 Clarence Jack of the Chemainus Indian band died in the Ladysmith RCMP lockup because he was not given medical attention. This month his cousin, Harvey Jack, was in a car accident and suffered a broken neck. Instead of getting him medical attention, the RCMP put him in the Nanaimo lockup. Today he is in Shaughnessy hospital paralyzed from the neck down. As these two incidents are not isolated but fit into a

total pattern of relations between Indians and the Mounted Police, will the Minister order a full and public investigation of all relationships between the RCMP and the Indian people on Vancouver Island?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I have looked into the incident to which the Hon. Member refers, in which the individual was locked up in an RCMP lockup with a broken neck. I have had a full report on it. The individual appeared to be in perfectly good condition when he was incarcerated. He was speaking. He was asked about his condition. He indicated that he was not suffering from any physical problems at the time that he was incarcerated. It was discovered, after he had been incarcerated and had passed out, that he had a broken neck. He was rushed to the hospital as soon as that fact was discovered.

I would like to hear more from the Hon. Member about any suggestion that that tragic event had any connection with any other event, and any evidence that he has to suggest that the RCMP are mistreating the Indians. I totally reject that, and I suggest to him that if he wants to make a serious charge like that he should have more information to back it up.

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, the First Nation South Island Tribal Council have asked for such an investigation because of their concern.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

THE CASE OF DONALD MARSHALL—LEGAL COSTS OF FIGHTING WRONGFUL CONVICTION

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs. According to reports the Minister said that he would "do his damndest" to get compensation for the legal costs of Donald Marshall who was fighting to redress a wrongful conviction for manslaughter. So far no money has been forthcoming. What did the Minister do in terms of "doing his damndest" to get this money? Did he give up after a preliminary inquiry by the Department, or did he go to Cabinet? Is there no source of federal money to help pay for the tragedy that this young man has suffered, at least to cover his legal costs?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Hon. Member is referring to a quote of somebody else rather than myself. That should be noted for the sake of accuracy. I saw Mr. Marshall's father when I was in Nova Scotia. I saw his lawyer on several occasions, both in Nova Scotia and in my office, and heard representations of a very moving nature with respect to the legal costs that this falsely accused man had been put to, as well as other losses he had suffered as a result of this rather atrocious occurrence.

There is absolutely no authority in my Department for payment, as I think the Hon. Member is aware from his knowledge of my authority through his experience on the parliamentary committee. I did write to the Province on at least two occasions urging it to look with some compassion on the situation. As well, I examined other areas in Government that might provide funding. There is none. I regard this very much as an obligation on the part of the provincial Government. To alleviate some of the hardship on this particular individual my Department arranged employment for him with our Department when he was out of jail.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

KING POINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to that of my colleague from Brampton-Georgetown, to direct to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In his first answer the Minister mentioned that it was a matter of timing on the King Point Development Project. In his second answer he raised the environmental question. It is my understanding from a report from within his Department, and also additional reports that he has, that there is no negative environmental impact on King Point. He knows the situation in the Yukon. He knows the jobs that are needed. In his planning, when is the right time in terms of months, weeks or days, as to when he can give approval for King Point?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I have indicated many times that there is not environmental clearance. Some of those questions could be more directly referred to my colleague, the Minister of the Environment. It has clearly been stated that certain mitigative measures would have to be put in place in order for you to seriously consider it from an environmental point of view. Keep that in mind.

As far as the Yukon government pressing me to approve these projects at a time when land claims are almost close to settlement is concerned, it is an absolutely integral part of any northern strategy with respect to opening it up for development in the future that those land claims not be prejudiced. The Yukon Government, walking capriciously away from the table during negotiations, and slowing up the negotiations for many months until finally deciding to return, did not in any way help this situation. If it had not been for that irresponsible conduct on the part of the Yukon Government this claim might have been settled and we might have been able to approve the project.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher): The Yukon has been hit very hard with unemployment in mining and industries relating to mining. The Minister knows that if we do not have infrastructure in northern Canada we cannot create private sector jobs. Is the Minister's argument now one of the environment, or

only one of timing? Is he in fact committed to northern development in projects such as King Point?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, it was this Government that showed the political will to get on with the settlement of land claims necessary to open up the North and permit development. When my predecessor held this office he cut off all funding to the native groups in terms of negotiating land claims. If that policy had still been in place we would not be near settlement in either one of these particular cases.

* * *

NATIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND

APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FROM MARITIME PROVINCES

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs. In view of the current debate with regard to the recent report on the subject, I recently had an exchange with the First Nations Indians regarding the economic development allocation for bands in Canada. Could the Minister inform the House whether or not a Member for the Maritime Provinces has been appointed to this important board with respect to the disposition of these funds for economic development for Indian bands?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not hear the first couple of words. If the Hon. Member is referring to the Native Economic Development Fund, that is the responsibility of my colleague, the Minister responsible for small business. I would suggest he direct his question to him.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

THE CASE OF DONALD MARSHALL—PAYMENT OF LEGAL FEES

Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has just heard his colleague sitting in front of him rightly term the Marshall case "an atrocious occurrence". Now that the courts have found someone else guilty of the crime for which Donald Marshall spent 11 years in prison, is the Minister of Justice prepared to take the necessary steps, which only the federal Minister of Justice can take, to see that Marshall's legal fees are paid at public expense?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, without passing any final judgment on the facts of the case I may say that I am indeed very troubled as a result of what I know about the proceedings of the investigation and the trial of Mr. Marshall on the first occasion. If there were any readily apparent actions that the federal Government could take, I would be indeed prepared to consider that. In fact, as I am sure my hon. friend knows, all aspects of the initial investigation and trial were under the jurisdiction of the Province of Nova Scotia, either directly or indirectly through the police of the city of Sydney.

I am sure my hon. friend does not believe that we have a system of federalism in which it is the responsibility of a federal Government to correct the mistakes of the Provinces, or to take over from the Provinces when they are not doing things properly within their own jurisdiction. I have to say to my hon. friend that, not only is there no precedent for a payment, if that is what my hon. friend is suggesting in a case of this kind, in fact, I do not think it would be very good federalism to proceed in that way. However, because I am so troubled about it, I am at the point of discussing the matter with the new Attorney General of the Province of Nova Scotia to canvass the situation in order to see whether or not there is not some action which he may take.

● (1500)

ROLE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Hon. Allan Lawrence (Durham-Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, Marshall is a native Micmac and there is a federal responsibility for his welfare, and since there was at least an understanding that a federal Cabinet Minister gave a commitment to pay all bills, because it was a federal police report, commissioned by the federal Minister of Justice, who then caused the retrial of Marshall to be held; in light of all this federal involvement, can the Minister really expect us to believe that the federal Government has no further responsibility in righting what is so obviously a wrong? The people of this country believe that the Minister of Justice is merely buck-passing this to the provincial Government.

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I understand from my hon. friend, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, that not only did he not make such a statement, but it has already been denied in the press.

I may say that I find my hon. friend's argument, that because our report led to the freeing of Marshall, we should therefore assume some responsibility for his initial wrongful incarceration, to be an astonishing doctrine and one that is not supported in any way. He has made no comment at all on the fact that his version of federalism which he is presenting—and I wonder if his Leader endorses it—is that it is up to us to correct the Provinces and stand behind them, to step in and do work within their jurisdiction, when they are not prepared to do it. I find that astonishing.

* * *

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the Table the report of the Clerk of Petitions stating that she has examined the

petitions presented by Hon. Members on Monday, November 14, 1983, and finds that the petitions meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. NIELSEN—BILL C-155—REPORTING ERROR CONCERNING REPORT STAGE MOTIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Last evening the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) raised a point of order concerning the reporting of certain report stage motions in *Hansard* of Thursday, November 3, 1983.

After reviewing the *Debates* I have to agree with the Hon. Member's point of order. A corrigendum will be printed in today's *Debates* indicating the corrections to the errors.

I want to assure the Hon. Member and the House that the official record of the House, the *Votes and Proceedings*, was correct, as is the version of Bill C-155, printed after passage by the House.

MR. McGRATH—QUESTION ON UNEMPLOYMENT ANSWERED BY MRS. EROLA—RULING OF MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, is the Chair prepared to rule today on a point of order raised yesterday by the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath)?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yesterday, the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) raised a point of order following the daily Question Period regarding a question asked by the Hon. Member for Timiskaming (Mr. MacDougall). The question was addressed to the Hon. Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) but was answered by the Hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola).

Our practice is very clear in this matter and I would like to quote Citation 361 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition:

> A question may not be asked of a Minister in another capacity, such as being responsible for a Province, or part of a Province, or as spokesman for a racial or religious group.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker Lamoureux puts the matter very succinctly in a ruling given on October 16, 1968, and I quote:

> —a Minister may be asked questions relating to a department for which he has ministerial responsibility or acting ministerial responsibility, but a Minister cannot be asked, nor can he answer questions in another capacity, such as being responsible for a province, or a part of a province—

I am concerned, however, that the question posed by the Hon. Member for Timiskaming referred to actions of another Minister, while it was directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. That complicates the matter from the point of view of the Chair. It is difficult for the Chair to make a ruling to the effect that any Minister named in a question should not have some right to respond to the allegations in a question.

However, the general rule that Ministers should be asked questions and should answer questions relating to their primary ministerial responsibility is a basic rule of the procedure of the House.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, normally we would know what the business for the House would be on Thursday, but since we are not sitting tomorrow and since we did not get this far last week in describing Government business for this week, I wonder if the Parliamentary Secretary, in the absence of the Government House Leader, might confirm whether we will be dealing with the fisheries legislation on Thursday and would he state what it will be on Friday? If it is not fisheries legislation, what business will we be dealing with on Thursday?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge it will be the fisheries Bill. I will check with the President of the Privy Council and get back to the Hon. Member definitely about Thursday, and also with information about Friday.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I expect to be in the House all afternoon but since the purpose of this kind of question is to advise all Members what the business will be, perhaps if it is something different from fisheries the opportunity might be taken to rise in the House in order to tell us what the business will be for Thursday.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

MR. PATTERSON—CALL FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Alex Patterson (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and duty to present the following petition to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the constituency of Fraser Valley East in the Province of British Columbia, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that there is a crisis of confidence in the Government of Canada because of high unemployment throughout the country, business bankruptcies and personal hardship.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to take necessary action to restore confidence in the Government of Canada, that Parliament be dissolved and a general election be called immediately.

MR. HUDECKI—CONDEMNATION OF POSSIBLE INVASION OF NICARAGUA BY U.S. TROOPS

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting this petition signed by 200 constituents of Hamilton West, the majority of whom are members of the staff and students of McMaster University.

In essence, the petition expresses concern over a statement made by the U.S. Secretary of Defence who indicated that an invasion of Nicaragua by the United States and neighbouring countries was not discounted and that he considered such action as a definite option. This concern is strengthened by the mobilization of 4,000 Guatemalan troops, a massive military buildup in Honduras, militarization of Costa Rica and open support of the invasion of Nicaragua by Contras and the lack of response from the United States to peace initiatives by the Government of Nicaragua and the Contadora group. The petition requests that Parliament notify the U.S. Ambassador to Canada that Canada would condemn any invasion of Nicaragua or El Salvador by any military forces and would urge the negotiated solution of any prevailing problems.

RETENTION OF CROWSNEST PASS RATES

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of petitions that I wish to present this afternoon to the House of Commons. Since they all reflect a similar concern, rather than read each one I will read the covering page of the petition and just name the communities in which the petitions have been received in order to speed up presentation in the House this afternoon.

Mr. Fisher: Why be any different today?

Mr. Anguish: These petitions are to the House of Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled. If the Liberals would like me to read each one in the House, I would certainly be more than happy to do that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would encourage the Hon. Member to proceed as he indicated and the Chair would express its appreciation.

• (1510)

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, these petitions are addressed to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned residents of the Province of Saskatchewan, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that the undersigned have carefully considered the alternate plan presented by the New Democratic Party, that the Crow rate must be maintained and that the railways of all Canada must be upgraded and developed into a modern and efficient transportation system.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to adopt the provisions of the New

Democratic Party's alternate plan which will not change the Crowsnest Pass Freight Rate Agreement. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

At this point in time I suppose they would have to find a different Government to honour the wishes of the petitioners.

The first petition I have comes from residents of Flaxcombe and Waseca.

The next petition I have is signed by residents of Lashburn and Unity, Saskatchewan.

The next petition is signed by residents of Rosetown, Herschel and Saskatoon.

The next petition is signed by residents of Dodsland and Rosetown.

The next petition I have is signed by residents of the Macrorie and Outlook areas.

The next petition comes from residents of the community of Kyle and area.

The next petition is signed by residents of Biggar, Province of Saskatchewan.

The next petition I have is signed by residents of Lloydminster, Saskatchewan.

The next petition is also from residents of Lloydminster, Saskatchewan.

The next petition is signed by residents of the Lucky Lake area, Saskatchewan.

The next petition I have is again signed by residents of the Lucky Lake area.

The next petition I have is signed by residents of Marshall, Saskatchewan.

The next petition is signed by residents of Unity, Saskatchewan.

The next petition is signed by residents of Lashburn, Marshall and Lloydminster.

The next petition is from residents of Holden, Alberta, Marshall, Saskatchewan, Lone Rock and Paradise Valley, Alberta.

The next petition is signed by residents of Kindersley and area.

The next petition is from the Kindersley and Rosetown area.

The next petition is from Rosetown, Saskatchewan.

The next petition is from Dinsmore, Saskatchewan.

The next petition is from Biggar, Saskatchewan.

The next petition is from Handel, Saskatchewan.

The next petition is again from Handel, Saskatchewan.

The next petition comes from the Kerrobert and Luseland areas.

The next petition comes from Landis, Saskatchewan.

The next petition comes from Beechy, Saskatchewan.

The last petition comes from residents of North Battleford, Lloydminster and Handel, Saskatchewan.

MR. ANGUISH—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have one other petition to present this afternoon which has a bit of a different thrust. I will conclude after presenting this petition.

I would like to present this petition to the House of Commons today, signed by some 465 residents of the Province of British Columbia who support the passage of Private Member's Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone, standing in my name. The petitioners stress that multilateral disarmament must occur in order to secure peace in the world. If Canada is traditionally a peaceful nation, Canada must play a crucial role in achieving multilateral disarmament. The petition calls on the Parliament of Canada to debate and pass Bill C-678, which would prevent testing of the Cruise missile in Canada and thereby allow Canada to act as a serious mediator in worldwide disarmament processes and engage in talks along with other countries that would wish to participate in such a forum.

* * * * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving the time of the House I once again make the same suggestion, without creating any precedent, that you simply ask any Members who may have notices standing in their name to rise if they wish to do so. I do not think you will find any rising. We are all so anxious to hear the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien) in his first public bid in this House for the leadership that we really want to get to it as quickly as possible.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer that the proper procedure be followed.

Motions stand.

* * *

● (1520)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 5,248 and 5,328.

[*Text*]

HIRING OF CONSULTANTS BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Question No. 5,248—**Mr. Blenkarn:**

1. In the fiscal year (a) 1981-82 (b) 1982-83 were outside consultants employed by the Department of Justice and, if so (i) how many (ii) what was the total amount paid?

2. Were any consultants paid more than $20,000 and, if so, in each case what (a) was his/her name (b) was the amount (c) services were provided?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned:

1. (a) (i) two, (ii) $62,989.

(b) (i) 11, (ii) $147,621.96.

2.

1981-82		
Price Waterhouse Associates	$36,089	Support staff requirement study
Peat Marwick and Partners	26,900	E.D.P. Study
1982-83		
Price Waterhouse Associates	$44,500	Support staff to Officer ratio study
Peat Marwick and Partners	23,748	Development of an improved legal information system Phase II
Touche, Ross and Partners	23,327.20	Study of Department Management Information Requirement

LIAISON AND INTEGRATION SECRETARIAT

Question No. 5,328—**Mr. St. Germain:**

What is the mandate of the Provincial Analysis and Liaison Secretariat of the Federal-Provincial Relations Office?

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The mandate of the Liaison and Integration Secretariat (formerly the Provincial Analysis and Liaison Secretariat) is to ensure effective flows of information and data on provincial and regional concerns, views and initiatives in order to provide timely and accurate assessments of the current status of federal-provincial relations at the national, regional and provincial levels and to identify any emerging issues affecting federal-provincial relations in each of the Provinces.

The Secretariat also co-ordinates the preparation of briefing material for major undertakings (for example, First Ministers' Conferences and bilateral meetings between the Prime Minister and Premiers), and for the provision of advice on specific federal-provincial issues of major importance.

Further, as part of the liaison and integration function, the Secretariat also has responsibility for managing the Prime Minister's correspondence with each of the Premiers.

[*English*]

Mr. Evans: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Parliamentary Secretary could tell me when he expects we will have an answer to question No. 5,015 which relates to the standards, if any, followed by the Prime Minister when he appoints Members to his Cabinet. I wonder, more particularly, whether the Parliamentary Secretary could assure me if this straightforward and simple question could be answered before the Prime Minister leaves again.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I will look into that particular question. Unfortunately I can give the Right Hon. Member no such assurance. However, I am sure the Prime Minister will want to answer that question at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet perhaps I could answer the question raised with me by the Hon. Member for Yukon earlier concerning the order of business for Thursday and Friday.

I have now checked and I have discovered that we will resume second reading of Bill C-170, which is the fisheries Bill; and, should we be able to dispose of that Bill, we would move on to second reading of Bill C-91, an Act to amend the Public Works Act and the Public Lands Grants Act. Then, should we be so fortunate as to dispose of that piece of legislation, we would move on to the resumption of second reading debate on Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Financial Administration Act.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62(9)—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—GOVERNMENT LEGISLATIVE ACTION

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Nielsen:

That this House condemns the Government for having taken high-handed and antidemocratic actions in this session and for having proceeded, without a mandate and through the imposition of closure, to abolish the historic Crow Rate, to impose measures relating to taxes on petroleum and natural gas, to cap old age pensions, to create Canagrex, to limit increases in family allowance payments, to change income tax laws, and to increase public debt through additional borrowing and calls upon the Government to seek a mandate by calling a general election without delay.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to take part in today's debate on an Opposition motion of censure, because in the motion as drafted by the Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), who this morning made a speech that had no connection whatsoever with the motion before the House, he referred to the energy issue, thus giving me a chance to rise in the House today and comment on this particular subject. In fact, I wish to thank my hon. colleague from Yukon, the Opposition House Leader, most sincerely for giving me an opportunity that is becoming scarce in the House, especially in view of the kind of abuse that is going on in the House of Commons as we saw with a list of petitions that took twenty or 50 minutes to read, and all that only to say that they were not proceeding with the motion as proposed. I think that is really abusing the rules of the House. In so doing, Members make it extremely difficult for Government Members and Ministers to speak before the House.

In any case, to get back to the motion, I think that if the Parliamentary House Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party had given the matter more thought and read up on current events, he would have realized that by referring in his motion to energy policies, he was giving me a chance to bring up what the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech last week in Calgary—two days later, he did a complete about-face and said that in this field as in any other, he had no policy whatsoever.

[*English*]

It was very interesting to see what happened last week. On Tuesday, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) made a speech in which I felt he enunciated the new energy policy of his Party. He was talking in Calgary and he became somewhat excited. It was amusing to be in Ottawa the day after and see the people in his office running around and telling people that what he said was not what he said, that it was not what he meant if he said it, and what not. It was also amusing to hear the poor Member who represented him before the committee which was discussing Canadianization say: "What my Leader said yesterday is not the policy of my Party". It was fun to see what happened last week.

Last week, after two and a half months in the House of Commons, the Leader of the Opposition was to enunciate a policy. I have been told that he has not met with the press or had a press conference since becoming Leader. His strategy is well known—he will not say anything on anything. When I heard that he made a fantastic speech on energy policy in Calgary, I became excited too. It took a few days before they produced a text. They had some problems with taping and not taping, erasing and not erasing. I do not know what happened, but it was kind of funny to see their organization there. I looked at it and thought that he might be "on". I thought that at last the Leader of the Opposition might tell us something on a subject of vital interest to Canadians. He spoke about energy. It was a great subject on which to speak because he

was in Alberta. He made a speech to please the Alberta audience.

I thought at least the Leader of the Opposition, who aspires to becoming Prime Minister of Canada, would check his facts a little. We understand that some Members of the House, when they have to fill a gap just to kill a bill or not let a piece of legislation pass, can speak and not give a damn about the substance of their speeches. However, when the Leader of the Opposition makes his first speech on energy policy, we feel he should offer something at which the people of Canada can look.

I want to highlight some of the points he made. Just to indicate the kind of fun we can have with it, he spoke about the back-in policy, that famous policy where the Canadian Government is saying that after a discovery it will buy back its position for 25 per cent.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Buy?

Mr. Chrétien: Yes, we pay.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That is a new policy.

Mr. Chrétien: No, you do not know.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I know.

Mr. Chrétien: The Hon. Member will learn a lot if he listens.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: I am listening.

Mr. Chrétien: As a former Minister of Energy, he should shut up if he does not know that. One of the funny parts is that he said he would abolish the back-in. I reflected on that and remembered that not long ago I dealt with the Premier of Newfoundland on the question of trying to reach an agreement with that Province on offshore resources. I proposed that we should have a back-in of 25 per cent, something according to the policy of the Tories in Ottawa to which they were opposed. One difficulty I had with Premier Peckford was that he wanted a back-in of 40 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Chrétien: Yes, he wanted a back-in of 40 per cent; 25 per cent was not enough. He said that I was not allocating enough; he wanted 40 per cent.

What will happen when the Leader of the Opposition moves east? He made a speech in Alberta. When he goes to Newfoundland, it will be very interesting to hear what he will say to Brian Peckford about it. What will he do when he arrives in Halifax? There is another Tory Premier there, Mr. John Buchanan. He telephoned me not long ago—and his officials were in Ottawa as well—to ask: "When, Mr. Chrétien, will you proceed with the Bill which will confirm the agreement between Canada and Nova Scotia on offshore oil and gas?" I said: "Why is it so urgent?" It is because he wants to have right now his share of the back-in. It is very urgent for him to develop his policy so that he can get his back-in. What will the Leader of the Opposition do if he becomes Prime Minister and deals with Mr. Peckford and Mr. Buchanan on the back-in, which he says he will withdraw because his friends tell him that he should? Of course, multinationals are very important to him. When he received orders from Cleveland to close down Schefferville, he said: "Yes, ready I am". Not only did he close the mine, Mr. Speaker, he closed the whole town. However, that is only one point.

• (1530)

Another point I would like to mention is that he spoke about the taxes. He said that the taxation was a grab and a steal in the middle of the night. I was amazed. I asked myself what the share of the industry was some years ago and I looked it up because it is good to have the facts. In 1977, oil and gas revenue was a 45 per cent share of the industry. That was in the good old days before the NEP. In 1978, again before the NEP, it was 46 per cent. In 1979, when the Hon. Member was the Minister of Energy, it was 41 per cent. Now, after the NEP, do you know how much the industry is getting from oil and gas revenue, Mr. Speaker? Not 45 per cent, not the 41 per cent it got under the Tories, but today it is getting 52 per cent.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chrétien: Even so, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) says that we are taking too much and that it is almost a steal. He spoke about robbing somebody at three o'clock in the morning. Again his facts were wrong.

He spoke about other things that were very important. He said that it was terrible—and I agree with him—that there are 81 different categories of oil. He said that that makes no sense and that he will change it. However, I have discovered the facts. It is very complex, but this rule was established by the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission. The Government has nothing to do with it. It is his friends in Alberta who have established a system with 81 different categories of oil. Again, the very learned Leader of the Opposition had the facts wrong and blamed the federal Government for the mistakes of Peter Lougheed. I think he should check his facts a little more.

Let me cite another example. The Leader of the Opposition said that the federal Government has failed to stimulate new markets for natural gas. I would like to tell him again that he should check his facts. Who does not know that in the gas policy agreement we have signed with the Alberta Government, we have jointly agreed that the price of natural gas will not be more than 65 per cent of the price of oil in Toronto? That is an agreement that was reached between the Government of Alberta and the Government of Canada. It was reached in order to expand the gas market in eastern Canada.

We had all sorts of what we call off-oil programs designed to stimulate the demand or utilization of natural gas in the East. You know about the programs that allow for private home owners to get grants from the Government to convert from oil to gas, Mr. Speaker. We have built pipelines to expand the market in Quebec.

[*Translation*]

All the Members from Quebec know about it. To date, we have spent over half a billion dollars on expanding the gas pipeline network in Quebec. The pipeline has now been built as far as Quebec City and Sherbrooke, and it will soon reach the Lac-Saint-Jean area, I hope, if we can get enough contracts. The Member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Gimaïel) and his colleagues are putting pressure on me daily about this, but my answer is: pressure the companies to sign and then we can build another pipeline extension. We even built an extension as far as Lachute, where it was not even supposed to go, but we managed, following representations by the Member for Lachute. And, Mr. Speaker, just to show that we are not partisan, the pipeline even goes as far as the riding of Joliette. He cannot criticize us, since it helps increase sales.

Mr. Speaker, of course I could go on with my comments on the natural gas issue, but my time is limited. Ironically, we worked together with the Government of Alberta to expand markets in Canada. Of course, he is also condemning the Government because, according to him, we were not successful in sales to the United States. Perhaps I may remind him that everything we have done in the past year in the field of natural gas and gas sales to the United States was done in close co-operation with the provincial governments.

[*English*]

Everything we have done in relation to the situation with the United States in terms of marketing gas has been done after lengthy consultations with the Alberta Government. We reduced the price to $4.40 and we have given an incentive price of $3.40 for volumes above a base level quantity. Last month, we again changed another mechanism to measure natural gas on a monthly basis rather than on a yearly basis in order to meet the demands of the industry and the Governments of Alberta and British Columbia. All that has been done in close consultation with the Provinces. However, the situation in the gas industry has not been caused by the federal Government. It has been caused by the international situation. There are huge bubbles of gas in the United States and so there is no demand for gas. The election of another Government will not change the situation in the United States.

I would like to know something from the Official Opposition. I am glad to see that the energy critic is present in the House. We know that she is a good writer. When she was with the press, she used to work for the federal Government in the North.

Miss Carney: That's a lie, not true, never.

Mr. Chrétien: She is touchy. She never received any money from the federal Government.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: She said it was the opposite of the truth.

Mr. Chrétien: We know that she can write. We hope that she will tell us, after consultations with her Leader, if the Conservative Party wants us to sell Canadian natural gas to Americans cheaper than to Canadians. That will be very interesting for us to know.

We would like to know what the Official Opposition will do about these problems. For example, today the Alberta government wants to deregulate the price of oil but it does not want to deregulate the price of gas. That is the position taken by the Alberta Government. Mr. Lougheed wants to deregulate the price of oil but not the price of gas. On the other hand—I was at a meeting last week with Premier Davis and Mr. Lougheed—Mr. Davis wants to deregulate the price of gas but does not want to deregulate the price of oil. That is a nice little problem for Mr. Mulroney to solve. At least he can pass an objective judgment, but he is trapped between the two.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order! Perhaps I may remind the Hon. Minister that he must refer to his colleagues in the House by the name of their riding or their position, not by their own names.

[*English*]

Mr. Chrétien: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I thought my time was up. It is not quite over and that is good.

That is the type of problem that the Leader of the Opposition will be facing sooner or later. He will have to decide between the opinions of these two leaders.

The Leader of the Opposition made another point that I believe needs some clarification. He said that the biggest problem was that there was very little activity in the oil and gas industry in Canada and that all of the rigs were idle. I would like to tell the people that in the oil exploration industry at its peak in 1980, there were 2,081 wells completed in Canada according to an *Oil Week* source. In 1983, there were 3,136 oil wells completed in Canada. Of course, there was a big decline in gas wells for the very valid reason that the market in the United States is such that the Americans cannot take any more gas. There is so large a surplus of natural gas that it is useless for people to drill for more gas. In western Canada, there are 17 trillion cubic feet of gas in excess of our needs for the next 25 years so far. I do not blame the oil and gas industry when it does not drill for gas, but there was a big increase in oil drilling.

What is the story in the United States? According to the Official Opposition, the oil and gas industry has slowed down somewhat because of the NEP. The Government in the United States is not socialist and there is no NEP there. The number of wells drilled in the United States decreased from 4,530 in 1981 to 1,807 in 1983, a drop of 60 per cent. That was in the United States and it was not because of the NEP. It was only because the oil and gas situation in the world has not been what it once was.

● (1540)

The point is that for the first time we heard the Leader of the Opposition making all sorts of innuendoes without check-

ing his facts. It was amusing because the night after that he went to Edmonton. During the day there was quite a scramble. They said it was not what he had said. When he went to Edmonton, he had nothing to say other than that he would have a new energy policy. Canadians have a right to know what he would do about it.

The Opposition critic of my Department is always talking about PIP grants. Last week I was in St. John's, Newfoundland. The drillers, Husky and Bow Valley, said at a press conference that if there were no PIP grants, they could not afford to drill there. Are the Conservatives saying that if they come to power, they will stop the drilling off the coast of Newfoundland and off the coast of Nova Scotia and there will be no more Canadianization of the oil and gas industry?

An Hon. Member: They will give it all to the Americans.

Mr. Chrétien: Yes, they might. He said there would be no more discrimination between Canadians and Americans. If they do that, we will be back to the good old days when everything in the oil and gas industry in Canada was controlled by the Americans.

We have made progress. Let me give an example. Canadian ownership is now 38 per cent compared to 28 per cent three years ago. Sixty per cent of the Canada lands today is owned by Canadians compared to what it was a few years ago. Are they against Canadianization? We want to know that. Are they against self-sufficiency and security of supply? How do they reconcile the differences between Mr. Lougheed and Mr. Davis? What will they say to Mr. Peckford who wants a 40 per cent back-in? What will they say to Mr. Buchanan who wants his 25 per cent shares right away on the back-in? Canadians have a right to know. They want more than negative statements. They have the right to know. The NEP is a fundamental policy of this Government.

When dealing with the industry and what I have done over the past 12 to 15 months, I told them that I would not change the policy but would adjust it. I said I would give them stability. The industry is asking for stability, not a change of policy on a daily basis. That is exactly what we have done. We managed to get an agreement with Alberta in July without any flak. Mr. Mulroney pretends—

Some Hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Chrétien: I am sorry. I have known him a long time. Canadians have the right to know what they will do.

In the last 15 months there has been a lot of stability in the industry. Last week the Leader of the Opposition did a great disservice to the industry by creating complete confusion. Within 24 hours he had to backtrack. I hope that his critic will tell us today what that Party intends to do. The people know what we want to do. We want self-sufficiency and security of supply for Canadians. We want to Canadianize the industry.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister. I have a letter dated February 18, 1983, addressed to Mr. Brian Mulroney, President, Iron Ore Company of Canada, Montreal, in the Minister's Province. It reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Mulroney:

Thank you for your letter, dated January 24, 1983, setting out some possibilities for the future of Schefferville.

Firstly, I have noted with great interest your company's compensation and relocation program for the workers affected by the closure of your Schefferville operation. I think that your actions in this regard are commendable.

Your proposals for a new industrial base for Schefferville appear to have good potential and are worth serious attention. Because of their diverse scope, I shall be transmitting them to the appropriate federal departments in order to get their views and opinions on the subject.

A representative from E.M.R. was present at the Parliamentary Commission in Schefferville, and I am expecting a summary of the proposals submitted to the Commission. Hopefully, it will permit me to assess in more detail what possible role participants of the federal government could have in the suggested development committee. For the moment, we cannot name a specific representative for you, but once the committee and its mandate are defined, it should be possible to indicate an appropriate contact.

I would like to assure you that your efforts in diversifying the economic base of Schefferville are of high interest to me and that Energy, Mines and Resources Canada will do what it can to support your efforts.

We emphasize the sentence "I think that your actions in this regard are commendable". Does the Minister agree with the sentiments set forth in that letter?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, he closed the town of Schefferville. We all know that he tried to do something about it. Most of the programs were developed in collaboration with the federal Government. I did not say that he did not try to relocate the people. Most of the programs were financed by the federal Government. The fact is that he closed the mine. Of course he tried to reduce the problem somewhat. That is natural. We offered our help, our programs and so on.

This morning the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) accused us of being somewhat reddish. The proposal of the Leader of the Opposition was to do something along the lines of what is done in Russia, that we apply to Schefferville a technique used in Russia to repair the damage there. If the Hon. Member wants to be fair to the Leader of the Opposition, there is a very easy way of doing that. Why does the Leader of the Opposition not run for election there? The people of that area will give him an answer. He could go to that town with his smooth voice where he could be judged. The people of that riding will show him what they think about what he has done.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Before again recognizing the Hon. Member for Yukon, the Chair would like to observe that both the question and the comments were rather lengthy.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, my question was not brief because the rules prohibited me from tabling the letter, which I would like to do. I had to read the text, which was fairly brief. My question is simply whether the Minister agrees with the sentiments in the letter, particularly, "I think that your actions in this regard are commendable".

I was going to get the answer and then point out to the Minister that the letter was signed by his colleague, the present Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs.

Erola). As far as her sentiments expressed on behalf of the Government of Canada are concerned, it seems that the actions of the then president, Mr. Mulroney, at that time with respect to the Schefferville closure were commendable.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, it was a novel expression of desire, after he put everyone there on welfare, that he wanted to do something about it. It is commendable. However, it would have been more commendable if he had persuaded his American friends to keep the mine open.

Miss Carney: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister a question. I understand from his remarks, which I first caught over television, that he again said that the Leader of the Opposition had said that he would abolish or scrap the NEP. Is the Minister aware that that misquote which occurred last week has been retracted by Canadian Press? Is he aware that an editorial has appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* pointing out that the press misused the Leader of the Opposition? With all the resources at his command, was the Minister not aware that the Leader of the Opposition was misquoted in the press when he said that he was going to abolish the NEP?

● (1550)

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I find that extremely funny because he did not use that word. I am happy that he will keep it as his policy. The Hon. Member is saying that there will be no abandonment of the policy, but he said, "The programs concocted to implement them constitute the most self-defeating pile of tax"—I am glad that they will keep it—"and red tape which has ever been unleashed upon a single industry or sector in the history of this country". Now he says he will do nothing—

Miss Carney: Point of Order.

Mr. Chrétien: —after using that crazy type of language. If he thinks it is so bad, why not come clean and tell us? He is using some big words like that and then telling us he will not do anything. What I want to tell the Hon. Member is that I challenge her to give us the policy of her Party as to what it will do with the back-in. What will it do with the back-in in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia? I would like to know.

Mr. Rossi: Stand up and say it.

Mr. Evans: She said, abolish it.

Mr. Chrétien: If that Party has a policy, I would like to see it in writing. If it will be as the Hon. Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. Dick) said the other day, "We will only change the name", then let them invite me to the baptism and we will have a glass of champagne together. If it is just changing the name, then there is no problem. As long as they keep the same policy, God bless them.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien) on the kick-off to his election campaign for the leadership of his Party, although I believe he is going to have to do better than that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The Hon. Member for Vancouver Centre rises on a point of order.

Miss Carney: I am sorry to interrupt my colleague, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to point out that the Minister has deliberately misled this House on various points this afternoon. He misquoted—

Mr. Fisher: Let us have the point of order.

Miss Carney: The Minister has misled this House. I withdraw the word "deliberately". He obviously is ignorant of events in his field. He misled the House when he said that I had been paid as a journalist by the federal Government. He misled the House when he said that Mr. Mulroney said that all the drilling has halted, and he misled the House when he said that Mr. Mulroney had said that we would abolish the NEP.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. That is hardly a point of order. Those are points of debate.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, instead of throwing a bit of mud back on the floor, I would like to ask the Minister how the National Energy Program is really working. The megaprojects are not working in the tarsands, the big megaprojects. The Alaska pipeline is not going on as promised. The National energy policy was built on rising world prices, whereas we had falling world prices. The NEP, in fact, in its pricing policy, is in a shambles. I would also like to put to the Minister the fact that for all the much vaunted Canadian ownership, I am told—and these are figures from the Minister—that since the program came into being in 1980, Canadian ownership of oil and gas production has increased to 38 per cent from 28 per cent. That is, 62 per cent of our industry is still foreign-controlled. Would the Minister not agree with me that in fact the national energy policy has been quite a colossal failure and we have not achieved Canadian self-sufficiency or 50 per cent Canadian ownership of our industry? Why, then, in the name of Heaven, is the Minister giving the oil industry $2 billion in PIP grants and another $5 billion in the next five years in PIP grants, which surely must make it the biggest welfare bum in the country? Why does the Minister go to Calgary—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

Mr. Chrétien: There is a very simple answer, Mr. Speaker. There is nothing the Canadian Government can do about the international situation regarding the price of oil. It was not done by us. It was done across the board in all the nations of the world. I believe it is not necessarily bad. I believe it is good that the price of oil is not going up to $60 or $70 a barrel. I believe the general public of Canada will appreciate that we are not faced with that problem.

In spite of the difficulty, this year we have signed an agreement with the Government of Saskatchewan for an

upgrader of $600 million. We have the Cold Lake project, which will go between $300 million and $1.5 billion. The Wolf Lake project is $200 million, and on the Syncrude expansion over five years there will be a spending of $1.5 billion. These are not small projects in the oil and gas industry. I would like to tell the Hon. Member that for the first time in years, in 1982 Canadians have produced as much oil as we have consumed. We have 17 trillion cubic feet of gas in surplus, so we are in a much better position today than we were five years ago, and he has to recognize that fact.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: You would not know the truth if it came up and kicked you in the shins.

Hon. David Crombie (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, since the Question Period, much of the debate has centred on one small part of the motion dealing with energy and gas prices. I thought I might begin my remarks by simply refocusing on the essence of the motion. The motion called for the Government to seek a mandate by calling a general election. That is the essence of the motion.

An Hon. Member: Any time.

Mr. Forrestall: How about tomorrow morning?

Mr. Crombie: The motion says that this House wants to have an election. This morning the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) indicated that in his view the motion calling for an election was "frivolous, irrelevant and makes no sense". I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and Hon. Members of this House, that so far as I understand the people of this country, and certainly the people in my own riding, the Minister of Transport is dead wrong when he thinks the people of this country do not want an election. People in this country desperately want an election, Mr. Speaker. I believe, indeed, that if every Hon. Member of this House thought about this for a second and remembered the last time he was in his own constituency, particularly during the week of recess, and he took the same opportunity that many of us did, he would know exactly how his constituents feel. People in the constituency of Rosedale, people in the constituencies of Toronto where I spent that week, want a change. They want a change badly. If you listen to those people in the constituencies they will tell you things you need to hear about whether or not we need an election. I listened to the people in my own constituency all week long. I believe that every Hon. Member would have had the same experience as myself in listening to what they had to say. They have concern, Mr. Speaker. Their number one concern is jobs and financial security. That is the first concern of the people I talked to.

There is, Mr. Speaker, 11.1 per cent unemployed in this country. There are 1,346,000 people counted who are unemployed. If you add those who live in areas of the country where there is no opportunity for work at all, the figure is well over 1.5 million people without work. People need to have a job in order to look after their responsibilities. It is something which goes to the very core of the lives of people. What they have had for four years as of February, in the face of that awesome unemployment, is words, words, words; numbers, numbers, numbers, and programs no end. With all the words, all the numbers and all the programs, the reason that the people do not believe the Government, Mr. Speaker, is that they know a hard fact, which is that beneath all those programs and pronouncements by Ministers, there is the underlying reality of chronic unemployment in this country which will not go away, and which is scaring hell out of people.

When you ask the people, Mr. Speaker, they will tell you that their first concern is jobs and financial security. Twenty-four point four per cent of the people under the age of 25 and who have finished their education are without a job. Is that not a great way to start out in this country, knowing that no matter how hard you try or how much education you have, 25 per cent of you are going to be unemployed?

• (1600)

Mr. Evans: Not true.

Mr. Crombie: It is true. The Hon. Member will understand if he remembers that I said it was those who had finished their education.

Mr. Evans: It is not true.

Mr. Crombie: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, it is the people between the ages of 55 and 64 who are without jobs. How many Members of this House have talked to those people who know the prospects for re-employment get dimmer and dimmer as they get older? That is why this is not a debate about some frivolous thing about whether or not someone said something or someone said something else. The first concern that people have is jobs and financial security. That is the first reason they want an election.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, people talk about taxes. My constituents talk to me about taxes and I know they talk to Hon. Members about taxes.

Mr. Fisher: Yes, all those Rosedale—

Mr. Crombie: The Hon. Member says "Rosedale". If he knew more about the city he came from, which is supposed to be Toronto, he would understand that in my riding we have people who have been waiting for years for this Government to produce what is promised. What bothers them most about taxes is not only that they are too high. No matter what level of Government you are in, taxes are always too high. Whether they are working people, small business people, artists and writers, they know the system is no longer fair and equitable. It is unjust, unfair and unworkable. That is why when they look at taxes they say to themselves, how is it that a system could go so wrong in such a short space of time? This is an important matter, Mr. Speaker, because in our system of Government taxes are voluntary. The only way people will voluntarily pay their taxes is if they feel the system is fair and just. But they do not see that. What they see is a Department of National Revenue which is just about out of control.

Two weeks ago we had a motion from the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), to which this House agreed unanimously, to examine the unjust and unworkable rules applying to artists and writers in this country in the face of the reinterpretation of the law by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Bussières). Despite that, the Minister and his Department continue to apply those rules. He made the interpretation, he can change it, but he does not. That is one example of why people in this country are increasingly trying to avoid taxes in ways which they would not have contemplated in the past. As they do that, the Department becomes more oppressive and makes the assumption that people are guilty until proven innocent. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that when you talk to people in my constituency, indeed in every constituency, there is going to be a day of reckoning for this Government when it tries to explain how it let loose the Department of National Revenue and the way it has been going for the last couple of years.

The third thing my constituents talk about is peace, Mr. Speaker. Peace is not a Party matter. There is no one, whether it is from the NDP, the Liberal or the Conservative Parties, who has a monopoly on or concern for peace. It is an issue which transcends this House and our politics. Everyone I have talked to feels the same way no matter what his role in life. They are more frightened these days because they read in the paper, hear on the radio and watch on television a kind of slow escalation. That is why, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced he was going on a mission to see what he could do with respect to world peace, I know how my constituents felt. They wished him well. Better than that, some of them prayed for him because they need peace and want it so badly. That is why it was even more incumbent than normal on the Prime Minister to bring what he found out to the House and allow the House, and therefore all the people of this country, to deal with the matter as best we can at this time. Peace is not a question of Party, it is not a monopoly of any Party. In a way, not bringing it to this House diminished the Prime Minister's mission. He still has an opportunity and I hope he takes it.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, my constituents talk about the Government and Parliament. I do not think it will come as a surprise to any Member here that they are very skeptical. They do not trust the Government to understand their problems, and they are skeptical of this House's ability to solve those problems. The more the Government and this House become removed from the people, the more people do not pay any attention to it and the more the national community begins to divide. That is why far more people than I would have thought—and I ask Hon. Members to think about their own constituencies—paid attention to the issue of parliamentary reform. They know that this is the one national free institution which will allow us to deal with our problems. They know it still ought to be what John Stuart Mill once called it, the nation's committee of grievances and its committee of concerns. That is why they supported parliamentary reform, and that is why it was supported by all Party representatives on the committee concerned. That is why they are also concerned about why the work of that committee has not proceeded. They know it is only this institution which can help.

Not only do they have concerns about jobs, taxes, peace and the future of our institutions, but they also know what they want. That is not always the same thing and it is not always explained in the same way, but what they want is something very vague and not something small. If I can put it in a few words, Mr. Speaker, they want to start again. They want a rebirth, a renaissance, a revitalization of this country. Nothing less. That is what they are looking for today. They want world class investments, world class skills and world class markets. They want a Government responsive to their needs and to their concerns. They want a Parliament which reflects their thinking, not the internal bickering. They want the tax system reformed so that it is just and fair. They want peace unencumbered by Party politics. They want jobs and financial security for themselves and their children, and they want that fast. Above all, Mr. Speaker, they want hope for the future of this country and they want to have pride in this country. They are sick and tired of region pitted against region, of intolerant groups trying to impose views on other groups. They want what the Constitution promised them 116 years ago: peace, order and good Government.

• (1610)

In 1946 a great Canadian historian offered a very small and modest thought. It is so apt. He said:

> In every generation Canadians have had to rework the miracle of their political existence. Canada has been created because there has existed within the hearts of its people, a determination to build for themselves an enduring home.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that the constituents of Rosedale, the people in Toronto with whom I talked, and I am sure all the constituents of all the Members of this House, want to have an election is that they want to get on with building that future, and this Government is in the road.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Questions? Comments? The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans).

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I am always elevated by the speeches of the Hon. Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie). I was disturbed by some of the comments he made with regard to the unemployment statistics. Is he confident that youth unemployment for educated youth who have gone through university and high school is 25 per cent? The latest figures I have seen indicate that the only group for which that figure is true is that of students who have not completed high school. For university graduates the unemployment rate is around 11 per cent. While it is unacceptable, for high school graduates the rate is around 18 per cent. The over-all average youth unemployment rate today is not 25 per cent but 18 per cent. This is still totally unacceptable but it is far less than the figure that the Hon. Member was putting forward as being the youth unemployment rate in this country.

Mr. Crombie: Mr. Speaker, I used the Government's own statistics, not mine. I think the record will show that I carefully said it is the category dealing with youth who have finished their education, whether it is high school, public school or university. Twenty-four point four is the figure I have. If that is not true then I will correct *Hansard*.

Mr. Evans: It is wrong.

Mr. Crombie: If I could add, that is the figure which I took out of the Government statistics. If that figure is right then of course I would be happy to accept an apology from my hon. friend.

Mr. Evans: I would be happy to offer it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Debate.

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I too listened with interest to the comments made by the Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie). I thought they were thin. We will read his comments here with interest. He stood in the House and told us what people want. That is substantial and that is important. He did not tell us anything about what he believes. He did not tell us anything about what he would do. While trying to pretend that he was offering something to people, he acutally failed the real test. He did not offer the people of this country his positive views and thereby give them an opportunity to judge which course of action they would like.

Mr. Speaker, that is the whole character of this motion and this debate. This is political fluff today. It is a waste of time. It is a rag-tag collection of tired clichés. We have seen this motion in the House over the over again. The Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen), the man who signed the motion, is a typical Tory. The motion and his speech today really represent his best contributions. He has a highly specialized skill, the skill of opposing. They offer no facts. They certainly offer no economic facts. If they were to take some of their statements out of the House and into the private sector they would not have a prayer of getting a job, because some of these statements do not hold water and do not earn anybody's respect. In the House those same statements are used to threaten courses of action and to threaten the basis for the livelihood and prosperity of some of our people.

The *Mississauga News* saw this very clearly and they treated the whole thing in a symbolic way recently. The Member for Yukon visited my riding. When he came, they ran his picture on November 2 and said the following things about him:

> Conservative House Leader Erik Nielsen was the guest speaker last week at a fund-raising dinner for Mississauga North federal candidate Bob Horner. Nielsen was late for the dinner because of a filibuster in the House of Commons Friday.

They did not say anything about his speech because he did not say anything in his speech. They did not say anything about the crowd who were there. I am told the crowd was not big enough to start a fight. That is so typical of the Conservative Party.

On the same weekend the Liberal Party in my riding held a dinner as well. We charged the 500 people $5 a couple, and we made money. The Tory Party charged $75 and served up a guy whose description in the newspaper is solely limited to that of a man who contributes to a filibuster in the House of Commons. That is all they have to say about him. That is all we can say about the Opposition in its offerings today. It is a filibuster. It is empty fluff. They are only for their capacity to oppose.

This same hollow motion and this same hollow speech have been repeated now for 20 years. For 20 years the Tory Party has been losing the very elections that it calls for in this motion. The same defeats follow the same hollow ideas.

I was quite amused the other day at a comment from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in answer to a recent question on the economy in the House of Commons. Statistics Canada had just reported some more good economic news and the Prime Minister stood up and said:

> I was wondering this morning how the Opposition would manage to seek grief because unemployment had fallen for the seventh consecutive month and the figures are good and encouraging. I am interested in seeing that the Opposition can still put a sad face on good news.

That is exactly what we are seeing in this motion today. This imaginary tale of woe flies in the face of the reality in our country. It flies in the face of the fact that our economy is recovering. It flies in the face of enormous consumer confidence that is building and helping to regenerate that recovery. It flies in the face of serious attack against the unemployment tragedy in our country. It flies in the face of positive policies that are bringing back our positive economic strength.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Let's have an election.

Mr. Fisher: What are those policies? Policies like the 6 and 5 program in the general anti-inflation fight that got rid of one of the worst economic diseases ever to strike our country.

An Hon. Member: Brought on by a Liberal Government.

Mr. Fisher: Policies like our short-term job creation program that are helping people facing severe disaster in their own lives. Policies brought out in the April budget that generated and rekindled business confidence. Policies like the special recovery projects that are speeding up Government investment and bringing it on line now when it is needed. Policies like our ongoing emphasis on trade and international relations. Those are the policies that this imaginary tale of woe flies in the face of.

My friend from Halifax called out that he would like an election. I would remind him of something that the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker said in Lethbridge way back in 1962. He said, "I would never have been Prime Minister if the Gallup polls had their way." Perhaps in the light of all their enthusiasm across the way sparked by the Gallup poll our good friends over there would like to keep Mr. Diefenbaker's reminders in mind. The Liberal Party is proud to stand up and

base an election campaign on the policies that we followed over the past five years.

Let us compare the programs that we have offered and the kind of hollow opposition that has been offered by the other side. Mr. Speaker, we believe that Canada is part of the whole world. We believe that, despite the desire by the Opposition to overlook that very simple obvious fact. That is why the six and five program was introduced. It kept us in line with our world competitors. It helped us to keep up our standards in world trade. It helped us to rebuild our export industries and to recover the lost jobs in the export industries. It helped us to keep in step with the recovery all over the world.

• (1620)

What was the Tory Party doing when that program was introduced? They voted against it and fought against it. They spoke against it. That was the end of their contribution to anything in that vein.

We in the Party believe that Canada is part of the world. That is why we have encouraged aggressive trade policies and that is why in this Parliament we expanded the Export Development Corporation. That is why in this Parliament we initiated Canagrex. What was the Tory answer to that? Their answer was a filibuster in the House of Commons and in the committees from people like the Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) and the Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens). They could not stomach any longer the idea of supporting the Export Development Corporation, so they wanted to fight it despite the best interests of the country. They wanted to fight it to the point where the Business Council on National Issues sent a telegram, the day after another successful filibuster, pleading with the committee to get on with it because the Corporation was needed by businesses and exporters all across this country. That was the Tories' answer and that was the public's answer to their activities.

We believe that Canada is indeed part of the world. That is why we proposed a revitalized rail system. That is why we have just finished an intense debate, following two years of consultation coast to coast with Canadians on the Crow rate. Through these kinds of revitalization in our rail industry, we create the confidence that we can deliver our products to the outside world. Our customers come to believe that they can rely on us. Our customers believe that our suppliers are reliable sources of these vital products for them.

We have supported the change in the Crow rate because in this case there is a clear link between better trade, better railroads and better jobs for all Canadians. But what happened? The Tory Party voted against the Crow rate. They voted against new industry for western Canada.

Mr. Huntington: That is unbelievable.

Mr. Fisher: They voted against jobs in mining, in steel, in railroads and against suppliers for railroads. They voted against stronger industries coast to coast.

Mr. Huntington: You do not even understand what you voted for.

Mr. Fisher: They can squawk and complain but they cannot go to Trenton and tell the workers in the railroad plants down there why they held up those jobs that those people need so badly. There are no squawks. Not a comment.

Mr. Forrestall: That is a figment of your imagination.

Mr. Fisher: There is not a whimper from them now when that kind of fact is brought out. When they want an election, we will be happy to bring those gentle facts from the record to the attention of a few Canadians.

Not only do we live in an open world, we believe that we must foster and nourish Canadian industry within that context. That is why we have FIRA—to set standards and to screen applicants who want to come to Canada. It is not to keep them away or to discourage them but simply to let them know that when they invest in this country they must follow Canadian standards for the benefit of the Canadian economy and Canadian society.

That is why we have the national energy plan, so that our wealth and resources can be developed for our own use and prosperity. What do we see from the Tory Party? They want to tear down FIRA and destroy the National Energy Program. We see a leader in the Party who cannot wait to pander to every foreign carpetbagger with any kind of business idea. We see a finance critic who ran his leadership campaign recently on the entire thesis of open trade and complete vulnerability to the United States. We see the foreign critic of that Party for whom Washington's every wish is his deepest command.

We on this side of the House believe in a co-operative effort between the Government and the people to build our country. That is why we are proud to support Petro-Canada. That is why we do not want to abandon the Canadair efforts. That is why we are proud of our Crown corporations. That is why we are ready to join with business and give them incentives to become involved in vital activities.

When we examine the Tory record, we see memories of the Avro-Arrow and we hear hollow squawks about European socialism as the thin disguises for their destructive programs.

Finally, we on this side of the House believe that Canadians should have a decent safety net for the days when they personally get into trouble or when our economy gets into trouble. When one examines our record over the past year, one can see a proud record of help for Canadians in the depth of really tough economic times. We put $4.5 billion into the special recovery program. We have the National Training Act to help people whose skills are outdated or businesses which need to upgrade the skills of valuable employees. We have seen the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) put an emphasis on a decent medicare system, despite the activities of Tories in the provincial Governments from coast to coast. We have job sharing under the Unemployment Insurance Program. As well, we have the NEED Program, Canada Works and Summer Works, all of which are short term

job-creation programs intended to bridge tough times and help people have a job for a few days or weeks until their old jobs return.

But what we see in this very motion is the revealing of the real Tory attitude. Their attitude is that we should give the rich a nice tax break despite the homilies from the Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie). I would say to him again that I doubt the people in Regent Park are really worried about having some kind of special rollover provisions on our RRSPs, or other cute little tax breaks. What they want are jobs. They want a fair tax system that taxes people from coast to coast equally. We see Members on the other side propose ideas to help the rich keep their money and hide it from the taxman at the expense of the poor who must carry those burdens. No one engaged in such vitriolic debate as some of those Members when the MacEachen budget was introduced. The very heart of their complaints was that the rich would have to pay more and pay their share. That was very clear in all of their debates.

We offered a chance for a fair and more even tax system. In this motion we find that that is supposed to create a lack of confidence in the Government. What else do we see in this motion? We see a direct attack on the funding for the safety net. We see a direct attack on the use of Government resources to help people in trouble. This comes out very clearly when the two Members from St. John's rise. The Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) wrings his hands, full of pity, and the Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) says that we must cut the deficit. Who is it that has the greater power and greater influence? It is the deficit cutter, the one who wants to take a direct run at the safety and prosperity of ordinary working Canadians.

This motion is thin. The speeches we have heard, particularly the one from the Member for Yukon, are outstandingly thin. After this debate, when all of these clichés are dragged out and these tired criticisms are dragged out, we should always remember the little warning we had from Gérard Pelletier back in 1971 who told us that "Alarmism is the real temptation of opposition". That is what we are hearing in all of this. It is a faint hope that they will stir up fires and drag out discontented people without being caught in any of the real choices or real options of Government.

Let us just go down the list that I have given in my comments. Let us note that we on the Liberal side believe that Canada must take part in the entire world and not hide. The Tories voted against the six and five. They voted against the Export Development Corporation. They voted against Canagrex and against the Crow. Here on this side we believe that we must help our own economy to grow. What do the Tories do? They fight against FIRA. They vote against the National Energy Program and they try to open our doors to any kind of carpetbagger that comes along. We believe on the Liberal side that Canada must use co-operative efforts between the people and their Government. What we see is two clear-cut cases of deliberate and malicious attacks on Petro-Canada and on Canadair. On this side of the House we believe that Canada must create safety nets for ordinary Canadians. What do we see on the other side? Plaintive pleas on behalf of the rich, and deliberate attacks against the spending that funds and supports safety nets for the poor.

• (1630)

Mr. Beatty: There are poor people like Alistair Gillespie.

Mr. Fisher: The Tories want an election. Good luck. Those ideas and concepts have been dragged out and paraded before the people for 20 years, and for 20 years the Tories have been thrown back into Opposition, kicking, screaming and wondering whatever happened. I wondered. I just got curious as to what happened to the people between 1979 and 1980. I think the best answer to that can be found in the electoral record of the Hon. Member for Yukon. He was thrown into office in 1979 with a margin of 1,400 votes and thrown back in by an even more overwhelming majority in 1980 of 100 votes. The people of the Yukon are getting increasingly sick of him. They get sick of him because he has nothing to offer but criticism. Given a chance to be positive, given a chance to build and given a chance to do something creative, he and his colleagues blew it because they refused, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) is now refusing, to offer creative ideas and real choices to the Canadian people. Who knows, you may in fact find that their ideas are accepted, Mr. Speaker. But to this point they are only a question mark, and Canadians will never reward cowards. We offer vital ideas and we will stand by our record because it has been human in tough times and energetic in a time of recovery.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, so much for decorum and civility coming as close on the heels as it does in the words expressed in this Chamber as late as yesterday with respect to the necessity for civility.

I have a question for the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher). He used the expression that it was the intention to use the vast wealth from the energy of Canada for use by Canadians and for Canadians. I know the Hon. Member was in the Chamber and listening closely to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien). Could he tell me if that might include the persuasion of Government, with the immense talents the Member has, to make an adjustment in the PIP grants so we do not drive out of Canadian shipyards about 16,700 jobs that could be taken up with the construction of offshore service rigs, oil drilling rigs and, vessels for the Canadian commercial account involved in energy exploration? Is the Hon. Member for Mississauga North sufficiently familiar with this difficulty? If he is, would he respond as to whether or not that would be a useful adjustment to make so that what he did say with respect to the Canadian use of the wealth and energy might become a reality?

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, it is nice to hear a Member from Nova Scotia talk about civility in the House. I certainly hope he will take the opportunity to pass his lesson along to his colleague, the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley-Hants (Mr. Nowlan) who is always ready to drop insults and accusations

here but does not seem to be able to carry them outside the House where he is a little more vulnerable. The Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) might also want to pass his homily along to the Hon. Member for the Yukon whose best benchmark in Canadian politics is perhaps to attack his colleagues in this Chamber personally. I have only challenged him. I suppose it is uncivil in a Tory sense to do this, but I have only challenged them to come forward with some ideas. If that is uncivil, then I do indeed apologize for asking where they stand and what their ideas and beliefs are. So far the Tories have not shown us that except in the behaviour of people like the Hon. Member for the Yukon and the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley-Hants.

May I say that the Hon. Member and I engaged in a "Late Show" on this very question of PIP grants, and I would be happy to run down two or three observations for him. The Hon. Member knows, because I said it to him then and I presume he remembers, that the Canadian Government uses two checking points to try to determine that Canadian spending will happen first with that money. There must, first of all, be a serious check through both the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to make sure the PIP grant money is spent on Canadian projects.

Second, we do not intend to distort the market totally to make the people, whether in the Maritimes, British Columbia, Ontario or anywhere else, pay more because of an exclusive Canada policy. We need the check of international competition. The Hon. Member smiles. He knows it is true. He knows his own constituents would not thank us if we were to waste our money by letting these shipyards go unchecked or by letting any other industry or supplier to the Government go unchecked. He also knows there is a tremendous world glut in much of this equipment that simply ruined a lot of the shipbuilding activity. The Hon. Member also knows the Canadian Government under the Special Recovery Program has started the frigate program and the icebreaker program, and speeded them up to offset the effects of that glut and to provide some employment in some of those very shipyards.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the rambling response from the Hon. Member for Mississauga North. I asked him a simple question. He is obviously not aware of the difficulty that PIP grants cause for Canadian shipyards. I asked him whether or not he would use his office as a learned backbencher in Government to persuade the Treasury benches to make that adjustment in the PIP grants so that explorers—those out there doing the offshore work—can in fact claim their capital costs here in Canada in terms of building up their level of grant or award for this exploratory work.

Petro-Canada built its rigs here in Canada because it could not get the grant. It sold its service rigs offshore and then it was able to claim full capital costs all the way up to 80 per cent. That is what is happening in case after case. It is that question that I would like addressed. Would the Hon. Member direct himself to an adjustment in the program that would allow rigs, service ships and other equipment built in Canada, to qualify at the same level rather than having to go offshore to get it?

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, again the Hon. Member directly or indirectly is asking for a Canada value added or for some allowance so that these rigs and this equipment made in Canada, more expensively at times, could be devalued so as to be competitive with international equipment. If he wants us to do that and it is a reasonable idea, we will take a look. I am sure the Minister is open to these kinds of suggestions. On the other hand, I reject the allegation that PIP grants are a pipeline into cheap equipment.

● (1640)

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I have two short questions for the Hon. Member. I want to congratulate him on his spirited speech. I do not agree with much of what he said, but it was spirited. The Government has budgeted about $8 billion in PIP grants, which I have called welfare to the oil industry. I have read that the Canadianization rate has risen since the National Energy Program came into being in 1980 from 28 per cent to 38 per cent. We now own 38 per cent of our oil and gas industry.

Why does the Government not cut out these PIP grants and all such giveaways and simply use the money to take over one of the foreign multinational companies like Imperial Oil? The Government would still have a mixed system, private and public, but we would clearly have over 50 per cent Canadian ownership. It could be done quickly. We could buy the company and we could use that money which is going into PIP grants, instead of going with the long scheme of grants to help Canadian companies which might ultimately get us there by 1990.

My second question concerns what we hear in the country, that Canadians want a change in leadership in the Government. Does the Hon. Member agree with that? Will he go on record as urging the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to hurry up and get out of there so that we can get on with some new direction in leadership?

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I will go on record as telling the Hon. Member that I like my Leader. He is the Leader of my Party, and I am happy to support him. He can stay around for as long as he wants, and two things will happen. First, I will be happy and, second, I will win my seat in the next election because the people of my riding like him.

In answer to the other question, which was a lot less frivolous than his second one, I think the Hon. Member is overlooking two or three matters. I understand the sentiment behind it; I, too, would like to have the oil industry dominated by Canadian companies. That is a worth-while objective. Perhaps on this question we have more disagreement on the pace of it than on the substance of the issue.

When the Hon. Member talks about the federal Government becoming involved in the buying of a foreign oil company, I would like to remind him that he has forgotten BP and many other acquisitions which went into the making of Petro-

Canada. Obviously that has not brought us up to the 50 per cent mark, but it has been an enormously expensive endeavour. It has come at a time when the Government has to make some choices about further expansion and the pace of it. We have a company which is established there. We have a system which is encouraging needed exploration. It is possible for us to go at a slightly slower pace without ruining the economy, without pouring billions and billions of additional dollars out of the country and without slowing down the pace of exploration. It seems to be a reasonable balance at this point. I recognize the sentiment. I happen to agree with much of it. However, it is a question of the pace of the sentiment rather than the final destination.

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, since the earliest days no principle has been more central to our system of justice than that the law must be understood and that it must be applied fairly and even-handedly. When ordinary citizens are incapable of understanding how the law applies to them or when laws are enforced unevenly, democracy perishes and despotism is born.

In Canada we take pride in the fairness of a system of laws designed to protect the citizen when his rights conflict with the convenience of the state. One of the reasons Parliament acted two years ago to entrench the Charter of Rights in our Constitution was precisely to defend that principle. Yet, principles can become undermined to the point that they cease to have any relevance at all. By its sheer weight, big government can smother the rights of its citizens and overwhelm their ability even to insist upon fairness in their dealings with the state.

For Canadians in 1983, that is precisely what is happening in their relationship with the federal tax bureaucracy. We have a crazy-quilt Act that probably no one in Canada, either inside the Government or outside it, can claim to understand. Certainly I would be surprised if there were anyone in the House who is responsible for passing laws, including the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Bussières), who would claim to understand fully the Income Tax Act.

If those of us who write the law and those who enforce it are not fully knowledgeable about what it means, think of the position of ordinary Canadians—working persons, farmers or fishermen, artists, owners of small businesses and pensioners. How are they to negotiate the income tax morass without becoming lost in it? Indeed it is hard to see what they are to do when faced with laws they do not understand and with officials who have little interest in their plight.

A tax system like ours, based on voluntary reporting and payment, can only work as long as those affected by it feel they are being treated fairly. When respect for the law breaks down, or when people begin to feel they have become victims and no longer beneficiaries of the Government and its policies, growing numbers of citizens are prepared to break the law or to make enforcement as difficult as possible.

Increasingly that is what is happening in Canada today. The vast majority of Canadians are conscientious and law-abiding. They love their country and they are prepared to carry their fair share of its economic burden. However, when they begin to feel that their Government views them as criminals waiting to be caught, their respect for the law and their willingness to comply with it rapidly decline.

Here is how one chartered accountant from Toronto described the problem in a recent letter to me. He wrote:

> I can see how upset my clients are with the unreasonable treatment that they are receiving. My advice is to file the documents and appeal when the notice of reassessment comes through. The obvious result is that the auditors are wasting their time because they don't accept the document and we don't accept the reassessment. My clients have to pay me for what they can see is unreasonable treatment and the tax department has to pay their employees for the wasted effort.
>
> But I think that there is a larger impact in this. As someone recently said; the tax department is unfair and arbitrary so why should I be honest in reporting information on my tax return? I think that this attitude is much more common now than it was when I first started in the business. I advise my clients to file their returns correctly, but if taxpayers believe that they are being treated unfairly, they are much less inclined to be honest.

Members of Parliament on all sides of the House could quote from similar letters or refer to similar representations which have been made to them by chartered accountants, lawyers or other experts in the tax field. We have found two things happening frequently. First, the income tax laws become so complex that ordinary people feel trapped in the maze. Second, actions by the Department of National Revenue have often been so capricious and unfair as to estrange ordinary Canadians and make them feel that they are victims of their Government or that their Government is out to get them rather than simply requiring that they pay their fair share.

I cite this example, not because it is extraordinary but because it is typical of a growing number of complaints being received by every Member of Parliament. If the Government needs other authorities to convince it that the situation is serious and that it is rapidly growing worse, I could refer it to a book which was first published by a tax lawyer from Montreal. It is entitled, "How to Survive Canada's Tax Chaos". On the front cover of the book there is a quotation from a review in *The Gazette* of Montreal which read, "should be required for every Member of Parliament". Certainly I agree. It would be helpful if Members of Parliament on all sides of the House would read this book. They would gain some impression of the author's views of how the tax system has worked in Canada and how improvements could be made to make it more fair and equitable, to ensure that it functions in a better way and more successfully and to ensure that relations between the Government and the citizens of Canada are conducted in a more civilized fashion. Here is part of what the author wrote in his introduction:

> Since the introduction of "tax reform" with all its complexities and inequities, I have noted a distinct deterioration in the "tax morality" of many taxpayers who hithertofore have been scrupulous in their accountability to the public treasury. Why? There are at least five discernible reasons for this development—

He then proceeded to list the five reasons he feels Canadians are losing faith in the tax system. The first reason listed was that many people have lost confidence in the Government's

ability to provide them and their families with any long-term security. That was in 1976. Surely since that time, as the Government has dragged Canada into a recession, that confidence has fallen even further.

● (1650)

The second reason which is advanced by the author is uncontrolled Government spending and bureaucracy. He elaborates on the point in this way:

Many taxpayers find no way to counter what they consider profligate government spending otherwise than through tax avoidance and often tax evasion. The growing list of government "white elephants" that have consumed billions of taxpayers' dollars, the failure of government to establish and abide by accepted financial controls as illustrated by the recent revelations of the Auditor General, the unacceptable level of remunerations, perquisites and retirement benefits enjoyed by certain of our "civil servants" which are virtually unmatched in the private sector, and the seeming disregard for the peoples' priorities, have all contributed to an attitude of hostility towards governments at all levels. Many maintain that hard-earned income is being expropriated by government in the guise of public necessity only to be in turn dispensed on ill-conceived public projects, to idle bureaucrats, and to indolent welfare beneficiaries both individual or corporate and that this waste of tax dollars is justification for resistance to growing government fiscal demands. This resistance may take many forms but tax evasion is certainly one of them.

The third cause listed by this author is tax inequities. The author states that:

—there is no doubt in my mind that the failure of our tax system to achieve "tax neutrality" (i.e. that taxpayers in the same circumstances should bear the same tax burden) is also contributing to the practice of tax evasion.

Two other reasons listed by the author are that a small proportion of the population will always want to evade taxes and that the tax system is too complex. On the latter point, he concludes:

I believe that the establishment of requirements clearly destined to be ignored or disobeyed has the effect of undermining the entire system.

Who was that tax lawyer from Montreal who wrote the book "How to Survive Canada's Tax Chaos", Mr. Speaker? He was the Prime Minister's tax laywer, a man named Donald J. Johnston. He is currently the Minister of State for Economic Development in the Cabinet of this Government.

A review from the Montreal *Gazette* appeared on the front of that book as saying that the book should be required reading for every Member of Parliament. I would suggest that that is entirely correct. The first place to start would be on the Treasury benches themselves because when the Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston) was simply a tax lawyer and was representing Canadians at that level, he had a very good grasp of some of the problems which are confronted by Canadians when dealing with the Government. He had a prescription for ways to correct those problems. Yet today, Mr. Speaker, we find that he has been swallowed up in this massive bureaucracy against which he previously railed and we find that he is part of a Cabinet which is indifferent to the plight of ordinary Canadians and which is not concerned about reforming the system, making it more equitable and ensuring that the confidence of the people in Government is increased. That is why I agree very much with what was quoted on the front of that book. This book should indeed be required reading for every Member of Parliament.

The statements which I quoted were written in 1976. Today we have a tax system that is far more complex, far less equitable and far more subject to bureaucratic caprice than it was seven years ago.

In September of this year, Hon. Members will recall that the Canadian Chamber of Commerce met with the Minister of National Revenue and the Minister of Finance to recommend ways to improve our tax legislation and its administration. In its brief, the Chamber complained of inordinate delays arising from bureaucratic inefficiencies. It also reported this finding:

There is a growing perception across the country that Revenue Canada is becoming more and more aggressive in its attitude towards the assessing and collection of income taxes. No one disputes the right of Revenue Canada to collect the full amount of tax to which it is entitled, but there appears to be a significant growth in the number of frivolous or poorly based assessments, often issued without the benefit of discussion with the taxpayer. In addition, the collection officers then insist on payment of the tax owing, even though it might be obvious on a cursory review that the assessment will be reversed on appeal.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a blunt and candid assessment of the Department's procedures. However, the Chamber of Commerce is not alone in its concerns. On May 28, *The Globe and Mail* reported that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association had struck an ad hoc committee to consider the assessing procedures of the National Revenue Department. The article quoted a number of authorities who were concerned about the Department's aggressive tactics. If the Government were serious about its relationship with Canadians, it could implement reforms today to begin to correct this situation.

There is no element of this problem that is more serious than the inequity that occurs when moving from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. One finds that the law is applied unevenly as one moves from place to place. A recent example of this was brought to the attention of the House, and that was the tax treatment of members of symphony orchestras. The tax department's interpretation in the case of the Montreal Symphony Orchestra was entirely different from the way in which it interpreted the position of members of the Toronto Symphony Orchestra. That is not atypical. It is something which happens all too often in the system and something that must be addressed.

I would like to refer the House to an article that appeared in The Toronto Sunday Star of November 6, 1983. The author of that article, Mr. George Brett, was referring to comments made by a lawyer named Paul Schnier. In that article, the author says this:

Schnier adds that some district tax offices are tougher than others to deal with (though the taxpayer must deal with his own office and so has no choice).

"Hamilton is notorious and Kitchener is another tough one," he says. "Toronto, because it deals with more (tax) professionals, is in a position where it has to be a little more accommodating.

"The auditor in Toronto knows he's dealing not only with the taxpayer but his accountant or lawyer as well—and tax practitioners aren't easy to push around."

This tax lawyer says that one's treatment at the hands of the Government under the Income Tax Act depends to a great extent upon where in the country one lives and which office one must deal with. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is something that is unfair and that attacks the confidence of the people in the administration of the income tax system.

There are a number of things which can be done to correct the problems that we have referred to today. First, it is time for a review of ways to make our tax laws more intelligible. When growing numbers of people find that they cannot fill out their own tax returns without someone else's help and when the cost of assistance in filling out one's return is not even deductible for individual taxpayers, the system has broken down badly. The Leader of my Party has struck a task force that will report in a matter of months on ways in which a Progressive Conservative Government would simplify the tax system.

Second, it is time to remove some of the clear inequities from the system. When the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) was Minister of Finance, he attempted to give Canada's hard-pressed family farmers a break when he proposed capital gains tax relief for family farms.

Third, it is time to take a fresh look at some of the special advantages which the law gives to the tax department. As an article in the October 23 edition of the *Toronto Star* recently pointed out, the onus of proof is on Revenue Canada only in a small number of instances; for example, when it is prosecuting, when it reassesses a tax return more than four years old and when it is levying penalties. In most other cases, the onus of proof is on the taxpayer to explain any discrepancies. Additionally, it is hard to justify allowing the tax department to force payments while the assessment is being disputed.

Fourth, and perhaps most important of all, the Minister of National Revenue has a responsibility to ensure that his officials treat taxpayers with courtesy and respect. Every Canadian would expect tax cheaters to face prosecution, but for the vast majority of people whose greatest offence was to make an honest error, there is no justification whatsoever for anything but polite and helpful treatment by the Government. That tone should be set by the Minister himself and clear instructions should go from him to each of his employees indicating that strong-arm tactics will not be tolerated.

There has probably never been a time either in this or in any other country where a call from the tax department has been particularly welcome. I doubt that any of us will ever see that day in the future. However, relations between taxpayers and the Government have now reached the lowest point in our history and the breakdown in our tax system can only worsen unless the Government acts now.

There is no need for the atmosphere of mutual distrust which exists today between the federal Government and the Canadian people. It is perhaps too late for the present administration to reverse that sad condition, but it is not too late for a new Government with fresh ideas, with a desire to serve and not to rule and with faith in our citizens to begin the task. Rebuilding the confidence of Canadians in their Government is a challenge worthy of a new team and it is urgent that the work begin now.

Mr. Jim Schroder (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak in this debate. There are two issues contained in the motion which concern me, and one is the idea that we have used closure or time allocation on many occasions. The second is the idea that what the people of Canada want now is an election. I was interested to hear many speakers, including the last speaker, say that Members of the Party on the other side have some fresh ideas. They must still be germinating because I have not heard many of them.

• (1700)

I would like to warn the people of Canada that in light of the fact that there are no ideas and we do not know what the policies of the Opposition would be if they were in Government, they should think of what Napoleon said when inspecting his troops toward the end of the battle of Waterloo. Following his inspection of that rather rag-tag group of desolate beings, he was asked by someone what he thought their effect would be on the enemy. Napoleon was reputed to have said, "I don't know about the enemy, but they sure scare the hell out of me". When we think about the Opposition, that is the sort of feeling I get. I am a little frightened.

With respect to time allocation or closure motions that we have had, I find the attitude taken by the Opposition in bringing forth this motion today to be quite strange, to say the least. They wish this House to condemn the use of, not closure but time allocation on various Bills passed during the session. On the face of it, they do not wish to take account of the merit of these Bills, the time that was consumed in debating the Bills, or the surrounding circumstances, including the impact that failure to pass the legislation might have had.

Good management in all things, particularly good management of time, has always been a virtue, yet these are exactly the issues which must be addressed by the Government in taking action to limit debate. In fact, before time allocation takes place, there is a time period set aside during which Members on both sides of the House may debate the motion for time allocation.

Let us take two of the Bills that have been singled out by Members opposite, Bill C-131 and Bill C-132 to amend the Old Age Security Act and the Family Allowance Act. Both of these pieces of legislation were intended to give effect to portions of the six and five program announced in the budget of June 18, 1983. The program was designed to tackle the very serious problem of inflation by setting identified goals for cost increases in both the public and private sectors and then by taking the lead in a broad range of ideas within the federal authority. It was an effort to end the inflationary psychology that had taken hold of this country and was keeping inflation at high rates of around 12 per cent. As part of this effort, the Government felt it necessary for a period of two years to set limits on the indexation of family allowance and basic old age security pension. In so doing, it was the Government's stated intention to enlist the participation of Canadian families and Canadian senior citizens in this effort to show how important and serious the six and five program really was. Clearly this was a difficult step to take and special protective measures had to be instituted at the same time to safeguard those with low

incomes, as I will discuss later. In both cases, the Bills were introduced in the House in October, 1982, to take effect from January 1, 1983.

In the case of Bill C-131 to amend the Old Age Security Act, the amending legislation was introduced for second reading on November 18, 1982, and was debated by 28 Members, including 23 Opposition Members, seven Progressive Conservatives and six New Democrats, up to the point of time allocation.

The terms and effects of the legislation had by that time been very thoroughly debated indeed, well beyond the point where any additional insights or views were being added. It came to the point where the Government had to consider the effects on the parliamentary process, on the six and five program and on the public if passage were to be further delayed.

These effects were serious. First, time was being lost for the debate of other important legislation. Second, the whole psychological effort, the seriousness of the Government's determination to ensure that inflation would be brought down, was being laid open to question, and this could have led to a return to the inflationary viewpoint if matters had gone on indefinitely. Last and most important, uncertainty that was being created in the minds of the pensioners had to be of concern. They did not know what to expect. Would their January pension cheque be limited or would it not? What was the amount going to be? They needed to know this so that they could plan accordingly.

The provisions of Bill C-131 had been designed with great care. The old age security pension is indexed four times a year rather than once a year so that its real value stays as constant as possible. However, the 6 per cent and 5 per cent limits were annual targets. To meet these goals within the OAS program, the indexation of the basic pension was to be limited to no more than 1.5 per cent over the December 1982 rate in the first quarter of 1983, no more than 3 per cent in the second quarter, 4.5 per cent in the third quarter and 6 per cent in the fourth quarter.

As it turned out, the fully indexed basic pension in the first quarter of 1983 was $251.12, while the limiting amount under the Bill was $250.62, a difference of 50 cents. It was for that amount, 50 cents a month, that Opposition Members were acting to create uncertainty and anxiety in the minds of pensioners by delaying passage of the Bill.

Furthermore, it was not all pensioners who were subject to a limit on their indexation. All low income pensioners, in fact all pensioners who received any portion of the Guaranteed Income Supplement, were guaranteed by the legislation not to lose a single cent. The legislation provided that recipients of the supplement, who make up more than half the pension population, would have their supplement fully indexed and then increased further to offset the effect of the six and five limits on their basic OAS pension. These pensioners then were assured that they would be no worse off after the legislation was passed, but the delay in passage was no doubt causing them some worry.

Despite these factors, it was clear that Members of the Opposition were not prepared to agree to a reasonable length of time for debate prior to passage of the legislation. Instead, there were clear statements made that the New Democrats at least would continue to present speakers as long as the bill was in debate in order to delay its passage to the longest extent possible. This is the climate in which the Government decided that it must move for time allocation.

Even so, time allocation only limited further debate on second reading of the Bill, which was then sent to committee on December 10, 1982. In committee, the Bill received a further and extremely thorough examination in four days of hearings before the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs before it was reported back to the House without amendment on December 21, 1982.

It was then debated at the report stage until January 31, 1983, when time allocation had to be moved a second time to finish off report and third stages. At that point, the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) noted that some 71 Members had spoken at various stages of the passage of the Bill. After a further time allocation debate, another full day at report stage and a final day of debate on third reading, the Bill went to the Senate on February, 1983.

Very similar circumstances were faced by Bill C-132, a legislation to limit the indexation of family allowances for two years. That Bill did not require time allocation to obtain second reading. In fact, it was moved to committee after two days of vigorous debate in the House and was reported back after three days of hearings by the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. However, at report stage, it again became clear that debate was being extended for the sole purpose of delaying passage, and time allocation had to be sought. At that point, 32 Members had already participated in debate on the Bill at its various stages.

● (1710)

As with Bill C-131, the concerns of the Government extended to more than simply the time of the House which was being used up in debate for the sake of delay, while other important legislation was awaiting passage. There was also concern about the uncertainty and worry which were being created for recipients, although by this time the limitation had been applied in January, 1983 to restrict family allowance increases to 6 per cent. More important for these recipients, however, was the delay created by opposition to another piece of six and five legislation, namely, Bill C-139.

As in the case of Bill C-131, the Government had been careful to ensure that low-income families could be protected against the effects of limiting their family allowance increases. In the case of old age security, the protection came through the income-tested Guaranteed Income Supplement. In the case of family allowances, however, the appropriate vehicle for protection was the refundable child tax credit which is provided for low-income and middle-income families under the Income Tax Act. To offset the effect of the limit on family allowances, the Minister of Finance announced a special one-

time $50 increase in the child tax credit for 1982, raising it from $293 to $343 per child. This increase was intended to balance in advance the expected reduction in family allowance over the two-year restraint period for these low-income and middle-income families. However, the increased child tax credit could not be refunded until Bill C-139, the legislation amending the Income Tax Act, was passed. This again took a great deal of time while the Bill was being debated in the House. That delay in passing C-139 held up the child tax credit payments for many mothers.

If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, the experience of Canadian mothers having their child tax credits delayed, provides a very good example of the type of circumstances which support the responsible application of time allocation. We heard this morning some talk about the fact that Parliament has lost relevance in the eyes of many of the people and they were saying, "Why do you not get on with the job?" Time allocation in this case did help in allowing us to get on with the job.

Let me now turn to perhaps the most important point in discussing the wisdom of this motion as it refers to Bills C-131 and C-132, and that is the merits of the legislation itself. During the course of the debate, which some Members of the Opposition clearly feel was not long enough, there was certainly plenty of time for Opposition Members to say many incorrect things about the six and five program and about the purpose and the effects of Bills C-131 and C-132. There was time for them to suggest that the Bills were deindexing family allowances and pensions, when they were continuing indexation, albeit subject to limits. There was time for them to suggest that the legislation was simply an effort to save money, when in fact the savings were less in the first year than the cost of the child tax credit increase, and every effort was being made to minimize the effect of the limits by bringing inflation down. There was time for Opposition Members to quote and repeat figures showing that pensioners would lose hundreds of dollars, even after actual figures for the first quarter were released showing a difference of only 50 cents a month once the Bill took effect, and only for pensioners with incomes too high to qualify for the Guaranteed Income Supplement.

To put it mildly, it is obvious that many Hon. Members of the Opposition portrayed the legislation as something which was dangerous, misguided and would create hardship among vulnerable segments of our society. So it is certainly a welcome opportunity to look back now at the end of 1983 and be able to confirm that these Bills did serve the purpose they were intended to serve, without harming Canadian families or senior citizens.

These very favourable conclusions stem largely from the results of the six and five program. All Hon. Members know what has happened to the inflation rate in Canada. It has gone from an unacceptable high rate in 1982 to its lowest level in years in 1983. The 12-month rate to September, 1983 stood at 5 per cent. For old age security pensioners, this has meant that the limits set by Bill C-131 have not had to be applied in the last three quarters. The amount of the old age security benefits right now is exactly the same as it would have been in the absence of the legislation. This is due to the measures taken by the Government. The OAS basic pension is the same as it would have been in the absence of the legislation, as I said. I feel that bears repeating.

The full indexation of old age security to the end of 1983 has been held within the limits allowed, so that the amount of benefit for the last three quarters has not been at all affected by the legislation. Some pensioners did lose a total of one dollar as a result of the limit applied to their February and March OAS cheques, but that is all, up to this point.

For family allowances recipients, the drop in the inflation rate has meant that the over-all impact on the value of their allowances is less than originally expected. Given that inflation is now running at 5 per cent, the limited indexation increase of 5 per cent in family allowances this coming January will be doing a good job of maintaining the real value of the benefit. Furthermore, since Bill C-132 was passed, the Minister of Finance announced in his April, 1983 budget that the special $50 per child increase in the 1982 child tax credit will not be removed. Instead, the credit will remain at the $343 per child level for 1983, and this amount will be fully indexed for 1984 and subsequent years. This means that neither old age security pensioners nor family allowance recipients have been hurt by Bills C-131 and C-132 in the way in which some Opposition Members suggested they would. In fact, we might ask ourselves who has benefited most from the drop in inflation which has taken place since the six and five program was introduced.

One group which has deservedly benefited from lower inflations is pensioners with fixed annuities and unindexed private pensions. These pensioners were unable to protect the value of their pensions which were being eaten away by double-digit inflation. Even 5 per cent is too much inflation if you have a fixed income, but it is definitely preferable to 12 per cent. Another group which may have benefited is young families in the low and middle income ranges. These were the people who were hardest hit by inflationary mortgage rates and by general costs which for many rose faster than their wages.

This then was the record of this legislation. It did no harm to those who most need the social benefits. At the same time, it was an important contribution to the objective of the Government; to help bring inflation under control by reducing the inflationary expectations in the country. Clearly, the six and five program worked to the point at which it has surpassed our expectations.

Time allocation is a tool of the parliamentary process which must not be utilized lightly. Its use must be justified by the circumstances and defended by Governments in debate. Nevertheless, it is a legitimate instrument to which responsible Government must resort for good and sufficient reasons, as in the case of Bills C-131 and C-132. Accordingly, I must advise you that I cannot agree with the motion which has been laid before the House today.

• (1720)

Mr. Kristiansen: Mr. Speaker, I have a comment rather than a question, although the Hon. Member may want to

comment on it himself. It is really not a disagreement, although of course I would not deign to say that I agree with all that he said. But for the sake of the record, the Hon. Member stated that it was the Emperor Napoleon who said something to the effect: "I do not know if they frighten the enemy, sir, but, by God, they frighten me." In fact it was Arthur Wellesley, the First Duke of Wellington, who made that remark about the British troops. I am sure the Hon. Member would not want to offend some of the Bonapartists in his own camp across the way, so I simply draw that to his attention as I feel his speech will be circulated among some of his constituents and I would not want any of the young people in Guelph to get the wrong idea about history.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for pointing that out. I understand the last person who mistook the Duke of Wellington for Napoleon was shot on the battlefield.

The Official Opposition has proposed a non-confidence motion, Mr. Speaker, and they say they do not like closure. They do not like closure on the Crow rate, on petroleum taxes, pensions, Canagrex, tax changes, the public debt and so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, neither do my colleagues or I. The Conservatives say they do not have confidence in this Government. Neither do we, nor, I think, do the people of Canada. But as the debate developed today and I got a chance to listen to different viewpoints being put forward, it was very interesting to see that the topic of energy was brought up and the positions taken or not taken by the Official Opposition. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I urge Canadians to scrutinize very closely, especially in light of public opinion polls, the so-called alternate Government, the Conservative Party under its new leader, the Hon. Member for Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney).

As my colleague and House Leader pointed out earlier, what we can find of Conservative policies are inconsistent and vague. Some of the Conservative critics are starting to show already a disturbing arrogance, very much like that shown over the years by the Trudeau Government.

Mr. Fisher: That is a misreading of our situation.

Mr. Waddell: It may not be quite as bad as that arrogance, but it is getting there. When I sit here and see the Conservatives raise their voices against closure over Canagrex and petroleum taxes and so forth, well, I am from British Columbia and we just had an incredible fight against the Social Credit Government of Bill Bennett, which is in part a Conservative Government and which tried to close down the legislature. It had the Leader of the Opposition dragged out of the legislature, it pushed legislation down the throats of the people, and the people rose up, went on strike and stopped Bill Bennett in his tracks. But when I tried to get some support against this use of closure in British Columbia from the Conservatives MPs from British Columbia, I got absolutely nowhere. There was not one voice—well, perhaps on human rights that of the Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser). But none of the rest said anything against the kind of closure that Bill Bennett brought in. As a matter of fact, behind the curtains they thought it was pretty great.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has some concern about references to matters taking place in a provincial legislature. The Chair listens with interest, but there are certain courtesies normally observed.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I am not in British Columbia and thank goodness that matter is hopefully over. But I wanted to point that out to show the hypocritical and selective nature of the motion and the position taken by the Official Opposition.

In the debate today the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien), and a number of speakers from the Conservative Party, talked about energy and petroleum taxes. I took the opportunity of getting a copy of the infamous speech by the Leader of the Official Opposition at a fund raising dinner in the Calgary Convention Centre on November 8, 1983. He talked about some problems in the National Energy Program with which I have some passing familiarity. The motion mentions energy taxes, and the Leader of the Opposition said this:

> One, the cash flow of the companies involved was gravely impaired by the federal "tax grab"—

When the Official Opposition presents a motion like this, and when its Leader makes a speech like this, it really has to get over some very serious naiveté in dealing with energy in this country. The oil companies of this country always want more "cash flow". They did ten years ago, they do today and they will tomorrow. They always want more money. The poor Leader of the Opposition is getting sucked in to giving more money to these companies. How do you finance a Government, Mr. Speaker? You have to get taxes and you have to choose whom you are going to tax. Are you going to tax consumers, the poor, the middle-income earners, the pensioners? Or are you going to tax the oil companies and banks, some of the people who can afford to pay? Here we have the first indication of the kind of policy presented by the Opposition. Finally we are hitting a moving target here. They are about to change the tax structure to help the oil companies, and it will result in penalizing indirectly the average ordinary Canadian. The second thing the Leader of the Official Opposition said in that speech was this:

> Two, there was so much obvious retroactivity and confiscation in the NEP that investors lost whatever trust and confidence they had in the federal Government.

That is the United States line, Mr. Speaker. That is exactly what Ambassador Paul Robinson said. This is a branch plant economic position. When you take this kind of position on economic policy—that is, we will follow what the Americans want and open wide to American investment—and then take the same position on foreign policy, a "me too" Reaganism, then you have a complete change, and this is why the motion surprises me. You have a complete historic change in the modern Conservative Party. This is now a continentalist Party. It is for big oil, and make no mistake about it.

Have you seen the ads that the Canadian Petroleum Association has every night on TV, Mr. Speaker? I urge Canadians to watch these ads. If they flip channels they will probably see them. They talk about how they are going to help Canada and co-operate with the federal Government and take a fair return and so on. The Canadian Petroleum Association is big American oil. That is who controls the CPA. That is who is giving this line about more cash flow, about retroactivity and confiscation under the NEP. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, there are lots of things to attack in the NEP: the pricing scheme, the give-away PIP grants, where we are doing exploration and so on. But they are taking the American line. We are still an independent country. The Americans are our allies, but we are an independent country and we have to remember that. Is this what the modern Conservative Party has come to? John A. Macdonald would not be turning in his grave, he would be spinning in his grave if he could read this Calgary speech of the Leader of the Opposition.

● (1730)

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something else about this motion today. It seems to me that the Conservatives have missed the mark on the non-confidence aspect of the Government. It should not be in energy. It should not be in Canagrex or the Crow and so on. It should be in the handling of the economy. If we had had a chance to put forward a motion, we would have tackled head on today the most important thing that has happened around here in a little while. That was the conference on high tech last week. My Party and I have no confidence in the way that the Government is handling the revolution in high technology and the way that the conference happened last week. The Government spent $500,000 on a conference on high tech that was virtually Government propaganda and that missed the whole social implication of high technology. The highlight of the conference apparently was Senator Lawson's offcolour speech telling dirty jokes. That shows you the shallowness of the conference. Basically, labour was not at the conference. The largest labour group, the CLC, the legitimate group, was not represented at that conference. The reason that they were not there is that they never thought that the Government would look at the underlying problems of high tech. There was an underlying assumption from the conference that we do not have to deal with labour in the future because high tech will replace the labour unions and they will be gone. There was that very important and very serious assumption. There was also an assumption that high tech was a good thing. There was no talk about the deskilling effect of high technology or how it affects working people.

I think that what the Government was most incompetent in was in the handling of that conference and in its handling of the high technology revolution. The fact is that people are being affected by high tech and the Canadian worker should have a say in how high tech is developed. They are not modern Luddites, the people who knocked machines when they came in at the beginning of the industrial revolution. The Canadian worker has a legitimate concern. I say this to the Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) who was at the conference.

Look at British Columbia. When the worker is up against the wall, when you take away job security and seniority and you make things so insecure for the worker, the worker will fight back. One thing we learned in British Columbia last month is that the teachers will fight back. No one expected the teachers to go out the way they did. No one expected some of those other unions to join. There is a lesson to be learned, and the Government should learn it. The lesson is that the Canadian worker is not going to sit back and lose his or her job needlessly. There is a great feeling of insecurity out there, and the Government should address this in the upcoming high technological revolution. In offices secretaries are worried about losing their jobs. Women especially will be affected by this change. It is coming faster and faster all the time. We have to deal with it.

I would like to say one other thing about the high technological revolution. The Government should get on with the job of appointing an all-parliamentary committee or some committee that really has labour on it. I mean the CLC people who have really gone into some of the problems associated with high technology. The Government should listen to people like Heather Menzies when she speaks articulately about how technological change will affect women and how the deskilling affects the job. In fact, what we are going to have is a few high technocrats making lots of money and the rest of us being technopeasants of this new era. We will lose the middle class in Canada. That is a fundamental change in the Canadian economy and society.

I hope it is through negligence rather than bad will, but the Government is missing the boat here. It should get this out in public and have a public commission or a committee of this House of Commons and it should bring in all the labour groups. It should not have Senator Lawson come in and tell a few dirty jokes, but it should go to some other teamster people in the country. In Vancouver they can speak articulately about labour matters. The Government should speak to the CLC people.

I would like to conclude by moving a motion. I move:

That the present motion be amended by inserting the following after the word "borrowing":

"and for accepting the advice of the Official Opposition when they urged the Government to abandon the Crow rate and increase the public debt through additional borrowing to grant billions of dollars to private sector oil companies."

I am told that the motion has been approved by the Chair. I propose to move that motion, and I do so. I believe you have a copy of the motion, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to conclude by saying that in the NDP we think that we have made our position very clear as an Opposition Party. We opposed the Crow rate from the beginning. We consistently opposed it. Today in the House of Commons my colleague from Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) asked a question of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy). He said that one day after the Crow passed the railways were laying off people in Winnipeg at the rail yards. The Government promised that great things would happen after the change in the Crow rate. Right away we see lay-offs. We were skeptical

and we were right. I think we are going to see that the change in the Crow rate is not all that was promised and it is really going to hurt the farmer in the prairie Provinces.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment covers the notion that was brought up time and time again in debate today, that is, the energy policy, of borrowing and of giving billions of dollars in petroleum grants to the poor private oil companies which moan and groan and whose moans and groans have been accepted by the Leader of the Conservative Party. I do not know what he is going to do if he ever gets to be Prime Minister, because he is going to have to choose between Premier Davis, who is going to want low energy prices, and Premier Lougheed, who is going to want high energy prices. As the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech, they are going to solve all the problems because, "It is time for energy policy in this country to be established around the table of consensus. It is time for co-operative efforts. It is time for this country to begin realizing the tremendous potential we all know it has." That is fluff. That is shallowness. A real Prime Minister, a real leader, has to deal with and solve conflicting regional viewpoints. These regional viewpoints killed the former Conservative Leader, the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), who could not survive the problems between Premier Davis and Premier Lougheed. Let us not have this fluff from the Official Opposition. Let us not have these inconsistencies, as the Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) said. Let us have some real policy. Let Canadians know what you are going to do.

An Hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Waddell: We are clear. We know what we want to do in the area of peace. We know what we want to do in the area of economics. We know what we want to do in the area of the Crow rate and the farm policy. It is all there to read and see. That is why I propose this motion. Let us see that the Tory emperor really has no clothes and that the Conservatives in fact are just as bankrupt as the Liberal Government.

• (1740)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Questions may be posed to the Hon. Member who just spoke.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief question. It is the same question that the Hon. Member asked me. I want to return the compliment to him. Could he tell us when his Party will come to grips with its leadership problems? Does he agree with the Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish) and the Member for Regina East (Mr. de Jong) for example, that there is a problem? Can he tell us when his Party intends to start the tough job of revitalizing its policy under a new leader?

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the intent of the Hon. Member's question. With respect to leadership, I can tell him that there is certainly no problem on this side of the House and we are quite content and proud of our Leader, who is perfectly consistent and who does something which certainly the Official Opposition and increasingly the Government does not, which is to advance policies and stay behind those policies.

For us it is not a question of leadership; it is a question of policy. Any difference we have ever had in our Party has basically been over the question of policy. Let us look at the policy of the present Government. When its Leader was speaking in the 1980 election, in some previous reincarnation, after 12 years he suddenly found that our oil industry was controlled by multinational oil companies that were basically American. He also discovered that the oil industry was actually doing things which were not in Canada's interest, such as when Exxon said to move a shipment of oil away from Canada, Imperial would do so. The Leader of the Liberal Party advocated Canadian control—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to the Hon. Member, the Chair is trying hard to establish some relevance. While it is a very sweeping motion before us, the Hon. Member does appear even to be going beyond that motion.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I am trying to answer the question. The question was on leadership. I was making the point that we were more interested in policies than leadership. I was giving the Hon. Member an example of this. That is why I moved this motion, and if the Hon. Member would look at it he will see that it states:

—and for accepting the advice of the Official Opposition when they urged the Government to abandon the Crow rate and increase the public debt through additional borrowing to grant billions of dollars to the private sector oil companies.

To answer his question with respect to leadership and policy, I am saying that one must look beyond leadership and examine the actual policy. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) promised Canadian control of the oil industry. That is the second time he promised it since he did so in 1975 as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect, the Chair feels that both the question and the answer being pursued have gone beyond the motion before us. Perhaps the Chair should have intervened and not allowed the question in the first place. If the Hon. Member is relevant to the motion being discussed, he may continue.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I was trying to make the point that the question on leadership had to be referred to the debate today. The debate today showed an interesting new matter, which was raising the energy issue with the new Conservative position on energy which basically is to eliminate the National Energy Program. In my view that is a fundamental change for the Conservative Party. That is what we should be looking at.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being 5.45 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forth every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply in accordance with Section 9 of Standing Order 62. The question is on the amendment. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the Members.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Waddell) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 467*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Deans
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Kristiansen
Manly
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Waddell
Young—24.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
(Gander-Twillingate)
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Carney (Miss)
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark
(Yellowhead)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crouse
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupras
Duquet
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd
(Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Guilbault
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)
Harquail
Hawkes
Hees
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Ittinuar
Jelinek
Johnston
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
King
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewis
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDonald (Miss)
(Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro
(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Paproski
Parent
Patterson
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid
(St. Catharines)
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson
(Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Roche
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
St. Germain
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Simmons
Smith
Speyer
Stevens
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Trudeau
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Whelan
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—221.

● (1820)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment negatived.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall we dispense with the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Nielsen) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 468*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blenkarn
Bosley
Carney (Miss)
Clark (Yellowhead)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hees
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jelinek
Kempling
Kilgour
King
Kristiansen
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
MacDonald (Miss) (Kingston and the Islands)
MacDougall
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich)
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Patterson
Reid (St. Catharines)
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Roche
St. Germain
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Taylor
Thacker
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—108.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker (Gander-Twillingate)
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cousineau
Cyr
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupras
Duquet
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Ittinuar
Johnston
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Ouellet
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore)
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Trudeau
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—137.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion negatived.

It being 6.30 p.m., pursuant to order made Monday, November 14, 1983, this House stands adjourned until Thursday November 17, 1983 at eleven o'clock a.m. pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 6.30 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 17, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

● (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ATLANTIC FISHERIES RESTRUCTURING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Monday, November 14, 1983 consideration of the motion of Mr. De Bané that Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishery enterprises, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin-St. George's): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Bill C-170. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) deserves the lion's share of credit for the initiative which is contained in this Bill. He, together with many others, has worked over many months to come up with the set of arrangements which are now before the House. I commend him and the many others who were involved, including the Premier of Newfoundland, Mr. Peckford, for the excellent results which have been achieved.

The deep sea sector of the fishery is the very cornerstone of the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada. I have some related figures, Mr. Speaker, which will show you what I mean. In 1982 there were sales of just over three quarters of a billion dollars, $770 million. And that was in a year when the industry was not in full swing. Indeed, some of the fish plants had been obliged to close late in that year, August and September, for various reasons, including financial ones. Notwithstanding, there were sales of more than three quarters of a billion dollars, which meant that 44,000 people in Atlantic Canada were employed in the deep sea sector. There were 20,000 fishermen, either in small boats, which in effect commute to fishing areas every day, or in trawlers and draggers, which go further afield and return home every few days with the catch.

● (1110)

There are 20,000 people in that category, another 24,000 men and women who depend directly on the fish processing plants in Atlantic Canada, a total of 44,000 people depending on this part of the fishery alone. When you relate those figures to the population of Atlantic Canada, Mr. Speaker, you see how significant the deep sea fishing activity is to the economy of the region. It is fair to say that, in relative terms, the deep sea fishery is as significant to Atlantic Canada as is the automobile industry to central Canada. For that reason alone, letting the deep sea fishery go under is unthinkable.

That was one of the options, Mr. Speaker, one I thought was academic and to be dismissed out of hand until I heard continuing and disturbing suggestions that somehow the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Government of Nova Scotia and the Government of Canada ought not to be involved in this exercise. If you accept the argument that those three Governments ought not to be involved, you must ask the question: What then happens without the involvement of those three Governments? I would suggest one of two things: either the industry goes under completely, a complete collapse of the deep sea sector and the resulting chaos for three, four or five years until someone comes in and picks up the pieces; or we could have Government involvement in another way, as we have had over the years, that which I choose to characterize as the band-aid approach where we throw good money after bad by giving taxpayers' money to fish company managers to manage as badly as they have managed their own money.

There were, Mr. Speaker, just three options: to continue applying for band-aids; to walk away from the problem and allow economic and social chaos of a substantial size; or to do what is being proposed in this legislation. I support wholeheartedly the approach taken in this legislation, having in mind that I represent the largest fishing riding in all of Canada. I represent 1,500 miles of coastline with 135 communities, almost all of which have a very direct relationship to the fishery, many of them to the deep sea sector.

By way of example, there are 12 so-called deep sea plants in Newfoundland, eight of them in the riding of Burin-St. George's. Those plants are at Burgeo, Ramea, Gaultois, Harbour Breton, Grand Bank, Fortune, Marystown and Burin. In addition to those eight plants there are another 14, for a total of 22, in the riding of Burin-St. George's which depend on the fishery.

● (1115)

It would be helpful if we tried to put a human face on what we are talking about. Let us look at a community such as Ramea. This is a community of 1,400 people located on an island a few miles off the south coast of the island of Newfoundland. One hundred and twenty-five people of the community work the boats, either the trawlers or the inshore, and another 300 or so work in the plant. With fishermen and fish plant workers together there are 450 people out of 1,400 who

depend directly on the fishing industry for employment. One out of every three people in that community are directly employed in the fishery. For them the choice is not between fishing and some other employment activity. The choice is between fishing and nothing. The choice is between having a job in the fishery and seeing their employment opportunity, community and whole lifestyle collapse. That is Ramea.

I could mention Gaultois, which is also on an island and depends on a fish plant for its employment. I could mention Harbour Breton. I could mention some of the inshore communities like McCallum, François, Grey River, Grand Bruit and La Poile. These communities know only one way of life. It is a way of life that has served them very well. If you are looking for record crime rates you do not look to these communities. If you are looking for vagrancy and vandalism you do not look to these communities. These phenomena are almost foreign to the very proud and dignified way of life which the people in those communities pursue. I for one want to see to it that we in this House do everything within our power to ensure that that way of life is allowed to continue, is encouraged and is allowed to enhance itself. Canada is well served by people of that ilk. Canada is well served by people with a value system such as we find alive, well and thriving in communities such as I have mentioned.

This Bill does not seek to make welfare ghettos of those communities, Mr. Speaker, but to allow them to continue a profitable economic activity which they have pursued with vigour over the years and still want to pursue. The only reason they have not been able to do it unimpeded is that we have had some fish company managers who have let their enthusiasm get in the way of their judgment. They have allowed those deep sea companies to become overextended financially and generally have made some other incompetent, ill-advised decisions, financial and otherwise.

The consequence is that we have an industry with much potential. After all, if you cannot make money selling fish in today's world, what can you make money at? The potential is there and has always been there. The independents are proving that so well. Even in very hard times the so-called independents in my riding are doing very well at a time when they had many adverse factors with which to contend. They continue to sell their fish. They continue to make a dollar.

● (1120)

The same could have been the case with the deep sea sector, if we did not have some overenthusiastic fish company managers who made some terribly incompetent decisions. Our time is being taken up here today because of the chaotic, disastrous results of those incompetent decisions.

In this Bill, the Government of Canada, in collaboration with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Government of Nova Scotia, proposes the only sensible course of action open to it. A couple of days ago I listened with some interest to my good friend from South Shore (Mr. Crouse), in Nova Scotia, who spoke in this debate. Among other things, he suggested that a thorough search of the private sector has not been done in an effort to find investment capital. I respect his view, and that may well be his view, but I submit to him that it is a very wrong view.

I do not ask him to accept my version on my say so, but before he makes that kind of statement publicly I ask him to compare notes with a colleague from his own Party, the Premier of Newfoundland. It is no secret to the House that the Premier of Newfoundland wanted very much to get the deep sea sector back on a stable footing without the involvement of the Government of Canada. The Premier of Newfoundland did everything he possibly could to attract private capital. His exploits to find private capital on both sides of the Atlantic are well known. He did everything within his power to try to find private capital. The principals of Fisheries Products also did everything within their power to find private capital, as did the Canadian Development Corporation and the Bank of Nova Scotia. Therefore I believe it is somewhat misleading for the hon. gentleman from South Shore to say that there is private capital out there.

Let me put it differently. If he knows of private capital which is out there, let him tell the House and the Government. I make an undertaking to him now that if he can come forward with the private capital we will scrap this Bill. We will do away with it because there will be no need for it.

The reason this legislation is before us today is that all Parties involved, the Government of Newfoundland, the companies concerned and the other investors, have all failed in the most diligent effort to find private capital to stabilize this deep sea sector. The gentleman from South Shore wants a schedule by which the Government would divest itself of the shares. I believe he has a schedule. I believe he has a firm undertaking from the Government and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans as well as the Premier of Newfoundland that the divestiture will take place at the earliest possible opportunity. If a buyer shows up reasonably soon, the shareholders provided for in this legislation will be very happy to talk to that buyer on an urgent basis.

I always become a little amused when I hear the Tories talking about the socialist umbrella, as the gentleman from the South Shore characterized it. I do not know where that leaves the Premier of Newfoundland, because he is part of this same so-called umbrella, or where it leaves Premier Buchanan of Nova Scotia. I never thought of him as being a socialist. I suppose it is the same old story in which the Tories stand for many things. They stand for one thing in this Chamber, something else in the hustings, something else in the Government of Nova Scotia and something else in the Government of Newfoundland. It must be very convenient to talk out of all sides of one's mouth at the same time.

● (1125)

This legislation has nothing to do with socialism. It has to do with a pragmatic approach. It has to do with responsibility. It has to do with doing what has to be done. The alternative is to allow those thousands of jobs to go down the drain.

Let us make up our minds. Which is it? Is it some sinister approach which the gentleman from South Shore would have us believe? Or is it, as the Premier of Newfoundland, another great Tory, says—the best thing that happened to Newfoundland since Confederation? Which is it? Is it good or is it sinister? The economic viability of the industry must be the ultimate objective.

We have tempered that objective, of course, with a social cabinet. We recognize that communities such as Ramea, Gaultois, St. Anthony and Harbour Breton would have no future outside the fishery. So the Government has said that in those cases the industry ought not to bear the financial brunt. The Government of Canada on behalf of the taxpayers ought to address that issue. If it is determined that it is in the best interests to put taxpayers' money into communities like Ramea, the Government will do it quite apart from any objectives of the company which will manage the industry.

Finally, the question arises: Do I, as the Member who represents the largest fishing riding in Canada, have some reservations about this particular Bill? As a matter of fact, I do. It is not a perfect document. It is the result of a set of compromises which have been worked out with all the Parties involved.

Allow me, then, to state one of my reservations. This Bill has the effect of taking the Bank of Nova Scotia off the hook. I do not like that and I do not care who knows that I do not like it. The bank does not deserve to be taken off the hook. When the bank advanced the credit, it took its chances, or so you would believe. When the day of reckoning came, the bank should have lost its shirt for aiding and abetting incompetent fish company managers for making incompetent financial decisions. But that is not what happened; the bank did not lose its shirt because it had an ace up its sleeve. It had the Government across a barrel, in effect. It knew Governments would not stand by and allow bankruptcies to proceed and the assets of the deep sea sector dismantled and auctioned off. That would have put the industry in chaos for three to five years. The bankers sat in Toronto and smiled, and well they might. Their no lose scenario was working to perfection. Taxpayers would once again bail them out. At the right time we have to address that issue. We have to rein in those bankers so that they serve the people of this country instead of abusing them. This is the place, but this is not the time.

Let me say in conclusion that while I have some very serious reservations about the role of the bankers in this field, I recognize the Governments involved are doing the only thing they can to salvage the situation. It will do more than salvage; it will stabilize the situation and make for a very profitable fishery in the years ahead in Newfoundland and Atlantic Canada.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this Bill, I must point out that it is a very sketchy and incompetent piece of legislation that we are asked to approve by the Government opposite. This Bill does not in any way explain to us how the Government plans to carry out the so-called restructuring of the fishing industry in Canada.

The Minister when he introduced the Bill, as reported at page 28848 of *Hansard*, asked the question:

How can an industry that has so much going for it manage to get itself into such serious trouble?

The Minister went on and introduced the Bill but never once answered that question. There has been no rational explanation by the Government as to how the East Coast Atlantic fishery got into the state it is now in. The Minister has not explained whether or not this has anything to do with the policies of the federal Government. The fishery is solely within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada. The Minister has not explained what policies of the federal Government might have contributed to the debacle in the fishing industry off the East Coast of Canada. He has not explained to this House how these policies will be changed or what new policies there will be that might change the situation.

• (1130)

His introduction of the Bill was full of half-truths and specious reasoning. The Minister said that the agreements reached with Newfoundland and Nova Scotia reflected to some extent the recommendations made by the Kirby task force. I do not know to what extent this Bill and these restructuring agreements agree with the report of the task force. They appear to be diametrically opposed. There was great conflict between the Kirby task force and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané). The recommendations of the task force are not carried out in the Bill. In fact, it does not even refer to the restructuring agreement entered into with Newfoundland or with Nova Scotia.

Then the Minister went on to say that the industry needed to become leaner and more efficient ashore and afloat. How will the industry become leaner and more efficient ashore and afloat if the Bill is passed? If Government-controlled corporations are to take over the industry in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, is it likely that there will be a leaner and more efficient structure, especially when a government or two governments are involved? Of course not. In my view, unfortunately we will see a Canadair applied to the fishing industry. There will be a great deal of losses in these new companies. They will not be leaner and more efficient. Once the politicians are involved, they will be anything but lean and efficient.

The Minister claimed that he reached an agreement with the Governments of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. He has not reached an agreement with the Government of Nova Scotia. There is a so-called agreement in principle, but there is no other agreement with Nova Scotia. He said that it was an agreement in principle. That is all it is.

There was no explanation by the Minister of why we should approve the Bill and no suggestion as to how it should be improved. There is no accountability under this piece of legislation. It is inadequate, disappointing, frightening and irresponsible. The legislation authorizes the Government to make loans, to give guarantees or to give grants to any fishing company or fishing arrangement that it wishes. It does not have to report back to the House as to whom it has made the

loans, to whom it has given the grants or why. It does not have to report annually to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry as to what it has done, why, to whom it has done it or how much money it has spent. The Government asks us to approve $138 million to be spent between now and March 31, 1985, without its having any obligation to return and report to the House.

We just listened to the Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons) trying to blame the position of the industry on incompetent decisions by fish plant managers. What absolute tripe, to blame fish plant managers! What caused the crisis in the fishing industry? It was not the Bank of Nova Scotia which caused it. The Bank of Nova Scotia, poor devils, tried to support the fishing industry down through the years. They made loans and did their best to carry the fishing industry until it got beyond them. Why did it get beyond them? It was because of the interest rate structure in Canada. This incompetent Government which sits opposite allowed interest rates to rise to 22 per cent and 23 per cent. Today the rates are still 14 per cent or 15 per cent for companies engaged in the fishing industry.

This industry has very little equity in it. It has always been undercapitalized, has always had to borrow money and go to the banks to be supported. That is the history of the East Coast fishery. There has been heavy participation by the banks in the fishery. The banks and entrepreneurs took risks. Then this incompetent Government allowed the interest rate to go to 23 per cent, wrecked those fishing enterprises and made it no longer possible for the banks to carry the industry; the only alternative was for the Government to step in and carry it. There was no mention of that by the specious Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's. It has nothing to do with fish plant managers. The Hon. Member said that they overexpended. If the fishing companies overexpended, it was because they were encouraged to overexpend by the Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's, by politicians and by Governments generally. It was because DREE made grants and loans available, as did the provincial Governments.

Another reason the fishing industry is in its present position is overcapacity, but the main reasons are high interest rates and lack of equity, as well as marketing problems. The Minister did not explain that National Sea has had to close its plants in Newfoundland, not because of overexpansion or incompetent decisions of fish plant managers, but because it could not sell the product. The situation in the market for frozen fish products in the last year or two has been difficult because of the recession and competition from other products such as turkey, chicken and the like. National Sea has had to close at Burgeo and St. John's because of these marketing problems.

The Hon. Member did not explain that a lot of the trouble was caused by lack of sufficient throughput; many plants do not have sufficient fish to put through to keep the plants operating for a long enough period to meet overhead costs. Sufficient fish are not being caught to go through those plants. That is the responsibility of the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada decides on quotas and allocates quotas. The federal Government of Canada is largely responsible, I would say to a degree of at least 90 per cent, for the crisis in the East Coast fishing industry. That is why it is the Government's obligation to bring in a measure to help it. Unfortunately the only alternative it is offering is the Bill now before the House.

We have no option but to support the Bill now before us. How could we stand by and see the East Coast fishing industry, the offshore fishing industry, collapse? In my own district of St. John's West there are 23 fish plants. One major plant is the National Sea plant with six stern trawlers. It is closed today; it has been closed for several months. It employs 400 or 500 people. There is the major fish plant at Trepassey of Fishery Products Limited with five stern trawlers. It has been closed for the last two or three months. It employs 500 or 600 people. There are three inshore plants at Petty Harbour. At Bay Bulls there is a major inshore plant. Unfortunately it was just destroyed by fire. The O'Briens, a tremendous force in the Newfoundland inshore fishery, are hoping to rebuild. Witless Bay has an inshore plant. There are plants at Tor's Cove, Calvert—the Ferryland saltfish operation—Aquaforte and Fermeuse. The plant at Fermeuse is a major one which used to be supplied by offshore as well as inshore vessels. Now it is to be restricted to an inshore operation. Also there are the ones at St. Marys, Riverhead, Jersey Side, Argentia, Branch, St. Bride's, Little Harbour East, Fairhaven and Arnold's Cove. It is a major National Sea plant with only a few workers today; normally there are 300. Also there is the Admiral's Cove inshore plant and one at Southern Harbour. Of 23 fish plants, all of them are closed today with the exception of Arnold's Cove which has a few workers. Twenty are principally involved in the cod fishery, one operation for crab only and two for saltfish only. Naturally I will support the Bill. What alternative do I have? We cannot continue to have all those plants shut.

There are other problems upon which the Minister did not touch. He did not explain when he would start the resource-short fishing program to assist inshore plants. "The resource-short plant program", they so grandly call it. I have a telegram to the Minister from the community of Fermeuse asking when he would carry out his promise in the agreement signed in Newfoundland on September 26 to allocate fish to Fermeuse under the resource-short plant program. When will he get that off the ground? Canadian trawler operators have offered to catch offshore fish and sell it to inshore operators at cost. Inshore plant operators say that they cannot afford to pay that cost. There is a stalemate. The plants are still closed and people are still unemployed. The Minister does not seem to be bothered about it. He does not seem to be agitated about it. He did not mention it when he introduced this legislation to the House a few days ago.

If there can be no agreement between plant operators and Canadian trawler operators, and if it is possible for inshore plant operators to make a deal with foreign-owned fishing operators for this year, why not let it go ahead? If that is the only way plants like the one at Fermeuse can start to operate

again—and I have forgotten for exactly how long it has been closed; probably a year—then I suggest and recommend to the Minister that he arrange a deal and allow foreign-owned vessels to be used this year to catch the fish and get those plants operating again.

● (1140)

What we are being asked for in this Bill is to give the Government carte blanche, a blank cheque to intervene in the fisheries as it likes by way of loan guarantees or grants. That is what we are being asked to do. Having helped to bring about the collapse of the Canadian East Coast fishery, it is certainly questionable whether the Government of Canada has the competence to restore the East Coast fishery to economic viability. What has the Minister said that indicates to us that the Government is going to restore economic viability in the fishery? What is it going to bring to the fishery other than an unlimited supply of public funds?

What does the Government have to offer except public money? It has not shown us how it will make this industry lean and efficient or how the independent fish processor will be protected. It has shown us nothing, yet it asks us for a blank cheque. This legislation should be amended so that they have to report back to this House through the fisheries committee each year exactly what moneys have been spent under the legislation, who have been given guarantees and loans and just what is happening.

There is a vital inconsistency in the various clauses of the Bill. I quote two of the objectives:

—first, that the Atlantic fishing industry be economically viable on an on-going basis, second, that employment in that industry be maximized subject to the constraint that those employed receive a reasonable income—

There is an inconsistency in that objective. To be economically viable and to maximize employment is the matter of contention that has been at issue between the Kirby task force and the Government ever since the Kirby task force reported. The Government has not accepted the Kirby task force because it cannot decide that question. The question is still undecided. It is before us in the agreements that have been signed with Newfoundland. That inconsistency still has not been settled.

It is not with any great sense of elation that I have reluctantly concluded that we have to accept this Bill. It is only because nothing better has been put before us. The Minister did not answer any questions on the important issue. The Government is trying to press us to pass this Bill without any discussion in the House or in committee, although it was on July 2 that the Minister announced he was going ahead with this scheme. It was on September 26, two months ago, that the agreement was signed with Newfoundland. This Bill was only put before the House on October 31. We are being asked to rush it through in 24 hours even though the Government has bungled this problem for over a year.

Some of the questions the Minister should answer either in committee or in the House when the Bill returns are as follows: How is the Government going to assist the independents and keep them involved in the fishery? They are discouraged and now want to get out. We have the statement of Alphonsus Best of Southern Harbour, the President of the independents' association in Newfoundland. He says the Government may as well buy them out and take them over now; they cannot stand unfair competition which they feel they will have from the two giant Government-controlled corporations. The Minister did not touch on that.

What is the Minister going to do to protect us in the U.S. market from actions taken there in the nature of anti-dumping and restraint of trade? There will be countervailing tariff applications made in the United States. They will complain of unfair competition to U.S. fishermen from these Government-controlled and financed companies. What steps has the Minister taken to try and avoid that threat? What has he done in the United States to try and get around that major problem? What steps will he take in the future? There is a great danger of countervailing tariff action in the U.S. because of the so-called restructuring.

The Minister has not told us what decisions are going to be made about very delicate matters, such as who will be entitled to fish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence to catch the increased red fish stocks that are now supposedly present in the Gulf. In 1974-75, the Newfoundland and Nova Scotia trawlers as well as other trawlers were ordered not to fish in the Gulf until the red fish stocks came back.

The fish plants on the south coast taken over from the Lakes at Ramea, Burgeo, Gaultois, and Harbour Breton, need access to those stocks. That is why they were put there in the first place. As to the Nova Scotia vessels, is the Government going to permit trawlers to re-enter and fish in the Gulf again for a certain quota of red fish or not?

What is to be the decision there? What does the Minister plan to do about that? How can this restructured company in Newfoundland be viable economically if it is not allowed to fish those stocks? The Minister should explain how they are going to be viable if they have to send their trawlers north off Labrador, even though they are not especially ice strengthened, at three or four times the cost and two or three times the danger? How will they have access to the fish stocks that will permit them to be lean, hungry and viable? The Minister has not even touched on that problem. What is he going to do about the unclear aims; economic efficiency and viability versus employment as well as Unemployment Insurance benefits or social considerations?

Who will be the directors? Will they be political hacks? Will it be Liberal hacks appointed by the Government, as is usually the case, or will they be independent-thinking people with some experience in business, law, the fishery or labour? What kind of people will be directors?

How can a miracleman be found who will be able to do all the inconsistent things he will have to do as managing director of one of those two huge companies? He will have to satisfy federal politicians, federal bureaucrats, provincial politicians and provincial bureaucrats. He will have to deal with his directors, the plant employees, inshore fishermen and trawler

fishermen. They all have inconsistent purposes. The interests of one are not necessarily the same as the interests of the other. How will he be able to run an efficient company, look after marketing, sales in the U.S. and the European Common Market as well as fish production? Where is such a superman to be found? He will have to look after the members of every fishing district which has a fish plant apart altogether from Governments. When are they going to find such a man?

These two companies have no financial plan for next year. They do not know what their budgets will be for next year. They do not know who will be in charge. Morale is shattered. The Minister has not spoken of all these problems. The Minister thinks all problems will be solved because the Government will put more money in and it will be a Government-controlled corporation. What is the fishing plan for those companies for next year? What quotas of fish stocks is the Minister assigning to those two companies for next year? There is total confusion. The Government bungled the attempt to get the shareholders out of the way of those companies. It took so long that it did tremendous damage to marketing in the United States in the case of Fishery Products Limited.

There was bungling with reference to the Government's own Canada Development Corporation, complete bungling. That company, which is 48 per cent owned by the Government, could not even discuss with the Government some sensible way to compensate them to get their shares and those of the Monroes. The Government had to be brought to its knees by court action taken in Canada and the United States. It was a complete bungling. The Minister should submit his resignation now because of the untold damage caused by the shareholders. What agreement has been reached with the shareholders? What is agreed to be paid to the CDC, the Monroes and the Lakes? The Minister has not given us any figure as to what happened there. I hope it will all be discussed and explained in committee.

How are they going to overcome the disruption in the U.S. markets? The fishery was better off when the entrepreneurs were in charge, risking their money, such as they had, and borrowing from the banks. They were hard workers and gamblers. I would like to say a kind word about them as they depart.

The Lakes, the Penneys, the Moores, the Russells, the Monroes, their replacements will be hard to find. It is never the same when you are dealing with somebody else's money. There is no bottom line. The Government is going to put in the money. If they lose $100 million this year, the Government will put in another $100 million next year. It is not hard to find people who do not mind spending other people's money. It is a far different breed that built up this industry. They risked their own money and the money they borrowed from the banks, only to be finally done in by an incompetent Government which allowed interest rates to go to 23 per cent.

• (1150)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but I must inform him that his time has expired.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member a question. Is the Hon. Member aware that the Premier of his own Province has publicly stated that this is the most beneficial action for his Province taken by the federal Government since Newfoundland's entry into Confederation in 1949? Second, is he aware that the Premier of his Province has just tabled in the Legislature of Newfoundland a Bill ratifying the agreement that we have signed and urging that it be passed unanimously?

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly aware that the Premier of the Province welcomed the fact that the Government of Canada had at last come to its senses and agreed to give the provincial Government some say in how the new company was to operate, and the Premier also welcomed the fact that the Minister had finally taken a more reasonable stand by dropping the position he had taken on July 2 and entering into an agreement that was more favourable to the provincial Government and would give it some say in the fishery. However, if the Premier ever said that this was the greatest thing since Confederation or sliced bread, then I would only have to say to the Minister that I do not agree with him.

I think that this action will stave off the complete collapse of the fishery industry but it is the only alternative that is presented to us. The only alternative to the collapse of the fishery industry is a blank cheque which the Government will now give these companies in order to save the industry for a while. However, I do not say that this is the greatest thing since sliced bread. I have not seen any plan presented by the Minister that would show us how this will result in any benefit other than to keep fish plants open at the moment. It is a confession of abject failure on behalf of the Minister.

The Premier of Newfoundland is pleased because the Government of Canada had to concede that the provincial Government should have some say over the operations of the company. Naturally he was pleased that the Minister dropped his previous stubborn and stupid attitude, but if the Premier said the words attributed to him by the Minister, then I would have to say that I do not agree. I think that this is a bad job that has been initiated by the Minister and his Government and we have no alternative but to support it and hail it. Other than on that basis, I would not agree with the Minister.

What was the second part of the Minister's question? The first part of his question was so jejune that I have forgotten the second part of his question.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the speech made by the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). I am not an expert in this field and I do not represent very many fishermen, but some things seem to me to be pretty obvious from the reports we have had.

The fishing industry, which is one of the main industries in Atlantic Canada and employs tens of thousands of people, was operated for many years by private companies. For various reasons, some of which include overexpansion, high interest rates and cutbacks in the markets, the industry was going bankrupt. The banks could no longer carry the private industry.

That being the case, there was an agreement reached between the federal Liberal Government and at least two Conservative provincial Governments, the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Nova Scotia. That agreement provided that the only way the industry could be saved and tens of thousands of people could be assisted was through massive Government intervention. That, Mr. Speaker, has been the history of so many industries in so many parts of Canada. The Government has intervened when the private sector could not do the job. This is not necessarily a criticism of the private sector, but that has been a fact of life.

The federal Liberal Government and the provincial Conservative Governments have reached an agreement. I am not competent to say whether that agreement is the best one that could have been reached or whether it will succeed, but surely it is obvious that the private sector did not and could not do the job. Yet it seems to me that the only solution which the Hon. Member for St. John's West has put forth as an alternative to what has been agreed on between the federal Liberal Government and the two provincial Conservative Governments is that somehow the Governments should give more money, either through grants or loans, to the private companies which have already failed. It seems to me that that is neither possible nor advisable.

Mr. Crosbie: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for asking a sensible question. It is the only sensible question I have been asked this morning.

The situation is that this is not an industry like any other industry because the source of its raw material is controlled by the Government. The fishing industry is unlike the agricultural industry in which the farmer can decide how many turnips or how much wheat or whatever he will plant. The fish resources are common property resources controlled by the Government. As well, many other aspects of the industry are controlled by the Government, including the kind of boat that can be used, whether the fisherman can get a licence for a trawler, a 65-foot longliner or a trap skip, or whether he can fish at all. All of this is controlled and licensed by the Government, so we are not dealing with an ordinary industry.

We are dealing with an industry in eastern Canada which, because there are no large amounts of capital available to be invested, has always been undercapitalized while its equipment is becoming more and more expensive. It does not represent the normal industrial situation. The responsibility for what has happened in the fishery industry is, to a major degree, that of the Government itself because of some of those factors I have mentioned.

With respect to the two Conservative Governments, the Government of Nova Scotia itself has not yet reached any agreement with the federal Government except for a so-called agreement in principle. The details of that agreement which are more important than its principle have not been agreed upon.

The Government of Newfoundland had no choice but to accept an agreement that would give it some say in what would happen. Newfoundland is a Province in which the fishery industry is the most important of its industries and is the biggest employer of its people. The only reason anyone lives in rural Newfoundland is to work in the fishery industry and the fishery industry is not controlled by the provincial Government at all. It is as if the land and the grain and everything in the Province of Saskatchewan were completely federally controlled.

From the point of view of the Government of Newfoundland, first the fishery industry had to be saved and rural Newfoundland had to be saved. That could only be done by the federal Government and if the provincial Government could get an agreement to give it some influence over the issues that are to be decided upon in the future, that would be an advantage. Finally, after getting that concession from the federal Government, it entered into an agreement to which it had no alternative in any event. We cannot have fish plants all over Newfoundland collapse, and if the only way to keep them going is through money from the federal Government, the provincial Government of Newfoundland naturally must support that, just as I must support it because there are 23 fish plants in my district.

Although I am supporting the agreement on that basis, Mr. Speaker, it does not mean that I believe it is the right solution. I myself would have preferred to see the Government allow the industry to continue in private hands but have the Government take over the plants that it wants to operate for social reasons and operate them itself separate from the other companies. Fishery Products Limited should not be operating a plant that it does not think is economical because that would give it an excuse to say in future years, if it has not done well, that it was prevented from doing so by the fact that it had operated plants that were uneconomical. Those plants should be taken over by the Government. If they are needed for social purposes, they should be operated by the Government.

The Government should have made financial arrangements through loans or, to some extent, grants to assist the trawler companies to continue in business because it was the Government's own economic policies and incompetence that put the fishing industry in a position where it could no longer survive and made it impossible for the Bank of Nova Scotia to continue its financing. That would have been my preferred solution, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

• (1200)

Miss Coline Campbell (South West Nova): Mr. Speaker, I would say to the last speaker that perhaps his concern should have been made known to his own provincial Government before it went into the arrangement, because it is now a partner to an arrangement. At least we from Nova Scotia have only an agreement to co-operate between the two Governments.

Bill C-170 is an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishery enterprises. It is by far the most important piece of legislation I have seen come before Parliament in the years in which I have represented South West Nova. It may not be the Constitution, the Crow Bill, any one of the budget Bills, or the six and five legislation, but to the people in the Atlantic Provinces this Bill will have a far-reaching effect. I believe that as politicians we must make sure that we get the most out of this Bill before it is passed in this House. Certainly my constituents feel it will affect them, and they want more information.

This legislation came about because of the Kirby task force. The powers the Bill gives to the Minister seem to be unlimited. The Kirby task force was established in January, 1982. It was to study the Atlantic coast fisheries and report to an ad hoc committee of Ministers on the Atlantic fisheries. In December of 1982 it made its recommendations on establishing and maintaining viable fishery enterprises on the Atlantic coast of Canada.

The Kirby task force set out three objectives which form the basis of its recommendations. I would like to quote from the Kirby task force report because I feel it is important for us to know the context in which we now have this Bill before us. At page VII the report lists three objectives in order of priority which should guide Atlantic fisheries policy. And remember, these are in order of priority:

> Objective 1: The Atlantic fishing industry should be economically viable on an ongoing basis, where to be viable implies an ability to survive downturns with only a normal business failure rate and without government assistance.

That was the top priority. I will read the next two priorities:

> Objective 2: Employment in the Atlantic fishing industry should be maximized subject to the constraint that those employed receive a reasonable income as a result of fishery-related activities, including fishery-related income transfer payments.
>
> Objective 3: Fish within the 200-mile Canadian zone should be harvested and processed by Canadians in firms owned by Canadians wherever this is consistent with Objectives 1 and 2 and with Canada's international treaty obligations.

These objectives are important to remember because I feel that this Bill and the restructuring of the fisheries seem to be in direct contradiction of these objectives, particularly the primary objective of economic viability.

Before commenting on the Bill itself, I would just like to go back a couple of years and review some of the history which brought about the Kirby task force, as well as the present collapse of the five large fishing companies on the East Coast. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, does not seem to be taking history into account. What we saw happening in 1981 was that five large East Coast companies were holding inventories which were too high. This was mainly due to a softening in our existing markets. The East Coast fisheries had seen this happen before. In fact, the last time it happened was in 1973. In 1974-75 the federal Government put approximately $150 million into assisting these companies and their inventories. Again, at that time, Mr. Speaker, the markets were soft.

In late 1980 through 1981, with soft marketing conditions and increased fish landings, inventories were again high and the market price depressed. Fish inventories have always been financed by banks and in 1980 interest rates went up and continued to climb. The debt incurred to finance the inventories and to hold these inventories became too great for the companies and they came looking to the federal Government and to the provincial Governments, as well as to the banks, for financial assistance.

We also found at that time that we did not have any mechanism at the federal level to alleviate this problem. We had a fisheries prices support board which could only remove inventories and hold them at similar cost to the companies as that provided by the banks. The Government did not appear to have any ability to offer an outright purchase of the inventory and then try to resell it later when the market could take up the excess inventory, and thereby avoid dumping fish into soft markets at certainly lower prices.

The Government gave no financial guarantees to an industry which was the most important industry on the East Coast as far as employment and revenues were concerned. Some companies, in my view, might still be in existence had they been provided with some sort of assistance. Heaven knows, over the years federal Governments have assisted other operations in Canada, such as Massey-Ferguson, Canadair and Dome Petroleum, yet our basic resource industry got the Kirby task force.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, how will this Bill ensure orderly marketing when our marketing capabilities go soft? I have always felt that federal involvement, along with the provincial involvement—because the Provinces have the jurisdiction to market fish—should have been concentrated on establishing a voluntary orderly marketing program. Such a program would set up an organization which would be able to sell excess fish and not have to compete in an existing soft market. In other words, if there were high inventories these inventories could be removed at the wish of the company and sold into either new markets, which would have been established by some mechanism, or sold at a later date into the existing market when the market had hardened up.

Today we have before us a Bill which does not establish a voluntary marketing system on the East Coast. I must say that the Kirby task force does deal with marketing in great depth. However, this Bill does not mention any of this. In fact, the Minister stated in his speech on Monday that there would be three new marketing companies. Again, Mr. Speaker, are

these companies to compete among themselves and the smaller processors? Will they eventually have the same marketing conditions which have existed in the past, without any relief?

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that this Bill will set up and fund three super East Coast companies. It is a Bill which incorporates the exact amount of money needed to establish these three super companies and which, from what I have read, does not set up any financing for the small independent companies which may also be in trouble. This is a Bill which, in my view, does not even resemble the recommendations of the Kirby task force. We have in fact a Bill which talks about economic viability in the preamble, incorporating the primary recommendation of Kirby, but does not talk about the fishing excesses which the report says presently exists within the five companies which are to become two companies. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is a Bill which suggests that the provincial and federal Governments are nationalizing the fisheries. Yet the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) and the Nova Scotia Minister of Fisheries talk about the privatization of the two companies. How will this take place? What will the Bank of Nova Scotia receive in real terms out of this? Will it be a benefit? What about the company owners, are they receiving a benefit?

● (1210)

We are told in Clause 4 on page 2 of the agreement between the federal Government and Nova Scotia that:

> The governments agree that their participation in refinancing the company will be on terms such that the existing shareholders and financial institutions shall not be bailed out.

Yet we see an article in the *Daily News* in Newfoundland on November 11 stating that the CDC will receive $14.6 million for its shares. Then take that together with an article in the *Evening Telegram* of November 12 which says the federal Government will pay $14.6 million to the CDC, a major shareholder in Fishery Products.

We have been told shareholders will not benefit in this restructuring. I think that question has to be answered in committee because we already see some shareholders getting benefits. I think the people on the East Coast would like to know the answer to this question. Will the Nickersons receive a benefit? On the other hand, we hear they are going into receivership. These are all questions which have to be answered because they concern my constituents and other East Coast Canadians. They should be answered before we proceed further with the restructuring of the Atlantic fishery.

There are other questions about the agreement, Mr. Speaker. Why would the Province of Nova Scotia agree that the Nickerson scallop fleet go to Newfoundland? I would like to know in what way that benefits Newfoundland. I have already spoken about the economic benefits to existing shareholders and financial institutions. I am curious to know if we are going to be funding them. Clause 11 on page 3 of the agreement between the federal Government and the Province of Nova Scotia says:

> The two governments will ask financial institutions to provide credit support to ensure the province's independent fish processors are able to maintain continued normal operations.

I know of several operations in my own area which are suffering because the banks have already increased interest rates as well as dropped the level of financing that the small producers were used to. When will the Province of Nova Scotia go after these institutions? When is the federal Minister going to go after them? How much power do these two Governments have over the financial institutions? Mr. Kirby is quoted in *The Globe and Mail* of November 5, 1983 as saying:

> Governments and the bank have simply become the buyers of last resort, a possibility we had foreseen from the beginning—

I do not see that in the recommendations.

> —if no private investors could be found. And once we decided not to bail anyone out, we knew we were going to have to get something for our money and that something was equity in the new company.

I know some Members have already asked this question, but what chance were private investors given to invest? Until the company goes into receivership, who can invest?

There are other questions the Bill does not answer. How are these companies to be formed? We are told they will be privately run with provincial and federal money. Who has control over the directors? The bank and the federal Government will appoint directors to each new company in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. Will these directors not have conflicts of interest? It is inconceivable to me that the Bank of Nova Scotia, which will make appointments to both companies, could not make a decision concerning one company which would not be beneficial to the other company. Will there be a conflict of interest concerning the federal Government? What will be the objects of these two companies? Will they operate as a public company in competition with the smaller, independent processors? Or will they operate as a private company? If private, will they be allowed to operate on the basis of good business practices, which might mean the shutting down of some operations as recommended by Dr. Kirby?

The one thing we have is a Bill which gives wide powers, but we have only one arrangement or agreement before us, Mr. Speaker, the one between Newfoundland and the federal Government. We in Nova Scotia are waiting to see what the arrangements will be. There are different players. We do not know what the shareholders in National Sea will do, whether they will accept this agreement to co-operate. We have to wait and see. But in all the recommendations Mr. Kirby and his task force made, I cannot say it was clearly and specifically set out that this is what we would end up with.

There were other things in the Kirby task force report which have not been dealt with. A key example of that is one whole chapter dealing with the herring seining fleet where he recommends there be a Government buy-back to reduce the capacity of that fleet. What is in it for the poor fishermen who are trying to make a living with too few fish and fleet overcapacity? They are being asked to do their own buy-back.

It seems to me that the players who were there prior to Dr. Kirby have not been heard from. That in itself shows a

vacuum and I would like to know why. Why are the processors being bailed out, because we hear the CDC is being bailed out? Who else is going to be bailed out? What is going to happen to the other recommendations? Will the seiners be helped? What about all those small fishermen who, over the last few years, have seen their interest rates go up? Are they going to be helped out?

● (1220)

Mr. Speaker, I realize my time is up. It is my hope that the concerns I have raised will be fully discussed in committee. Unless we have a clear indication of where this Bill will take us and who it will help and affect, and unless those concerns are answered, we will have many days of graver concern on the East Coast.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. Questions, comments.

Mr. Forrestall: Will the distinguished Member from South West Nova (Miss Campbell) in fact vote for the Bill in its present form?

Miss Campbell: The Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) certainly has more experience than I have on voting. However, I have used all my efforts to get this Bill into committee to be studied. The Province of Nova Scotia with a Conservative Government supports this restructuring and the Province of Newfoundland supports it. I come from an area where there are a lot of independents in the fishery and my main concern has to be for them.

I certainly want to see the Bill go to committee. I know there is urgency on your own side. Your own Leader has said that he supports this Bill. When so many great people are saying this, who am I to say that it is not a good Bill? I will let it go to committee and we at least have the opportunity to study it there. I will have to wait and see what happens.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Further questions or comments?

Mr. De Bané: Is the Hon. Member aware that the official critic of his own Party—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

Mr. De Bané: —has said in a speech that—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Minister is not allowed to put a question to the previous questioner. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. Crosbie: I thought the Hon. Member made a very reasoned speech, bringing up many of the points and conundrums that have not been answered. Has the Hon. Member put these points to the Minister privately and in caucus and has he provided any answers privately or in caucus? Is it just that he is impossible to get through to, or is he ignoring these issues? What is the problem? Obviously there is a communications gap between the Hon. Member and the Minister.

Miss Campbell: Certainly I have had discussions with the Minister of Fisheries regarding some of my concerns. The person that I have had not had too many discussions with is Dr. Kirby. It was Dr. Kirby who was negotiating the arrangements in Newfoundland. I would like to have him come before the committee so I can ask him some of these questions. I have raised these concerns with the Members of my caucus. I hope Members opposite have raised their own concerns in their caucus. This certainly does not appear to be the case, from what their Leader is stating and what we are hearing here.

Mr. McGrath: The Hon. Member made a very interesting speech. Given her critical position as chairman of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry and her announced bias in the House against this Bill, will the Member remove herself from that position when the Bill goes to committee so there will be no question whatsoever that the Bill will receive objective, critical examination?

Miss Campbell: My chairmanship or my bias could be raised by the committee and if there is a vote of non-confidence in me, I will certainly step aside. In fact, I thought of asking my vice-chairman to handle this Bill so I could be better equipped to ask questions. The Hon. Member has sat on the committee many times and knows that the chairman must more or less ask questions with the consent of the committee members. I do not think I have a bias in its going to committee. My concerns are very much the same as those the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) raised. Some of my concerns are very similar and I would think that we might have had the same researchers on some of them as far as the corporate structures of the companies go. I certainly do not think I have a bias against Newfoundland having made the arrangement.

Mr. McGrath: Just trying to protect your Minister, that's all.

Mr. Crosbie: Does the Hon. Member agree that the Bill needs to be amended to ensure some accountability? At the moment it is a blank cheque to spend money and make guarantees. Would she agree that it would be sensible to have this Bill amended so that the Government must report to the House of Commons fishery committee each year on what has happened under the Bill, who have gotten guarantees, loans, grants and why, and exactly what progress there has been so there will be some accountability? Would the Hon. Member agree that this would be a good step?

Miss Campbell: The Hon. Member raises an important question. He must remember that sometimes chairmen of committees have to rule out amendments because they are not in conformity with the Bill. I suggest that we look to see where the accountability is. Is it to Public Accounts or is it to the Minister of Fisheries? If we continue the present trial rules in the House we could probably have accountability just under the general Department of Fisheries report at any time. I think that is a very favourable way of operating any committee. I think you put the chairman in a difficult position because

sometimes, no matter who is chairman, because they have been given advice by clerks, not politicians, they have to rule as to the viability, the length or breadth of the amendment. I think there should be accountability.

Mr. McMillan: Mr. Speaker, how does the Hon. Member reconcile her apparent support for this Bill at second reading stage with an article that appeared in *La presse* on November 16 in which she is quoted as saying:

Fishermen and small businesses have numerous reasons for concern about the future this restructuring holds for them.

How does the Hon. Member reconcile that expression of outrage on behalf of independents with the apparent support she has for this Bill at second reading?

Miss Campbell: I am sorry, I missed that. Would the Hon. Member repeat it?

Mr. McMillan: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is quoted clearly in *La Presse* yesterday as saying:

Fishermen and small businesses have numerous reasons for concern about the future this restructuring holds for them.

How does the Hon. Member reconcile this expression of outrage against the Bill on behalf of independent operators with her apparent support for this Bill at second reading?

Miss Campbell: I think I raised all those concerns in my speech. I would assume that in committee the Bill will be studied. We will have people there who may answer some of those concerns. They are definite concerns of the fishermen and small businesses in the constituency of South West Nova and across Nova Scotia, as some of my colleagues from Nova Scotia have said and which they will probably speak on. If those concerns are not resolved there is an independence in backbenchers that has always been there. I ask the Opposition, who have already supported this Bill in principle, what they will do?

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one further question of the Hon. Member because she is the very distinguished chairman of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry and that is a very key role in this whole process. Will the Hon. Member support the opening of the Gulf to Canadian trawlers to catch the surplus ground stocks that are there at the present time? Does the Hon. Member support that position?

Miss Campbell: I know from whence the question comes; it is from the former Minister of Fisheries in 1979. He knows the answer. One has to remember that the Gulf was closed because stocks were greatly reduced. I think there are scientific outlooks that indicate the Gulf stocks have rejuvenated. I assume there is to be some discussion as to whether or not they have been restored to such an extent that perhaps we could allow some extra fishing in there. It is my understanding that it is one of the terms they will look at in the agreement to co-operate between Nova Scotia and the federal Government. Certainly, if the fishing activity in the area is able to take the stocks, they should probably be given first consideration.

• (1230)

On the other hand, if those stocks have been rejuvenated there should be some consideration given—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. Debate.

Mr. Tom McMillan (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the debate on Bill C-170, the federal Government's legislation to restructure the Atlantic fishery. At the outset, I should make it clear that I have deep-seated reservations about the Bill, especially from the point of view of my own Province of Prince Edward Island.

Prince Edward Island's interests have been all but ignored by the Government, so preoccupied has it been with other East Coast Provinces, notably Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. Yet the Prince Edward Island fishery is an important part of the total industry in Atlantic Canada. Indeed, the fishery is the second largest industry on the Island in terms of jobs and earned income.

The fishery is more than just another industry in the Province. It is an integral part of the culture of the Island. Many communities of the Province, from Tignish to Nufrage, were originally settled because of the fishery. It continues to be the lifeblood of most of those communities to this very day. The fishery is practically the only way of life that the people of that Province have ever known. Salt water is in their veins. To destroy the fishery through Government heavy-handedness, or to allow it to die through neglect or mismanagement, would be to destroy the people themselves.

Therefore, we are debating today not just another piece of legislation, nor simply a plan to rescue yet another industry, though clearly it has elements of that. In fact, we are discussing the survival of an important part of Canada. If such sounds like so much rhetorical hyperbole or flourish, let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not exaggerating. The Atlantic fishery provides some 100,000 people with jobs, with about equal numbers engaged in the catch and processing sector. That total number is approximately 25,000 more than the members employed in the entire automobile manufacturing industry of this country.

Now, after decades of abject neglect by the federal Government, it has taken a veritable crisis in the fishery to shock the Government into paying any attention at all to this important part of our national life, and only in the form of an after the fact rescue operation rather than in the form of a rational, well thought out, well planned strategy. With most of the large fish plants bankrupt, in receivership or on the verge of it, with thousands of plant workers and fishermen idle and with the entire region reeling from the economic impact, the federal Government has decided at last to take some action.

The Bill before us sets out to do several things. In general, it seeks to provide the legal and financial powers for the federal Government to restructure the Atlantic fishery. The Bill would empower the Government to acquire, hold or dispose of any interest in any enterprise engaged directly or indirectly in the Atlantic fishery. In particular, the Bill provides for an immedi-

ate appropriation of $138 million to finance the federal contribution to the so-called restructuring plan. The bill also authorizes the Government to make loan guarantees to fishery enterprises being restructured. As part of the restructuring, agreements have been signed or tentatively agreed to by the federal Government and Newfoundland and Nova Scotia to restructure the deep sea fishing plants based in those Provinces. In the process, two huge nationalized companies are being forged from the ashes of private companies.

I use the term "nationalized companies" advisedly. The Nova Scotia restructuring agreement will take the two large companies in that Province—National Sea and H. B. Nickerson and Sons—and make one large state-dominated company. The Newfoundland deal takes three major fish firms in the Province—Fishery Products, the Lake group and John Penney and Sons—and creates a massive company controlling 85 per cent of the processing capacity in Newfoundland. The two new super corporations will have the dubious distinction of being, respectively, the largest and second largest fish companies in the entire world.

Let us make no mistake about the matter. The so-called restructuring arrangement is, at once, a full-scale nationalization of the affected parts of the industry and a bail-out of not only the former privately owned companies but also the Bank of Nova Scotia which otherwise would lose millions of dollars in bad loans. Indeed, this scheme is a takeover, not a restructuring at all.

Neither Parliament nor the public has been allowed to know the details of the arrangement. The whole thing has been shrouded in secrecy and mystery from the very beginning. I think one may never find out the whole story. In the case of Nova Scotia, apparently the deal is yet to be finalized. But this much we do know about the Newfoundland deal. I mention it only in the context of my Province of Prince Edward Island which has been, to date, ignored in all of this. The super company is 85 per cent owned by Governments. Eight of the eleven members of the board of directors are Government appointed. The chief executive officer is a joint appointment of both Governments. Significant corporate decisions are subject to the veto of the federal and provincial Governments. Most relevant of all, management must consult both Governments before the company can act. This control is above and beyond that exercised by the federal Government through its general management of the Atlantic fishery.

What the country has received, therefore, is a Government-dominated industry, one in which the state will have a direct day to day vested interest through ownership and control, including corporate voting rights. Decisions affecting the companies, and therefore the industry generally, because of their size and influence, will most certainly be made on the basis of political considerations rather than on the basis of the best interests of the over-all fishery or of the region as a whole. The wonderful people who have made a hash of everything else they have controlled, from Canadair to the post office, are now going to put codfish on our tables.

The restructuring plan has the potential to devastate the fishery in Prince Edward Island, however important or however temporary may be the relief it could provide to Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. It could well ring the death knell to the independently-owned fish processing sector in my Province and consequently to a large part of the rest of the fishery there. The fact is, Sir, there are some 42 fish processing plants in P.E.I. About two dozen of them are independents operating outside the restructured companies and exporting produce on their own. The two largest independents, which process groundfish, are Georgetown Seafoods Ltd. in Georgetown and Usen Fisheries in Souris. The former, Georgetown, has not been in operation since the fall of 1981 but Usen and most of the smaller plants throughout the Province have been fully operational and profitable.

• (1240)

I do not know what will become of Georgetown Seafoods. P.E.I.'s Minister in the federal cabinet, the Hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Campbell), has been saying from one end of P.E.I. to the other that the plant's reopening is imminent. He was saying that as long ago as last spring and early summer. Yet in reply to my questions in the House as recently as October 7, the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) refused to associate himself with that commitment given by his colleague.

Moreover, a secret federal Government document prepared by the Ministry of State for Economic and Regional Expansion last summer and obtained by the research office of my Party made very clear that the plant, in the eyes of the Government, was "permanently closed". Here we had a secret Government document, at a time when the federal Minister of Veterans Affairs was saying that the reopening of the plant was imminent, making it clear that, in the eyes of the same Government, the Georgetown Seafoods plant was permanently closed and its reopening was not imminent, as the Minister was pointing out.

Obviously, the future is grim for that plant. I believe the best bet is for the plant to reopen under provincial auspices and it is to be hoped with private investment money. But for that to happen, Georgetown Seafoods will need to be given back four of the original 11 trawlers still in the hands of the existing owners, H. B. Nickerson and Sons Limited. Those trawlers are now at Canso, having long since been wrenched from Georgetown, leaving it virtually impossible for the plant to operate profitably.

The new restructuring package has nonetheless loaded the deck of cards against all the independent plants across P.E.I. and, indeed, throughout the Atlantic region and parts of Quebec. Now, the federal Government is to be in the fish processing business itself in a massive way, why should it want to encourage competition against itself? From here on, the Government will hold all the aces. Who but the most extreme optimist would believe that the Government will not weight future programs and regulations in favour of its own client

companies, to the detriment of the remaining private companies?

Even before the restructuring, the federal Government controlled everything from dredging operations to fishing quotas, to federal wharf construction, to DREE-type industry subsidies, to total allowable catches, to fish processing plant health standards, to import licences. Now the small, independent operators also face the prospect of having to compete against huge Government-owned and Government-subsidized fish companies in an industry where the Government could set all the rules to benefit its own industrial giants.

I have been in touch with many of the independent operators in my Province of P.E.I. and with both Premier Jim Lee and Fisheries Minister Roddy Pratt. Most of those operators are petrified about the potential impact of Bill C-170 on their plants. One such operator told me that if Bill C-170 passes as it stands he may as well close shop immediately. I know many others feel the same way. More and more of the independents are joining the Federation of Independent Fish Packers, recently formed for the sole purpose of fighting Bill C-170 that we are debating today. Premier Lee and Mr. Pratt share those concerns and fears, and I do too.

Independent operators have been assured by the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans that the restructuring arrangement is only a temporary one, made to support the fishery until it can find its sea legs, so to speak—stand on its own two feet. Assurances have also been given by the Minister and by other spokesmen for the Government that the new Government companies will then be returned to the private sector; they will be privatized. I ask you, Sir, if that is actually to be the case, why is the Government afraid to incorporate such a provision right into the legislation itself? There is absolutely nothing in the existing Bill to protect the independents.

I urge the Government to devise a new section to provide for the Government's orderly withdrawal from an ownership position in the industry according to a detailed schedule. Such a section should either specify a date by which all Government equity must be sold or, alternatively, set a limit on its equity; for example, less than 40 per cent by 1986. A section of that kind would have the effect of making the relevant assistance under the so-called restructuring program a one-shot impetus to the industry, not a prescription for permanent nationalization of it.

Bill C-170 is so important to P.E.I. and to all of Atlantic Canada that it should go immediately, or as soon as everyone has had his or her say, to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry for detailed study. Obviously, the Liberal chairman of that Committee, the Hon. Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell), who just spoke at some length, shares my deep-seated reservations and concerns about Bill C-170, for she is quoted in *La Presse*, as I pointed out a few moments ago, on November 16, as saying that "fishermen and small businesses have numerous reasons for concern about the future this restructuring holds for them".

[*Translation*]

Miss Campbell: In French!

Mr. McMillan: Mr. Speaker, I shall repeat the same thing in French later on.

[*English*]

I myself must insist, on behalf of the people I represent, on a full public airing of the views of independent operators in P.E.I. in committee. If those operators are denied a fair hearing, and if for whatever reason the Government denies a full and ample debate on the issue in committee, then I serve notice that I for one will muster every possible support from within the PC caucus and from the P.E.I. Government to fight this Bill at all remaining stages. In such a fight I am confident of the strong backing of the independent operators in my Province.

More than survival of a few canneries is at stake. And even more than the continuing viability of the fishery itself is involved. At the heart of the issue is the very fate of the Atlantic region. We must not let our people down.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Questions, comments? Debate.

● (1250)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I represent a federal riding in Quebec where, as one of the municipal authorities in the Gaspé said recently on national television, fishing is the only valid alternative to unemployment and welfare. Today, Mr. Speaker, I wish to underline the very substantial role played by the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans in taking this industry in hand, and the Department's very definite intention to provide for restructuring of this industry through Bill C-170.

The House will recall that Quebec's Atlantic coast extends for over more than 3,000 kilometers. Here and there along the cost, there are a number of very small villages that depend largely on fishing, not only for a living but for their very survival.

That, Mr. Speaker, will be the focus of my comments in support of the legislation to restructure the Atlantic fisheries.

Not long ago, the TV news showed us some tragic pictures of Gaspé fishermen who were obliged to throw a day's catch back into the sea, because they were unable to find any fish depots that would take the herring they caught the day before. These fishermen had just been confronted with the dilemma that arises when supply exceeds demand and shore facilities can no longer handle the landing capacity of the fishing fleet. On television the situation even more dramatic, of course, but the point was very clearly made that such occurrences were not unique in the Gaspé.

In its report, the Atlantic Fisheries Task Force had already commented at length on the lack of infrastructures in the fisheries industry in Quebec, as well as on the need for restructuring, without delay, the entire industry in that Province and Eastern Canada, so as to make it economically viable, provide a decent income for Canadians employed in the industry and finally, to serve the interests of all Canadians.

As a result of the recommendations made by the task force in its report, it was clear that it would be necessary to reorganize the management of Quebec's ocean fisheries and also to renovate and modernize existing infrastructures in order to meet the pressing needs of an industry which in Quebec, in any case, had a lot of catching up to do.

It is also true, however, that in Quebec, there was a situation where responsibility for ocean fisheries was either shared or duplicated, and as a result, both levels of government were able to blame each other and meanwhile, for instance, equipment that came under one jurisdiction rather than another was allowed to deteriorate through lack of maintenance. In any case, this industry, which is not a major one for the Province but is very important to the Gaspé and especially to the riding of Gaspé, is desperately in need of upgrading, which will require very substantial funding by the level of government that will be taking on this responsibility.

I realize that the fisheries industry in Eastern Canada has experienced very severe problems in recent years. In the Atlantic provinces, there have been times when business was very poor and the threat of bankruptcy continues to hover over the fisheries. After long and stormy negotiations, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) managed to obtain a consensus on restructuring the fisheries industry in such a way that both the provinces and the private sector would share the cost and together make the effort required to revive the industry.

The Minister is therefore to be congratulated on the success of this manoeuvre, thanks to which this time, at least, the Government of Canada will not be left to bear the financial burden and related responsibilities alone.

Unfortunately, the Government of Quebec is still dragging its feet and would rather fund other projects instead of contributing towards the restructuring of this new industry over which it claims exclusive jurisdiction. This would in fact create a kind of enclave in a system where all parties are closely dependent on one another.

After concluding agreements with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Government of Nova Scotia, and after clearly indicating his intentions to the Government of Quebec, the Minister is asking the House today to give him the means to fully implement a plan that has had a very positive start. In his speech in support of Bill C-170 which is now before the House, the Minister amply demonstrated how complex the issue is and how directly it depends on the proposed restructuring. He made it very clear that he was anxious to give all partners in this plan an opportunity to be heard and to express their points of view. He emphasized they should be given an opportunity to contribute directly to and, eventually, to benefit, both individually and collectively from, the results of this plan.

Last week, when I visited my riding, I met several hundred fishermen and processing plant workers. They were very concerned about the future of the fisheries industry in Quebec, as a result of what the Minister responsible for fisheries in Quebec, the Hon. Jean Garon, was doing in the Gaspé. Since he became Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Garon's actions have been based far more on his political views than on any concern for the social and economic welfare of producers and fishermen in the riding of Gaspé and the Province of Quebec.

My constituents have asked me to inform the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans that he should proceed with his plan for restructuring the fisheries industry, because in the past, it was always the Government of Canada that managed to save the fishermen of the Province of Quebec.

Between 1975 and 1978, a decision was made to revive the groundfish industry in Eastern Canada. During that time, the Government of Canada gave Quebec fishermen and producers grants amounting to $6,111,400. In 1976 and 1977, Quebec fishing enterprises received subsidies totalling $566,000 for ships of 100 feet or more, based in the Gulf, so that they could go outside the Gulf to fish and unload inside the Gulf. In 1972, Mr. Speaker . . . I believe I may call it one o'clock?

An Hon. Member: You have one minute left!

Mr. Cyr: —the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans introduced a program to protect Atlantic salmon and to stop commercial fishing, starting that year. The Government of Canada paid Atlantic and Gulf fishermen, including the Gaspé, to put away their fishing gear and refrain from fishing salmon commercially since 1972. In the Gaspé, people remember this, and they realize that it has always been the Government of Canada that managed to save fishermen in the province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, may I call it one o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order! It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

SMALL BUSINESS

EXTENSION OF SMALL BUSINESS BOND PROGRAM

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to yesterday's announcement by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) of the two-year extension of the Small Business Bond Program. This is a most important source of support for farmers and small businesses in temporary financial difficulty. In just two years the Program has accounted for more than 2,600 low-interest loans totalling over $500 million. More than half of these loans have been made to farmers, and the Program is expected to continue to be of major importance for agriculture. During a period of very high interest rates, this special Program has generated welcome relief indeed.

The extension of this Program is a vital part of the network of federal government support for both agriculture and small business. These loans are provided under normal commercial arrangements with the low interest feature made possible by a tax exemption to the financial institutions. The result is that loans can be made as much as five or six percentage points below market rates, a very significant benefit. I urge Hon. Members to promote the widest possible awareness of this excellent initiative.

* * *

COMMUNICATIONS

NORTHWESTEL COMPANY—CRITICISM OF SERVICE

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, the last few months have seen an ever increasing volume of complaints directed toward NorthwesTel and the telephone service it supposedly provides in the western Northwest Territories. Public meetings have been convened to express citizens' concern with the deteriorating level of services.

NorthwesTel's policy of centralization just has not worked. The disastrous policy of laying off needed maintenance and service personnel has resulted in prolonged breakdowns, interrupted service, and long delays in telephone installation for both commercial and residential customers. HF radio communications are said to be in a deplorable state, with VHF not much better. Despite assurances to the contrary by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy), facilities such as those at Hay River have been continuously downgraded, with necessary staff being discontinued. Unless the federal Crown corporation, NorthwesTel, can bring its service up to an acceptable standard, it should be replaced by a private telephone company forthwith.

[*Translation*]

THE PARTI QUÉBÉCOIS

ATTITUDE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, the MNA for Lafontaine, former Minister of Environment who had already stated that he was quite prepared to use provincial government aircraft to promote the advent of a separatist party on the federal scene, this acting leader of the Parti nationaliste and sometimes radio commentator, this man called Marcel Léger has candidly admitted recently that he was devoting all his time to pave the way for the arrival of the Parti nationaliste in Ottawa, to organize people, raise the necessary funds, and so on. Mr. Speaker, that is an open admission that the residents of Lafontaine are no longer represented. His attitude reflects his contempt for his duties as MNA and for his constituents who had expressed their confidence in him. After Gilles Grégoire, a separatist who lives off his MNA salary behind bars, after the former MNA for Jonquière who used to spend his spare time as Speaker of the National Assembly wishing that he would be appointed judge of the Provincial Court, and was, we now have Mr. Léger who bares his soul. So the Premier of the Province of Quebec is now saddled with three separatists MNAs who, for some time now, have not done anything for Quebec or their constituents. It proves that the Parti québécois is sick, very sick, and I do not believe that Dr. Pierre-Marc Johnson will be able to cure this terminally ill patient.

* * *

[*English*]

BANKS AND BANKING

CONDEMNATION OF ESTATE LOCATORS PROFITEERING FROM LISTS PUBLISHED BY BANK OF CANADA

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, may I, through this forum, draw to the attention of the Canadian people the fact that certain unscrupulous firms and individuals are taking advantage of *The Canada Gazette's* annual publication listing unclaimed bank balances. Members are all aware of the practice of the Bank of Canada to list names, by city and town, and by banks, and the amount unclaimed, and causing this list to be published in the annual edition of *The Canada Gazette*.

Certain operators calling themselves, in some cases, estate locators, are using this public information in a manner which may only be termed misrepresentation. For a price, or a finder's fee, these sharp operators are running a scam offering to inform relatives of deceased persons where funds are sitting waiting to be claimed.

This insidious, unethical practice can only be termed as bloodsucking, and the Bank of Canada, the Government, and the chartered banks ought to be asked to consult so as to make it illegal for anyone to profit from this information which is clearly in the public domain, and chartered banks ought to be encouraged to attempt more rigorously to contact the benefici-

S.O. 21

aries of these unclaimed balances, many of which are in the thousands of dollars.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NICARAGUA—CALL FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF CANADIAN EMBASSY

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, Canadians are worried by statements of the Governments of the United States, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatamela and Costa Rica, threatening military invasion of Nicaragua and of the liberated areas of El Salvador. Although Nicaragua and the El Salvador guerrillas have each repeatedly offered to negotiate, the U.S. and those Governments it dominates have refused any answer except to build up huge armies and navies for invasion.

The Canadian Government, after being shamefully deceived by the U.S. Government about its intention to invade and occupy Grenada, cannot trust the U.S. Government to give honest information about its intentions against the peoples of Nicaragua and El Salvador. Therefore, I call on the Canadian Government to establish our independent presence in Nicaragua by sending our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) to Nicaragua to discuss their recent proposals for mutual disarmament and removal of foreign military personnel, with on-site inspection, by opening an embassy in Managua to provide direct, independent day-to-day information about the illegal attacks by U.S. backed Somocistas, and by working closely with the Contadora group to block U.S. plans for war and to increase economic aid to Nicaragua.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—PROCLAIMED ESTABLISHMENT OF TURKISH-CYPRIOT STATE

Mr. Norman Kelly (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, two days ago the northern portion of the island state of Cyprus seceded from that country and proclaimed itself an independent state. To sensitive, fair-minded people everywhere this is an unnecessary, tragic development in the life of the Cypriot people. As a Canadian living in a bilingual state and a multicultural society, I firmly reject the premise motivating the coup—that Greek and Turkish Cypriots are so fundamentally different in their lifestyles and aspirations that previous attempts to work out an accommodation within the established internationally recognized borders of the state should now be abandoned.

No one should forget that Greek and Turkish Cypriots had lived together in peace and prosperity for a generation before the armed might of the Turkish forces viciously divided the island. That experience must mean something. Surely it proves that the two cultures can co-exist, even thrive, under a common Cypriot citizenship.

Diversity is rapidly becoming one of the dominant features of the modern world. A wise leader knows that, and tries to build bridges, not walls. Mr. Rauf Danktash's actions have betrayed the history of the people of Cyprus and subverted the bright promise of their future. He should be roundly condemned by all of us in this House.

* * *

• (1410)

REFUGEES

ADMISSION OF AFGHAN REFUGEES TO CANADA

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, may I ask why the Government of Canada treats the estimated 4.5 million Afghan refugees who are now in Pakistan and Iran in a different manner than it treats refugees from Poland, Central America and elsewhere? One of my constituents recently returned from visiting his family in the camps in Pakistan and said that the impression there is that the Canadian Government sides with the Soviet Union on its invasion of Afghanistan.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that since 1979 Canada has accepted a total of only about 200 refugees from Afghanistan. West Germany and the United States have each accepted several thousand. Why can we in Canada not declare the Afghan refugees as a designated class for the upcoming year? I also remind you, Mr. Speaker, that Canadian aid to the Afghan refugees is currently running at about $6 per refugee per year.

In the words of Professor M. S. Noorzoy of the Afghan Cultural and Charitable Society of Alberta, Afghan refugees "come with skills and education, but above all, with a great desire to re-establish themselves productively without delay". Canadians generally believe that human beings everywhere should be treated with dignity and respect.

* * *

EDUCATION

INSTRUCTION SOUGHT FOR STUDENTS ON HOW TO APPLY FOR JOBS

Mrs. Ursula Appolloni (York South-Weston): Mr. Speaker, in a brief presented this week to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, the Canadian Federation of Independent Business delivered a stunning and devastatingly negative report on unemployed youth. One of the main criticisms was levelled at those who, according to the report, simply do not know how to apply for a job or how to conduct themselves at an interview. If this is so, Mr. Speaker, then surely the young people deserve not blanket condemnation but constructive help and co-operation from all levels of society. In this spirit, therefore, I urge the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) to contract from the National Film Board a series of "how to" documentaries

which will be made readily available to all high schools throughout Canada.

* * *

EDUCATION

FUNDING NEEDS OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Mr. Bob Ogle (Saskatoon East): Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to explain to the House the difficulty that university students across Canada are having in getting financial assistance to continue at university or post-secondary institutions. This week I was told by Al Shpyth and Beth Olley of the University of Saskatchewan Student Council about the difficulties experienced by students in that university. They explained that the situation is full of Catch 22's. Provincial Governments are blaming the federal Government, and the federal Government is blaming provincial Governments for problems encountered when seeking loans and bursaries.

This morning I received a letter from Mrs. Meridel Magnuson, one of my constituents. Her letter explained the difficulties that her own two children were having in getting loans and bursaries needed to continue their university education. As we all know, it is a national problem and one which exists basically because the country has such a high level of unemployment. Universities are bulging, and many young students who are now attending university would not be there if there were a job for them outside the universities.

I would call upon the Secretary of State (Mr. Joyal) and the person who is in charge of fiscal relations with the Provinces to get cracking and make sure that the Provinces are doing their fair share and are not hindering the process of seeing that young Canadians, our best natural resource, are receiving sufficient funds to enable them to continue their education.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

WESTERN GRAIN STABILIZATION FUND—CONDEMNATION OF GOVERNMENT'S POLICY

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, people of Canada, beware! Do not let the Liberal Government get its mitts on any of your money. It will either lose or steal it and then destroy the files, as occurred with the $1,000 instalment payment paid to Revenue Canada by a new Canadian who is operating a service station in Cochrane, Alberta, or it will hold on to it tenaciously like a bulldog, as in the case of the money paid into the Western Grain Stabilization Fund by the Farmers of western Canada, which amounts to close to $1 billion.

Progressive Conservative Member after Progressive Conservative Member has described the difficult cashflow problem now haunting farmers, and has begged and pleaded for a payout. The Grain Stabilization Fund was established to help producers when prices were down in times like this, but the Minister says that we should wait until the five years are up as specified in the Act. It is strange that the Government did not bother waiting when it wanted more money from the farmers. It just increased the payments from $500 to $900, to $1,200.

The Minister says the Government is reviewing the matter. How long will this review take? Long enough for a few more scores of farmers to go bankrupt? No wonder more and more farmers are wanting to opt out of this plan. The Government is hanging on to their money like totalitarian money-hungry sharks. A stabilization Act should have some flexibility. At least until the Government pays back the $1,000 to the new Canadian, and makes a sensible payout to farmers, people of Canada, beware!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NATIONAL REVENUE

COMPUTERIZED MUNICIPAL DATA BASES—DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST FOR ACCESS

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. In an example of "Big Brother" government at its worst, the Department of National Revenue has written to the City of Kitchener asking it to duplicate its computerized data base and hand over those tapes to the Department of National Revenue for it to search. I would ask the Minister in which municipalities the Department has reached an agreement to have full or partial access to the computerized data bases. Second, will the Minister instruct his officials that this odious practice is to stop?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to say that in the request we sent to the City of Kitchener we did not ask them to send us a duplicate. According to my information, we did not request a duplicate of their computerized database but we asked them what kind of information they had in their computer. As soon as we receive this preliminary information, we shall then be in a position to decide whether the database contains any specific information we need and could eventually get from this municipality.

[*English*]

REQUEST THAT DEPARTMENT CEASE PRACTICE

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I can give the Minister a copy of a memorandum received by the City of Kitchener officials which indicates that what Revenue Canada wants is duplicates of the computerized tapes.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister with which cities such an arrangement has been reached. Second,

will he instruct the Department that this practice is to stop? Third, in the letter that was sent to the City of Kitchener reference is made to other non-taxpaying entities such as hospitals, school boards and municipalities. Has the Department reached an agreement for direct access to the data bases of institutions such as hospitals and school boards, and, if so, in which cases?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good opportunity to explain that the Department of National Revenue is responsible for ensuring that Canadian taxpayers are paying the taxes they owe the Government, and that this is done out of a concern for justice and equity with respect to other taxpayers who pay their taxes in full. Thus, the Department has a monitoring function.

To discharge this responsibility of the Department of National Revenue under the Income Tax Act, we ask certain bodies, including municipalities, for information that will help us check whether a taxpayer has completed his income tax return in accordance with the provisions of the Income Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker, we are certainly not interested in having any particular arrangements for obtaining all the information municipal or other authorities may or should have. We are interested in specific information, in order to discharge the responsibility and comply with the mandate given the Department of National Revenue under the Income Tax Act.

[*English*]

Mr. Beatty: Mr. Speaker, the Minister's answer indicates that 1984 has come a month and a half early.

DEPARTMENT'S AGREEMENTS WITH MUNICIPALITIES—REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, the Minister lectures the House on his duties. Will the Minister tell the House whether he is aware of Section 4 of the Privacy Act which states that no personal information shall be collected by a governmental institution unless it relates directly to an operating program or activity of the institution? If so, will the Minister finally answer the questions I have twice put to him? With which municipalities and with which other institutions, such as hospital and school boards, has the Minister reached such an agreement, and will the Minister now instruct his officials that this practice is to stop forthwith?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member took the trouble to write to me a note and ask me about this matter, and I therefore made enquiries and asked my officials which municipalities had previously been asked for such information.

Among our various district offices, there are a number through which we have requested specific information, not general information or a whole database as the Hon. Member seems to infer. Specific information was requested from a number of cities including Toronto, Winnipeg, Montreal and Calgary, and I could add several more. This is common departmental practice, when information is needed in order to discharge our responsibilities under the Income Tax Act, and the Hon. Member ought to know what those responsibilities are, since he himself, as the Opposition critic, is responsible for knowing what the duties are of the Department of National Revenue and the responsibility it has under the Income Tax Act for obtaining such information.

• (1420)

[*English*]

DEPARTMENT'S APPROACH TO HOSPITALS AND SCHOOL BOARDS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I would like to pursue this extraordinary practice, this big state, Big Brother practice by the Minister of National Revenue. He has said, if I understand him correctly, that he is seeking access to the records of other institutions in order to verify that the tax reports of individual Canadians are in fact accurate. He has admitted that he is seeking information from the municipal records of most of the major municipalities in Canada. Will the Minister tell us what other institutions he is seeking records from? Is he looking into hospitals?

Mr. Beatty: Yes.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Is he looking into schools?

Mr. Beatty: Yes.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): What other institutions is the Department of Revenue sending its people to look into, in the name of verifying the tax returns of individual Canadians? How extensive is this snooping?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised and I would even say disappointed by the holier-than-thou attitude taken by the Hon. Member who put this question, and I must say that he is even more naive than his attitude would lead us to expect, if his question was sincere, because, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who put this question held, during his term of office, the most responsible position in this country, and when he was Leader of the Government, he must have known what his Minister of National Revenue was doing and that the Minister's duties and responsibilities involved enforcing the Act, and that to do so, the Income Tax Act gives the Minister the authority to obtain information that will help to ensure the fair and equitable enforcement of the law in this country.

MINISTER'S POWERS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, the Act does not give the Minister of National Revenue carte blanche—he does not have unlimited powers. Three times today, the Minister refused to answer, here in the House, our request for a list of institutions, other than municipalities, which receive enquiries we believe are made in excess of the Minister's legitimate powers. Once again, I want to ask the Minister for a list of other institutions that receive enquiries from the Minister, that is, hospitals, schools, and others.

I would also like to know whether, according to the Minister's interpretation, there are enquiries he cannot make under the Act.

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I do not think and I am even positive there are no enquiries. The nature of the requests that are made does not contravene the laws of this country, on the contrary. I believe they comply with our statutes.

I may also remind the Hon. Member that most of the information we are requesting is in the public domain, that is, if, for instance, any Member of this House or any citizen of this country, I myself as a citizen and taxpayer, if I go to City Hall and ask them for specific information, they will give me that information because it is in the public domain, because these are public data, and I fail to see—

* * *

[*English*]

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

"CANADA TOMORROW" CONFERENCE—PARTICIPATION OF LABOUR AND OF WOMEN

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Economic Development. Last summer I released copies of a report from the Minister's own Department called "The Rocky Road to the 1990s" which predicted substantial job losses by 1991 due to structural and technological change in the Canadian economy. Last week the Minister finally responded by spending over $500,000 on a conference called "Canada Tomorrow". Would the Minister agree that this conference was a failure, partly due to insufficient participation by labour and by women, and partly due to its focus on the financial aspects of technological change and not on the people aspect or the social consequences like job loss, de-skilling, and the constant need for retraining due to this great problem of technological change?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I see the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway has his tongue tucked well into his cheek. He knows from at least others who were present at the conference that there was very good participation by labour. There were 75 representatives of labour. I wish he had prevailed upon his supporters in the CLC to ensure their presence. However, they will, of course, have the benefit of the report of the proceedings.

With respect to women, the participation of such people as Wendy Dobson and Dr. Margaret Fulton, just to name two of many who participated in the panels and workshops, should alleviate his concern that women were not represented. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the lack of women in terms of absolute numbers is, quite frankly, a reflection of what happens too often in all areas of our society, particularly here in the House of Commons. The fact that we have only 14 women Members of Parliament out of 282 is, I believe, clear evidence that there is under-representation. Indeed, I would have liked to have seen more women represented from the various organizations which attended the conference. I am sure all Hon. Members of the House share that view. However, that having been said, I believe the points made by the women present were significant indeed and these women contributed very effectively to the proceedings. Therefore, far from being a failure I would say that it was a great success. I could go on, if it is the wish of—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I believe the question of the Hon. Member has been answered. The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway on a Supplementary.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, if my tongue is in my cheek, I hate to speculate on where Senator Lawson's tongue was.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

CANADA LABOUR CODE

REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT TO PERMIT NEGOTIATIONS ON TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): My supplementary question is directed to the R2-D2 of the Cabinet over there. Is the Minister aware of the Harvard economist, Robert Reich, who has written, and I quote, "Unless members of a democratic society are persuaded—"

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Order, please. The Hon. Member is permitted a supplementary question. A supplementary question must be just that. It cannot be another question. Would the Hon. Member proceed?

Mr. Waddell: My supplementary question to the Minister is this: given these writings, and given the fact that workers in British Columbia showed they could fight back, will the Government do something for the working people, specifically, amend the Canada Labour Code to cover negotiating technological change, severance pay, conditions of work, and retraining of the worker who is affected by technological change? Is the Government prepared to give the House the commitment of amending the Labour Code, and doing it soon?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technolo-

gy): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway might have addressed that question to the Minister of Labour because certainly a good part of the—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair has concern about a supplementary question which is not supplementary but is another question. The Hon. Member was recognized for a supplementary question.

The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

ROYAL CANADIAN MINT'S DESCRIPTION OF UNIVERSIAD SILVER DOLLAR

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It relates to the whole proposition of truth in advertising vis-à-vis the Government. The Minister will know that there have been a number of complaints with respect to truth in advertising by the Government and government agencies. Most recently, the Royal Canadian Mint has put out extensive advertising with respect to the sale of the so-called "silver" dollar for the Universiad. It turns out that the so-called "silver" dollar is 50 per cent alloy and only 50 per cent silver.

In view of the fact that there have been prosecutions of private citizens and private sector corporations, such as Sears being fined $1 million for misleading advertising with respect to jewellery, what does the Minister intend to do with respect to the clearly misleading advertising of "silver" dollars by the Canadian Mint?

• (1430)

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time this matter has been brought to my attention. I can assure the Hon. Member I will look into it immediately and examine the advertising practices of the Royal Canadian Mint.

REQUEST THAT TRIBUNAL MONITOR GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, as the Minister will know, the federal Government is by far the largest advertiser in this country. In 1980 it spent three times more than General Foods, the second largest spender. In 1982-83 it expects to spend $70 million of taxpayers' money on advertising. In spite of this, there seems to be one law for the governors and another for the governed.

Is the Minister prepared to set up an independent tribunal to monitor government advertising so there can be the same standards for government advertising as there is for the private sector? Will she take some action?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I would like to assure the Hon. Member that indeed those same standards do apply to all government advertising.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

IMMIGRATION

ADMISSION OF ENTREPRENEURS—PROVISION OF SAFEGUARDS

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Can he tell the House what safeguards he is putting into the immigration provision for entrepreneurs coming into the country so that this will not be abused by people who could use it literally to buy a Canadian passport, or by elements such as organized crime to gain legal entry into Canada?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, those who come in under that program will still have to fulfil the normal requirements of a security and medical check. That will at least partially respond to the latter part of the Hon. Member's concerns. There is also a provision where, having made certain commitments about the level of investment and number of jobs to be created, the entrepreneur has an interim period of up to two years to ensure he meets those commitments. It is a provisional entry on a two-year basis. If he fails to meet the commitments he made, then the entry permit would be rescinded. That trial period, I think, is designed and will respond to the kinds of concerns the Hon. Member expressed concerning safeguards in the operation of the system.

USE OF ENTRY CARDS—APPOINTMENT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, on July 15 the Minister introduced a two-month trial program involving the use of landing cards for visitors to Canada, in order to control the flow of illegal immigrants. Can he tell us what the result of that assessment has been? Are the landing cards going to be permanent?

While he is on his feet, he might tell the House under what statutory authority he appointed the Hon. Member for Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine to chair an advisory committee on illegal immigrants? Are there any emoluments or expenses to be paid to the Hon. Member?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Imigration): Mr. Speaker, those are two quite separate questions. The answer to the first is that the use of the entry card system at three airports, was on a trial basis and the results are being accumulated. I have not yet seen an analysis of the over-all impact. Once we have made that assessment we will consider the question of whether that system should be extended.

The answer to the second question is that there is no remuneration or emoluments attached to that appointment. As the former Parliamentary Secretary had considerable experience in that area, I thought it would be useful to use that experience in chairing the committee. I wanted to ensure the advice we receive from officials is tempered by some concern for the humane considerations which Members of Parliament in their work hold foremost in their minds. I answered that question previously from an Hon. Member of the New Democratic Party, and the answer I am giving today is essentially the same answer I gave at that time.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY TURKISH-CYPRIOTS

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs regarding the extremely serious situation in Cyprus resulting from the illegal declaration of independence on the part of the Turkish-Cypriot community. Would the Minister expand on his comments in the House on Tuesday regarding what Canada is doing diplomatically to express its disapproval of this move and to seek a withdrawal of the declaration of independence?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will recall we have already disapproved of this unilateral action. We do not propose to grant recognition to the new alleged Government of Turkish Cyprus. We are concerting with other countries at the United Nations to support the efforts of the Secretary General who, up until this unilateral declaration, had been working to bring the two groups together in Cyprus. Our efforts are in the diplomatic field, and at the present time they are centered at the UN with other countries, including the United Kingdom which is taking the lead in presenting a resolution which will be debated at the Security Council and on which Canada will speak.

SUGGESTED WITHDRAWAL OF CANADIAN AMBASSADOR FROM ANKARA

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister comment a little further about what other diplomatic moves might be undertaken, especially given the fact the Turkish Government has recognized the new illegal Government? For example, would Canada withdraw its Ambassador to Turkey as an expression of disapproval?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, that would not be appropriate in the circumstances. I understand the Foreign Minister of Turkey has stated that the unilateral declaration had taken place without the consent or knowledge of the Turkish Government, so in those circumstances the action proposed would not be quite appropriate.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT'S PROGRAMS

Mr. Gerry St. Germain (Mission-Port Moody): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Does the Minister consider programs such as NEED, CCDP and others under the Canada Works Program, to be primarily ones of social security income support, or primarily of job creation and economic development?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think both of these objectives are important to this Government.

GOVERNMENT'S POLICY

Mr. Gerry St. Germain (Mission-Port Moody): Mr. Speaker, I think they are social security programs, as does the Department of Health and Welfare in its booklet "Basic Facts on Social Security Programs". What is the Minister going to do about job creation?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, on several occasions we have outlined to the House the general strategy for job creation. That is reflected in the budget presented by the Minister of Finance, a strategy which does believe that the private sector is the main motor force for creating jobs. We believe the tax arrangements brought forward by this Government will create a climate in this country in which that will happen.

On a short-term basis, through such programs as NEED and the Special Recovery Projects Program, we are undertaking direct job-creation programs until the full impact of the tax measures can be felt. If the hon. gentleman is concerned that unemployment insurance is an income maintenance program, the fact is that it is the kind of program which Parliament created. There are people who would argue that unemployment insurance contains too many social aspects and should be more narrowly an insurance program. There are those who take a very different point of view. The point I would make, Mr. Speaker, is that the Unemployment Insurance Program has just shown what a substantial and extraordinary benefit it is to this country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When the Minister's replies are long, it is difficult to discourage long questions.

Oral Questions

CANADA DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SALE OF SHARES—POSSIBLE LOSS TO TAXPAYERS

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue, with reference to the proposed sale of Canada Development shares in the market in the next few weeks. Unadjusted for inflation, the average price the Government paid for these shares over the years is $10.48. The current price is $6 a share, and the sale will probably be made at something less than that. Could the Minister explain to the public why taxpayers must accept a loss of at least 45 per cent on their original investment?

• (1440)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I should think that the Hon. Member will appreciate that, his question being based on sheer speculation, it is impossible for me to give him an answer.

[*English*]

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT WITHDRAW FROM CORPORATION

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): There is absolutely no speculation in anything I have said. The average cost is $10.48. The shares are trading now at $6. You can get the price in *The Globe and Mail* business section. They are going to be sold at less than that. There is a 45 per cent loss on the part of the Canadian taxpayer. It is another example of the mistakes that the Government has made over the years that have wasted taxpayers' money. Let me point out the reason for this. It is—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason for this is based on the fact that the Government meddled in the operations of this company some two years ago through the current Minister of Finance, by trying to impose its own management.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please ask his question?

Mr. Wilson: Would the Minister tell the House how long it is going to take for the Government to get out of that company and let it be operated in a more effective way?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Hon. Member is aware enough of stock exchange operations to know that the shares of various companies trade at various prices and that even the companies which the Hon. Member or other Members may consider as being under the best management hold shares whose price on the stock market may vary from day to day, either up or down. I also think that, before making any conclusion on prices, it is better to wait until a number of shares have been traded. In addition, the Hon. Member will agree with me that the measures taken by the Government will very likely contribute to strengthen the market value of CDC shares.

* * *

[*English*]

FISHERIES

PEARSE REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS—ROLE OF POLICY ADVISER

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. After the Pearse Report in British Columbia was brought down a year ago September, the Minister appointed a ministerial advisory board to study the report and make recommendations by this November. The Minister is also involved with his own Department in making recommendations to Cabinet. More recently the Minister appointed a ministerial committee with a senior adviser to his Department, to study those reocommendations also. What is the relationship between the Minister's policy adviser committee to M.A.C. and his own departmental officials?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, in one word, the closest co-operation and interaction between those different instances. What I need is the best advice of the most competent people within the Department, the advisers and also the participants in the fisheries, whether they are the native groups in B.C., or the commercial sector, or the sports fishery. I need the support of all those people.

I am pleased to report to the House that the spirit that exists at this moment is really very encouraging. All of them are working together hand in hand. I hope that early in the new year I will be able to put before Cabinet an important program to give a new start to the Pacific fisheries, exactly as we have been doing for the Atlantic fisheries.

Mr. Crosbie: We hope not.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER MEET ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Members of the Minister's advisory committee have charged that the policy adviser basically has kneecapped their recommendations to the Minister, and are asking that that policy adviser be recalled. Will the Minister give his assurances that he will meet immediately with his ministerial advisory committee to assure them that their recommendations will be carefully considered? Further will he recall his senior policy adviser to restore some faith with his committee and within his Department which he is so much in need of, when considering these recommendations for the West Coast fishing industry?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I have never heard such an unfair criticism of one of my closest advisers who works with me on my staff. On the contrary, I have only the highest confidence in him. I can assure the Hon. Member that his opinion is not at all shared by the people. He is most dedicated and is doing exactly what I asked him to do. I have no intention whatsoever of doing what the Hon. Member is suggesting.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRAND CAYMAN ISLANDS—LEGAL STATUS OF BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs who is used to being between a rock and a hard place. My question concerns the Bank of Nova Scotia which is being fined $25,000 a day by U.S. courts for not divulging bank records from the Grand Cayman Islands. At the same time, there is an injunction from a court in the Grand Cayman Islands forbidding the bank to give this information to the American authorities because of their secrecy laws.

Would the Minister advise the House whether the Government has made a decision to intervene before the U.S. courts to aid the Bank of Nova Scotia? The newspapers report that he has brought this up already with the Secretary of State of the U.S., Mr. Schultz. What was the response of Mr. Schultz? What action does the Minister plan to follow up this untenable position in which the bank has been placed?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the meeting with Mr. Schultz, the answer is yes. We did have a continuing consultation on what Canada considers an unjustified extraterritorial application of American law. In this case the Bank of Nova Scotia and other banks are put in an almost impossible position in being asked to comply with American law which contravenes the local law. The American authorities have sought information in a way which we think is unnecessary as well as unjustified. We believe that a good deal of that information could be obtained legally through the application, for example, for the taxation treaties. All of this was discussed with Mr. Schultz. We have attempted to put in place some mechanism that will overcome this difficulty.

The Hon. Member asked whether we intend to intervene in support of the Bank of Nova Scotia before the American court. That matter is under consideration by the Department of Justice. I believe there is an intention to file an amicus brief or take that status at court. As far as I know, the exact details of the statement are still under consideration by the Department of Justice.

UNITED STATES REACTION TO CANADIAN REPRESENTATIONS

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, the Bank of Nova Scotia is being forced to pay $25,000 a day in the meantime. If I am correct in my mathematics, that is $100,000 every four days. I know that is not a lot to the Government, so I wonder if the Minister would consider this to be urgent. Was Mr. Schultz sympathetic and did he indicate he was going to attempt to take some action?

Is the Government considering the suggestion of Mr. Bell, President of the Bank of Nova Scotia, who suggested that we should hold the line on activities of foreign banks operating in this country until the matter is cleared up, in other words use some pressure with respect to the operations of foreign banks in Canada? There is a parliamentary report on that subject now. Is the Government considering that? Did Mr. Schultz indicate sympathy and that he is going to take some action?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion Mr. Schultz did show sympathy and understanding of this problem and would like to have it cleared up. My information is that the collection of the fine from the Bank of Nova Scotia has been postponed for a month. To that extent at least, there is some relief from the situation which the Hon. Member has described. I hope it will not be necessary for us to apply actions to American banks which, in our view, are unjustified when applied to Canadian banks.

* * *

● (1450)

ONTARIO BICENTENNIAL

FUNDING OF FESTIVITIES

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. Could he state when the information on the details of the $1.5 million grant program for municipalities and community groups to celebrate the Ontario bicentennial will be available, so that the municipal groups and other groups can get on with their planning for this important celebration?

Hon. D. M. Collenette (Minister of State (Multiculturalism)): Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State did announce earlier this week the allocation of over $2 million toward the Ontario bicentennial festivities, with the emphasis on the fact that these festivities should encompass all cultural communities within the Province of Ontario. A board of community advisers has been appointed to assist with the allocation of these funds and the details will be forwarded to Members so that they can give the information to community groups and municipalities within the next couple of weeks.

Oral Questions

COMMUNICATIONS

CONTRACT ISSUED BY DEPARTMENT TO MAIL ENVELOPES

Mrs. Jennifer Cossitt (Leeds-Grenville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Communications. It concerns the issuing and distributing of licences to C.B. operators. Would he explain to the House why it is necessary for his Department to contract the services of Prestige Mailing Systems Ltd. to place in envelopes licences which his Department issues, and mail them to the C.B. operators? Surely there are clerks in his Department who are capable of stuffing and mailing out envelopes, instead of adding to our horrendous deficit in such a ludicrous manner?

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, we have tried to automate as much as possible the handling and issuing of all licences. We are doing so in the most cost effective manner possible.

DELAY IN ISSUANCE OF LICENCES

Mrs. Jennifer Cossitt (Leeds-Grenville): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Communications. Would he also look into the delay and distribution of the licences to the operators? Apparently it takes approximately eight weeks to have these licences issued because his Department is concerned about an operator's cheque bouncing and would like to save time in allowing for this. Is it possible for the Minister to instruct his departmental officials distribute licences faster, effectively and efficiently, perhaps by asking the operators to send their payment by money order or something of that nature?

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of the recommendation made to me to try to make the service even more efficient than it is at the moment, I will be pleased to discuss the Hon. Member's suggestion with officials of my Department.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

AGREEMENT WITH NEW BRUNSWICK—DATE OF SIGNING

Hon. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Economic Development. Will an economic development framework agreement be signed with New Brunswick before the Finance Ministers' meeting is convened in December, in order that New Brunswick can maximize its potential to deal with very high unemployment considering that a very high percentage of its revenue comes in the form of transfer payments from Ottawa?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I am most anxious, as are my colleagues on the Economic and Regional Development Cabinet Committee, to sign an agreement with New Brunswick as soon as possible. As the Hon. Member for York-Sunbury knows, work is moving forward in that direction.

I have had meetings and, in fact, Premier Hatfield has been in Ottawa and has met with the regional Minister and myself. I am optimistic that such an agreement can be signed with New Brunswick within a short time frame.

When we talk about a deadline such as before the Finance Ministers' meeting, I can make no promises in that regard. Certainly I can say that the priorities and the economic development perspective which was developed by our committee, and upon which I believe there is broad consensus, and which the New Brunswick Government has in its possession, are of course available and known by the Minister of Finance and the respective Ministers of Finance who have participated in its development.

I do not believe that the absence of an actual signature on an agreement will be in any way detrimental to the discussions taking place, particularly with respect to Finance Ministers. Again, I emphasize that we are anxious, as I hope the Government of New Brunswick is anxious, to sign an agreement as quickly as possible.

Mr. Howie: I thank the Minister for his answer.

REQUEST THAT SIGNING OF AGREEMENT BE EXPEDITED

Hon. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, the Minister is probably aware that most of the fast track programs which have been announced for New Brunswick are on a relatively slow track and have not yet created any jobs, and that unemployment remains chronically very high. As well, the Finance Ministers' meeting is billed as a pre-budget meeting.

In view of these facts, would the Minister be good enough to give the House the assurance that he will approach his counterpart in New Brunswick within the next few days in an attempt to facilitate and expedite the signing of the agreement?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I will not accept the premise that the fast track program is not on a fast track. In fact, I think things are moving well in New Brunswick. As the Hon. Member for York-Sunbury knows, New Brunswick has some very important projects, which range from general public works projects on routes, overpasses and so on, through to the most sophisticated kind of projects such as the Maritime Forestry Research Centre and the Forest Rangers School which is, of course, situated in the Hon. Member's constituency. I am sure he is most supportive of the program. I could go through the list of projects—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has answered the question.

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

PAY TV—SALE OF FIRST CHOICE NETWORK

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Communications. The CRTC spent ten years looking into questions associated with Pay TV. In its policy declarations last year, it spoke out specifically against vertical integration in the system. Now, in the case of First Choice, with only ten days' notice it stretched the rules, rushed through a hearing with haste that can only be called indecent and suspicious, and permitted a level of vertical integration that is unparalleled and contrary to policies it has announced. Will the Minister initiate an investigation into this irregular and unusual action by the CRTC?

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the CRTC has come down with a decision in the Pay TV area, which is an area that has been under intensive discussion in Canada by all parties. I will not launch an investigation into what the Hon. Member calls irregular activities of the CRTC. On the other hand, I am quite pleased to see that the regulators in Canada are now in a better position to respond quickly to the needs of the people who must appear before them. On many occasions in the House criticisms have been voiced to the effect that Crown commissions do not act quickly enough to take to heart and hear the problems that may be required to be heard rather quickly.

I have no comment to make on the merit of the decision since it is obviously a decision within the full jurisdiction of the CRTC to take.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER REVIEW COMMISSION'S DECISION

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Minister knows that the application, and the decision which came out of that application, have been objected to by virtually every group concerned with the production of TV material. In light of those objections, surely the Minister can at least consider exercising the right he has to overrule the decision of the CRTC. I would urge him to do that, or at least to look at it.

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, indeed I can assure the Hon. Member that I will examine the decision of the CRTC very closely. After a preliminary reading of that decision I know that many of the points of view expressed in front of the CRTC were taken into consideration since, in allowing the application to go forward, the CRTC did indeed indicate a number of conditions that it considers to be essential to the decision it has taken.

CROWN CORPORATIONS

IDENTIFICATION OF NUMBERS

Hon. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services. I direct it to him due to his responsibility for Statistics Canada. We have received a number of press reports in the last few weeks, as well as other information, to the effect that there are approximately 300 Crown corporations and business enterprises in Canada. In fact, certain press reports indicate that there are some 306 various Crown corporations and business enterprises. Is the Minister of Supply and Services able to confirm or deny the accuracy of these reports?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Hon. Member that Statistics Canada has never made a special statistical inquiry on the number of existing Crown corporations. I do not have that information.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL REVENUE

DESIGNATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA SCHOOL BOARD AS CHARITABLE ORGANIZATION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. On November 2 he told my colleague from Waterloo that his officials were going to pursue the full weight not of the law but of the regulations against organizations like the Canadian Mental Health Association and other such non-profit organizations. Since that involves their interpretation of such things as lobbying for changes in legislation, could the Minister explain the fact that earlier this year his Department gave charitable status to a school board in British Columbia?

• (1500)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): First, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the latest case referred to by the Hon. Member and, second, when the status of charitable organization has been granted, it is of course because the organization which had applied did so in accordance with the requirements and standards of the Department. As to the particular case mentioned by the Hon. Member, I cannot comment since I am not aware of the facts.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Don Valley West on a short supplementary.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ANGOLA—REPORTED HOSTAGE TAKING OF CANADIAN MISSIONARIES

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Late reports this morning indicate that some Canadian missionaries have been taken hostage in Angola. Can he tell the House—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. That is not a supplementary.

* * *

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has laid upon the Table reports of the Clerk of Petitions stating that he has examined the petitions presented by Hon. Members on Tuesday, November 15, 1983 and finds that the petitions meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Nielsen: May I ask the Governmenet House Leader—I assume we will be on the fisheries legislation again tomorrow—to indicate the business of the House should we some time during the day tomorrow terminate the fisheries legislation? Could he also go on into next week and indicate what the business for next week will be?

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, after consultations I indicated to my hon. colleague this morning that we would like to see Bill C-170 sent to committee as soon as possible. I now have an indication that will not happen today but I hope it will be done tomorrow. If, as the Hon. Member for Yukon has just indicated, there is a possibility the Bill gets sent to committee before the end of the day tomorrow, the following item to be dealt with will be resumption of the debate on Bill C-91. If that Bill is sent to committee, then we will deal with Bill C-96.

In so far as next week is concerned, as I indicated this morning, we will be dealing merely with the business of supply. I would like thereby to designate Monday as the third allotted day, Tuesday as the fourth allotted day and Thursday as the fifth and last allotted day of this period of supply. I hope by that time we will have the report of the committee on the fisheries Bill, Bill C-170.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, there was a matter that came to my mind after the House Leaders met. The Government House Leader knows that there has been substantial representation made, I think, to many Members of the House with regard to Bill C-653. I have raised this matter with the Minister on a number of occasions. Is there any possibility that that Bill might be reported back to the House in order that we could deal with it some time during the course of the next seven to ten days?

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take into account the progress made on Bill C-12 and the possible amendments on Bill C-12 that have interrelation with some dispositions included in Bill C-653. I will have to consult and report to the Hon. Member later.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. BLENKARN—SUGGESTED IRREGULARITY IN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I want to draw to your attention a vote in Supplementary Estimates (B) that I feel is out of order. It is Vote 6b under Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It deals with the payment to the Canada Post Corporation for special purposes of $8,109,406. The Estimates outline "special purposes" as being the relocation of the philatelic mail order service to Antigonish, Nova Scotia; special employment initiatives; a grant of some kind for propane vehicle conversion; special construction repair projects and federal off-oil conversion.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, you and your predecessors have ruled that the appropriations process should not be used as a substitute for legislation. To quote Madam Speaker's ruling of June 12, 1981:

—the government may not by the use of an Appropriation Act obtain authority that it does not have under existing legislation.

There is no legislative authority in the Canada Post Corporation Act to do the kind of things set out in this estimate. I would like to read into the record Section 28 of the Canada Post Corporation Act. Perhaps it is not necessary to read it in full but let me read Subsections (1), (2) and (3):

28. (1) Where at any time the available revenues of the Corporation are not sufficient to pay all the operating and income charges of the Corporation as and when due, the Minister of Finance, on the application of the Corporation approved by the Minister, may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, place at the disposal of the Corporation such amounts as may be required to enable the Corporation to meet all such charges.

(2) All amounts placed at the disposal of the Corporation pursuant to subsection (1) shall be reimbursed to the Minister of Finance from the annual revenues of the Corporation in so far as such revenues are sufficient.

(3) Where the annual revenues of the Corporation are insufficient for the purposes of subsection (2), the Minister shall cause the amount of the insufficiency to be included, in the form of a deficit appropriation item, in the next Appropriation Act laid before Parliament thereafter.

Nowhere in the Act is there any authority for an appropriation that is not an appropriation to pay losses. This is not a question of losses. This is a question of the post office entering into a series of activities that have nothing to do with its losses. Clearly if there were a loss in the post office, an appropriation could be made for the loss in accordance with Section 28 of the Act. But there is no provision in the Canada Post Corporation

Act for an appropriation to move an activity of the post office to Antigonish Nova Scotia. There is no provision for a loss, for special employment initiatives. It is not a loss necessarily to conduct a federal propane vehicle conversion program. In effect, what is happening is that this estimate is totally out of order.

I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to investigate the matter. If I am right, and I believe I am, that Section 28 of the Canada Post Corporation Act does not allow this kind of estimate, I ask that the estimate be disallowed and removed from the proposed appropriation Bill.

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Before you rule, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you take this representation under advisement so as to give the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) an opportunity to give an explanation, if he feels an explanation is required, either tomorrow or at the latest the beginning of next week, on Monday. I think this may enlighten you before you render your decision.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I want to thank the Hon. Member for raising the matter. The Chair would certainly wish to extend opportunities for Members to rebut the argument made before rendering a decision—

Mr. Nielsen: Or add to it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: —and to take some time to consider the matter. Or add to it, as the Hon. Member says.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MR. WADDELL—OPPORTUNITY TO ASK SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of privilege of which I gave you notice. It arises from the question period. I feel my privileges as a Member have been unfairly abridged, namely that my supplementary question was cut off unfairly and there were unfair comments by the Chair after the question.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please be seated.

Mr. Waddell: Do you want to listen to me?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please be seated.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member please be seated. The determination of supplementary questions is always a difficult matter. The rules are clearly set out in Beauchesne for Hon. Members. In the judgment of the Chair, a supplementary was not accorded in that particular situation. This is not a matter of privilege.

• (1510)

Mr. Waddell: A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member cannot raise on a point of order what he has been denied on a point of privilege. If he is merely going to repeat his argument, the Chair can only restate its position. However, if the Hon. Member has a valid point of order, the Chair will hear it.

Mr. Waddell: I am just asking the Chair to check the "blues" with respect to what happened, and I reserve my right to raise it tomorrow.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is simply repeating the same material as before.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. YURKO—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO PASS BILL C-691

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for finally seeing me today. I rise on a point of order in connection with a possible change in the order of business for today. I ask the unanimous consent of the House that Private Member's Bill C-691, an Act to pardon Louis David Riel, be brought forward today for second reading, consideration by Committee of the Whole House, report stage and third reading. I hope you will seek unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Yurko: I did not hear you put the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry, but either because of difficulties with the sound system or for some other reason, I did not hear you actually put the motion respecting the Hon. Member's request for unanimous consent. I am not casting any doubt that it was done, but it could not be heard at this end of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair recognized the Hon. Member on a point of order. The Chair's understanding of the procedures of the House is that he cannot move a motion under such circumstances.

Mr. Deans: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: For the benefit of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans), the Chair distinctly

heard a request for unanimous consent to proceed in a certain way. The Chair asked if there was unanimous consent. There clearly was not unanimous consent and, therefore, the Chair proceeded to the next item of business.

Mr. Yurko: A point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Hon. Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko) has a valid point of order, the Chair will hear it. What does he have to say?

Mr. Yurko: Mr. Speaker, I have the highest respect for the Chair; I always have for a number of years. I have to say that I do not recall, unless my eyesight is abandoning me—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair distinctly asked if there was unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to introduce his motion. *Hansard* will have clearly recorded that there was not unanimous consent.

Mr. Waddell: You did not ask.

Mr. Heap: You did not ask.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect to Hon. Members, the *Hansard* record will disclose that the Chair asked for it.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

PRESENTATION OF TWENTY-SECOND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the twenty-second report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts, the Canadair report, to which, pursuant to Standing Order 69(13), the Committee requests a comprehensive response. The report will be tabled in both official languages.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

TABLING OF TASK FORCE REPORT ON PAYMENT OF GRANTS TO MUNICIPALITIES IN LIEU OF TAXES

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 46(2), I have the honour to table in both official languages copies of the Pollack report dealing with municipal grants in lieu of taxes.

PETITIONS

MR. MURPHY—HEALTH CARE

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of the people of the Town of The Pas. In their petition to the House of Commons in Parliament assembled, they point out that one of the prime objectives of the Canadian medicare system was to guarantee accessibility of health care to all Canadians. They also believe that the practices of extra billing, hospital user fees and premiums limit accessibility. Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray that the new Canada Health Act reaffirm the cornerstone of medicare by forbidding these practices and thereby reinstating full accessibility to insured health services for all Canadians.

MR. ANGUISH—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILE ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, I have a few petitions which I would like to present this afternoon. The first one calls upon Parliament to debate and pass Private Member's Bill C-678 standing in my name, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone. This petition is signed by some 538 residents of the Province of Ontario who stress that the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada can escalate the nuclear arms race and is, therefore, a serious threat to world peace. The petitioners from all over the Province of Ontario urge Parliament to recognize that multilateral nuclear disarmament must occur in order to secure peace in the world and that Canada, as a traditionally peaceful nation, can and must play a crucial role in achieving multilateral disarmament.

In addition to petitions which I have already presented from the Province of Alberta, I have the further pleasure today to present one signed by residents of the City of Edmonton who oppose the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada and call upon Parliament to debate and pass the Private Member's Bill standing in my name, Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone. This Bill, if passed, would allow Canada to act in its traditional and historic role as a peacekeeper and mediator in the world-wide nuclear disarmament process, along with other countries that would wish to participate.

The next petition I am proud to present in the House of Commons today is signed by residents of the Province of New Brunswick. The signatures were collected by Saint John Project Ploughshares to mark disarmament week. The petitioners met in a storefront in the city's new downtown centre to focus attention on the relationship between the arms race and development.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member realizes that there are certain forms with regard to petitions and that he should briefly state the purpose of the petition.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I have only a few more to present and I will try to deal with them as

expeditiously as possible. These people emphasize that the specific commitment of Project Ploughshares of Saint John is to work for nuclear disarmament. The petitioners call upon Parliament to debate and pass the Private Member's Bill standing in my name, Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone.

Earlier I presented a petition signed by some 538 residents of the Province of Ontario who oppose the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada. At the moment I would like to present a petition signed by another 74 residents of the Province of Ontario, most of whom are from Toronto and London. They also oppose the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada and call upon Parliament to debate and pass the Private Member's Bill standing in my name, Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons-free zone. The petitioners urge Parliament to recognize that multilateral nuclear disarmament must occur in order to secure world peace and that Canada, as a traditionally peaceful nation, must play a crucial role in achieving multilateral disarmament.

Also I have the pleasure today to present to the House of Commons a petition signed by some 203 residents of the Province of Saskatchewan who believe that the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada escalates the nuclear arms race and, therefore, is a serious threat to world peace. They also believe that multilateral nuclear disarmament must occur to secure world peace. The petitioners call upon Parliament to debate and pass Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons-free zone, an Act which, if passed, will allow Canada to act as a mediator in world-wide nuclear disarmament processes along with other countries that wish to participate.

• (1520)

I have the pleasure today to present to the House of Commons a petition signed by some 157 residents of Canada who believe that the testing of the Cruise missile is an escalation of the nuclear arms race and is, therefore, a serious threat to world peace. The petitioners call upon Parliament to debate and pass the Private Members' Bill standing in ny name, Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone which would prevent the testing in Canada of the Cruise missile and allow Canada to act as a mediator in world-wide nuclear disarmament processes along with other countries that wish to participate.

I have the pleasure today to present to the House of Commons a petition which stresses the urgent need for the House of Commons to debate the Cruise missile and Canada's role in the peace-keeping process. This particular petition is more than 200 pages long and contains some 366 signatures, many collected one at a time by concerned Canadians from coast to coast. The petitioners believe that the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada escalates the nuclear arms race and is therefore a serious threat to world peace. The petitioners, who represent a true corss-section of Canadian society, ask your indulgence and that Parliament debate and pass the Private Member's Bill standing in my name, Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone, so that Canada as a traditionally peaceful nation can play a role as a mediator along with other countries that wish to participate in the world-wide nuclear disarmament process.

I have other petitions, but I will conclude with one final petition today. In the last few days I have had the opportunity to present petitions to the House of Commons from thousands of Canadians from coast to coast. Even though I still have more to present, I am extremely pleased today to present a number of petitions signed by the residents of many of the communities within my own constituency of The Battlefords-Meadow Lake.

The petitioners from such communities as Borden, Goodsoil, The Battlefords, Edam, Livelong, Medstead, Meadow Lake, Radisson, Dorintosh, Pinehouse, Meota, Turtleford and Vawn call upon Parliament to debate and pass the Private Member's Bill standing in my name, Bill C-678, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear weapons free zone. The Bill, if passed, would prevent the testing of the Cruise missile in Canada and allow Canada to act as a mediator in the world-wide disarmament process along with other countries that wish to participate.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to present these petitions in the House of Commons this afternoon.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT

NOTICE OF VACANCY IN ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF NEPEAN-CARLETON

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on an occasion which I know would be moved or seconded by the former Member for Nepean-Carleton because we shared a belief that the by-election laws in this country are very antiquated. In fact, they are the worst in the democratic free world. It is because of that common belief that I rise to give notice of a vacancy pursuant to Section 10 of the House of Commons Act.

"We, the undersigned, hereby give notice pursuant to Section 10 of the House of Commons Act that a vacancy has occurred in the representation of the House of Commons in the electoral district of Nepean-Carleton in the Province of Ontario by reason of the untimely death of the Hon. Walter Baker, the Member therefor". Given under our hands and seals at Ottawa, the seventeenth day of November, 1983, signed by myself, the Member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton, and the Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

* * * * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions. May I dispose of the reading of the rather lengthy number of items under Motions?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared once again to suggest, without, of course, setting any precedent, that you simply call upon Members who have Motions on the Order Paper in their names to determine if any wish to raise them. If

they do not, perhaps they could be stood without reading them seriatim.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer that the proper procedure be followed.

Motions stand.

* * *

● (1530)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,092 and 5,325.

[*Text*]

McLAUGHLIN-POLLARD ASSOCIATES

Question No. 4,092—**Mr. Cossitt:**

1. What is a complete list of (a) all the types of contracts and the amounts (b) any moneys received from the Government by McLaughlin-Pollard and Associates and, in each case (i) what was the date (ii) who used their services and for what reason?

2. Did the firm do work for the Department of the Environment, Statistics Canada and the Atomic Energy Control Board?

3. Is the firm primarily engaged in public relations and image-making and, if so, in each case where the firm was used, for what reason did the Government consider that image-making was required?

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): In so far as the Atomic Energy Control Board is concerned:

1. (a) None, (b) $2,950. (i) October 7 and 8, 1981. (ii) McLaughlin-Pollard held a seminar entitled "Learning to meet the Media" for 10 AECB divisional managers who have occasional to regular contract with the media. The seminar addressed techniques for preparing for and participating in media interviews for both radio and television.

2. Yes, see Part 1 above.

In so far as Environment Canada is concerned: 1. (a) None, (b) none.

2. No.

In so far as the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is concerned:

1. (a) One. $1,492.00 (i) March 10, 1982. (ii) Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development: To conduct a test training session to enable Program Senior Managers to evaluate the usefulness and effectiveness of training managers in how to conduct themselves in interviews with print and broadcast journalists so as to fulfil the requirements of the government's guidelines to public servants on dealing with the public and the news media. (b) None.

2. Not applicable.

In so far as Statistics Canada is concerned:

1. (a) two contracts. (i) Contract for $7,500, April 11 to May 16, 1981. Actual payment $6,048. Contract for $7,500, Sept. 17 to Sept. 23, 1981. Actual payment $6,252. Payment for both contracts were paid May 25, 1981 and Nov. 1, 1981 respectively. (ii) Statistics Canada requested the services of McLaughlin-Pollard Associates in order to help managers effectively communicate to the public pertinent information regarding policies, practices and activities.

2. Yes, see Part 1 above.

3. McLaughlin-Pollard Associates describe the firm as a professional company which helps executive and senior management take advantage of news media opportunities. In addition to the seminar "Learning to meet the media", the firm offers a broad range of communication and research services including preparation and development of books, manuals and audio-visual presentations, and quantitative research in the areas of audience, programming and marketing policy.

All other Department and Agencies have no information on this subject.

SUICIDES IN CANADA

Question No. 5,325—**Mr. Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore):**

Have any suicides been recorded in Canada as a result of harassment by officials of the Department of National Revenue and, if so, how many?

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Statistics Canada reports: Although statistics on the number of suicides occurring in Canada are collected as part of the vital statistics program of Statistics Canada, no statistical record of the reason for the suicide is maintained.

[*English*]

Mr. Evans: I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions as enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Mr. Herbert: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary if he could investigate why Question No. 4,305, which was placed on the Order Paper on May 3, 1982 and which asks about repayments into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, has not yet been answered. I would also like to ask if he could explain why, since the fiscal year ended on March 31 of this year, it is still impossible to produce the answer to that question.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, may I also ask about two questions which were placed on the Order Paper on March 25 of this year, those being questions Nos. 4,747 and 4,748, both of which deal with tax expenditures? I ask if the answers to those questions which deal with the book and magazine industry could be pursued.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I will look into those questions immediately. I know the Hon. Member has a great number of

questions on the Order Paper, all of very great importance to himself and to the House, and I will look into those right away.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

ATLANTIC FISHERIES RESTRUCTURING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. De Bané that Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishery enterprises, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, before recess, I was talking about the various times since 1970 that the Government of Canada has intervened to help fishermen in the Province of Quebec. I said that under its program to re-establish the Canadian groundfish industry, the Government of Canada had paid Quebec fishermen and processors grants totalling $6,684,400 between 1975 and 1978.

Furthermore, that in 1972, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans introduced a program to protect Atlantic salmon. He had to suspend commercial salmon fishing in the Gulf, and again. The Government of Canada subsidized ninety-five salmon fishermen, from 1972 to 1980, spending a total of $1,840,000 or an average of about $20,000 for every salmon fisherman in the Province of Quebec.

In the summer of 1982, there was utter chaos in the fisheries industry as a result of the dire situation at Pêcheurs-Unis. Here again, the Government of Canada stepped in to save the fishermen. In the spring of 1983, there was a recurrence of the same problem at Pêcheurs-Unis, and the Government of Canada guaranteed a bank loan so that Pêcheurs-Unis could start its operations and fishermen could start their fishing season.

Mr. Speaker, we, the people of the Gaspé, are not blind. We know what the Government of Canada has done for the fisheries industry in Quebec.

Within the framework of the Economic Development Plan for the Gaspé and Lower St. Lawrence, a total of $29,500,000 will be spent on the fisheries industry in the Gaspé in the next two years, for the construction of facilities for handling and unloading fish, manufacturing and storing ice, storing and distributing bait, and also for improving harbour facilities in the area. These funds are being contributed exclusively by the Government of Canada.

What has the PQ Government done since it came to power for fishermen in the Gaspé, the Magdalen Islands and on the North Shore?

Looking back, Mr. Speaker, we see that first of all, this Government did away with gillnet subsidies; second, it cut in half the Quebec Government's subsidy on insurance premiums for fishing boats; third, it abolished the subsidy program for lobster trap replacement; fourth, it closed several ice depots; fifth, it raised the price of ice provided by departmental depots from $8 to $20 per ton; and finally, it introduced its special tax on gas which put a heavy burden on fishermen and fish processors.

I could go on for much longer, Mr. Speaker, but that is how the Hon. Jean Garon has helped Quebec's fishermen.

During the week's holiday we spent in our ridings, I also met independent processors from the Gaspé. They realize that restructuring of the fisheries industry is necessary. Through their ability, initiative and sheer hard work, these processors have helped to maintain fisheries-related operations in the Gaspé and Quebec.

Private entreprise is absolutely essential to the future of the fisheries industry in Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces. The independent processors are also concerned about what will happen to their processing plants when a new giant company is established, with the majority of shares being held by the Government of Canada. They are not necessarily opposed to this new fisheries corporation based in the Gaspé, but they would urge the Government to set up management and control mechanisms in order to protect private enterprise.

We must not make it difficult for private enterprise to develop, to progress and to create jobs. If private enterprise were to disappear from the fisheries industry in Quebec and the Atlantic Provinces, the resulting economic disaster would be far worse than the bankruptcy of Pêcheurs-Unis. In the past, members of local co-operatives have had many problems with Pêcheurs-Unis du Québec. Today they are very pleased this organization will disappear when the new corporation is established, once the legislation before the House today, Bill C-170, is passed.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I urge Hon. Members to join me in supporting this Bill to restructure the Atlantic fisheries and to provide for financial assistance by the Government of Canada in defraying the cost of this restructuring, because of all the Canadians who depend on this and, perhaps also, because every day, our fishermen are exploring the living resources of our ocean boundaries and it is up to us to take advantage of these resources.

In committee, we shall be able to suggest amendments to this Bill. This morning, my colleague from South West Nova (Miss Campbell) wanted the Vice-Chairman, the Member for Gaspé, to chair the committee while this Bill is being considered. I can assure my hon. colleague that we can share the duties of conducting the debate in committee and thus ensure that the legislation is passed by the House before this session is adjourned.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there Hon. Members rising to ask questions of the Hon. Member who has just spoken? If not, the Chair will recognize the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis).

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise today to speak to Bill C-170, an Act to authorize the investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fisheries enterprises. I do recognize that this is perhaps the most important fisheries debate of any that we have had in this session of Parliament. I believe it was the Premier of Newfoundland who indicated that this was perhaps the most important phenomenon to happen to the Island of Newfoundland and Labrador since Confederation. I find it disheartening, though, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané), who sponsored this Bill, does not see fit to be in the House. While one might be able to understand the Minister's absence, I find it difficult to understand that even the Parliamentary Secretary is unable to be in attendance in the House of Commons today.

● (1540)

Mr. Nowlan: It is an insult. Shame!

Mr. Riis: It really is an insult, Mr. Speaker, to the Atlantic fisheries and to fishermen and fish processors across this country. I think it indicates pretty clearly just how seriously Members of the Government take this particular legislation. I appreciate that what this Bill really represents to Canada, Mr. Speaker, is a recognition of what happens when there is a lack of adequate planning, a lack of any comprehensive planning regarding one of Canada's major economic sectors. Obviously, we are seeing today the result of what happens when the federal Government does not sit down with provincial Governments and with representatives of the fishing industry in order to develop some long-range comprehensive planning strategies. The result is that we have today what amounts, by and large, to a bail-out situation, throwing a lifesaver to an industry which has been extremely hard-pressed over the last number of months.

I would like to say that this particular drastic measure which we are looking at today is the result of Government activities, in part, over the last number of years, and the incredible optimism which both the provincial and federal Governments brought about in the industry because of the expansion of the 200-mile limit, with the suggestion that this was a sector of the economy, the Atlantic fisheries sector, which virtually had unlimited opportunities and potential. People were encouraged to move into areas in which they were previously hesitant to move. Corporations, both large and small, were encouraged to borrow beyond their means in anticipation of this incredible bubble which was about to occur in terms of the Atlantic fisheries. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that management decisions resulted in a great deal of over-capitalization and unnecessary debt which precipitated and persuaded the Government to act in this very dramatic way.

We also, of course, recognize that the present problems were compounded by the monetarist position which the federal Government took a number of years ago. I might say it was a position which was supported by the Conservative Party of Canada, represented through its short term in office by the then Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister, who supported the position of Governor Bouey and the Bank of Canada. This position was later taken up by the present Government. It was essentially a Government policy of high interest rates, Mr. Speaker, the recognition that high interest rates would somehow cause investors to hesitate to make the necessary investments, which would cause the economy to wind down, slow down, and that is exactly what happened. We are looking at a situation, Mr. Speaker, in the Atlantic fishery, where, because of this high interest rate policy of the present Government and of the short-lived Conservative Government, fishermen, fish producers and fish processors were simply unable to operate effectively and efficiently. I will also say, Mr. Speaker, that these problems were compounded by the rather political nature of the DREE program, by the sort of indiscriminate throwing of DREE money out for political gain; some DREE money here, some DREE grants there. This resulted in a fisheries infrastructure unfolding which was not always based on economic advice and common sense.

Similarly, there was the indiscriminate doling out of licences, which resulted in there being more fishermen than the industry could support. As a result of that, restrictive regulations were brought in by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, which compounded the problem. I believe the most obvious over-exuberant expectations of what the 200-mile limit would bring about were demonstrated when the Department decided to dole out international fishing licences to foreigners to fish in our waters. That again was simply another factor which contributed to depleted resources and more pressure being brought to bear on an already over-extended resource.

This major problem of an industry which has floundered for years and years as a result of a lack of Government strategy in place can be seen on the West Coast of this country. Again, as a result of a lack of any real strategic planning with all the players involved, and with the lack of a comprehensive strategy for that resource sector, an ad hoc approach has been taken, which has resulted in chaos on both the East and West Coasts of Canada. It was certainly known many, many years ago that this would be bound to unfold in this way.

I remember the economic development task force, which was conducted by the New Democratic Party in Atlantic

Canada. Various fishermen's organizations and various fishing organizations brought to our attention at that time the financial and economic plight of the industry. However, the action the Government took was to appoint the Kirby task force, which of course resulted in Bill C-170 which we are debating today, the restructuring of the fishing industry into two fishing giants.

While having two giants in that industry will place it amongst the largest fishing corporations in the world, it raises a number of concerns. One of the major concerns I have is what this Bill provides in terms of power to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. The Minister may acquire shares, debentures or securities of any fishery enterprise. The Minister may make a contribution or loan to any fishery enterprise. I use those two references in the Bill to show the unlimited powers which the Minister will receive if this Bill passes. Mr. Speaker, I feel that that ought to raise concern among Canadians generally because we are really being asked, as Members of Parliament, to have faith in the good intentions of the Minister. Through us he is asking people in the fishing industry of Atlantic Canada to have faith in what this Minister plans to do for the industry. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the rather abysmal record of the Government and the Minister regarding this very critical fisheries sector, I do not believe it is a reasonable request for the Minister to make.

As the critic for fisheries in our Party has indicated, this Bill really does not solve the problem. It simply breathes life into an ailing industry. What happens from this point on will be really critical. This is simply the first of a long trek to revitalize and restructure that very ailing industry.

I believe it is important to note the role of the banks in this solution. We have not to this point recognized that one of the reasons that the Government moved as it did to restructure financially this ailing industry was to provide relief to the banks which were involved. It was well known that virtually every chartered bank in this country was heavily in debt as a result of imprudent loans made to a number of large and small corporations. Once again, as we have seen so often in the past, Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada, the taxpayers of Canada, through the Government of Canada, have been asked to come in and bail out a number of corporations. And I believe that really the motivation has been to bail out the banks which found themselves over-extended in this very critical industry.

• (1550)

We have made a great deal of effort in Bill C-170 to assist some of the large players in the Atlantic fishery, including the Bank of Nova Scotia. But what about the 700 independents who have been left out of the equation and are now looking with some fear at these two megagiants in the fishing industry? They are being asked to compete alongside these major players. Are the banks going to be sympathetic to their plight? Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker. We have already seen the major chartered banks of this country saying to the fishermen that they are cutting back the lines of credit, they no longer have faith in the industry or the fishermen and their traditional lines of credit are being reduced virtually as a matter of bank policy. When you consider the privileged position of banks in this country, Mr. Speaker, when you consider the responsibility they ought to accept as a result of that privileged position, this is not the kind of behaviour we would expect from our major lending institutions.

I believe it is critical that the Government of Canada view this problem not simply in cold, hard financial terms. There is the impression that the Government plans to privatize this restructured corporate amalgamation. While one will perhaps laud that as a long-term goal, I do hope we do not lose sight of the fact that, in getting these restructured companies back on their feet financially and then selling them off to the private sector, there is more to it than that.

I believe that what we are seeing here is not only a financial and economic problem, it is also a social problem. Because of the dependence of so many medium and small communities in Atlantic Canada on the fishing industry, an ailing industry will result in a tearing of the social fabric in many of those communities. After all, for a great deal of Atlantic Canada fishing is Atlantic Canada. What happens to the fishing industry, not only these restructured companies but the small independents as well, will reflect on the social fabric of Atlantic Canada in the months, years and decades ahead.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that the Government keep in mind that financial viability is a major factor but it is not the only factor, and I suspect we can make a case that it is not the major factor. Long-term employment of people in Atlantic Canada, long-term economic stability in the fishing industry, ought to be the number one priority, as opposed to a rapid move to financial viability and a turnover to the private sector of these new-found corporations.

I want to take issue with some comments made by certain Members of the House, Mr. Speaker. The concern was expressed that the provincial and federal Governments, as well as the fishing companies, did not look actively enough for foreign money to come to the rescue. I think it is time that we as Canadians stood up and stopped using taxpayers' money to bribe foreign corporations into coming into this country. I believe, as do Members of the New Democratic Party, that we can do it ourselves. There is money in this country to do it ourselves. We do not have to go out on bended knee with grants and give-aways to the Japanese, Americans, Germans or others. We can do it ourselves.

I shudder at the number of people who have suggested in debate on this bill that we should have gone to foreign investors in foreign countries for the answer to our fisheries problem. If one could be so bold, one could perhaps argue the case that one of the reasons we have problems in many of our resource industries today is that in the past that is exactly what we did. We went outside of this country and asked foreigners to come in and make the investments, and more important the investment decisions, for this industry and the future of Canadians. I hope the days are long past when we have to look to foreigners to make a decision regarding the Canadian economy. I repeat, we do not need to use taxpayers'

money to bribe foreign corporations to assist us in the bail-out of this particular industry.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting that this provides an ideal opportunity for the Government to show some real leadership in carrying out its intention to divest itself of these investments in due time. The Government should consider other viable alternatives simply to privatizing this organization. I raise as a concern the possibility of major co-operatives becoming involved. In other words, the fish producers and processors, the fishermen themselves in Atlantic Canada, are quite capable of running many of these corporations. They are quite capable of making the necessary management decisions. I think it is time we gave people credit where credit is due. These individuals have spent every working day of their lives in the fishing industry in one form or another, and to suggest they are somehow unable to make the necessary management decisions is a slight to these individuals. I believe the Government now has the opportunity, as it moves out of its involvement in the months and years ahead, to look at the people involved in these corporations to play a more meaningful role than they have often played in the past, particularly when it comes to making financial decisions of a marketing or investment nature.

While we in the NDP will do everything possible to remove any impediment to a rapid passage of this Bill, we do want to use the opportunity of second reading, when we are asked to comment on the principle of the Bill, to make it clear that one of the reasons we are in this situation today is the lack of attention paid to planning the future of this industry, particularly given the Government's monetarist policy concerning high interest rates. Rather than see this as a time of gloom and doom, as some other Members have suggested, we see it as a time of opportunity to place in the hands of those people in Atlantic Canada who are directly involved the opportunity to participate in the development of the Atlantic fishery to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley-Hants): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have an opportunity to speak on Bill C-170, the Atlantic fisheries restructuring Bill. I speak as a very concerned Nova Scotian rather than as a Member who at the present time has a very large fishing constituency. I used to have, and my colleague across the way from Central Nova inherited, that part of Digby which was one of the real king counties for fish in Nova Scotia. My heritage lies in Digby county and I can thereby relate very much to the concern in that county, and frankly in all of Nova Scotia, about the implications of this Bill. This is part of the paradox. It is the very size of the industry in Atlantic Canada, which employs about 100,000 people compared to the 75,000 employed in the auto industry, which we hear so much about from time to time in Ontario. Considering that there are 100,000 people in Atlantic Canada involved directly and indirectly in the fishing industry, one should appreciate the concern over this Bill. In effect, that compounds the problem because we know the industry is in "dire straits", to quote a famous phrase. It is in dire straits because of the mismanagement of the industry, because of Government policy, Government action and Government inaction.

• (1600)

When our fishing spokesman, the Member from South Shore (Mr. Crouse), replied to the Minister here on Monday he outlined, as other Members have, all the problems that the fishing industry had with a lot of the political interference that has adversely affected the fishing industry in terms of licenses, quotas and seasons. The entrepreneurial industry and the skills of those who ply the seas have really been hamstrung by Government interference and Government policy.

In the brief time that I have I am not going to review all those details. They were most ably reviewed by the Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse). We also had a very interesting speech this morning from the Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell). She is the Chairman of the Fisheries and Forestry Committee and has real concerns about this Bill. I am not going to waste the time of the House recounting what this Bill does. We know that the Government is pumping many millions of dollars into the industry to help it, but also thereby bailing out the banks who have over-extended credit to several of the major companies, two in Nova Scotia and three in Newfoundland. Out of this infusion of capital there are going to be two large fishing corporations, the largest and the second largest fishing companies in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we can bandy words about. I do not know what the official name is going to be for this new corporation or new corporations. I am apprehensive after having seen what happened with PetroCan and its establishment. It was the window in the industry, and there are some positive things to say about it. There are also things to be said about PetroCan and the national energy policy whereby PetroCan gets an unfair advantage against competitors in the oil and gas field. The new corporation, which I will call FishCan, for lack of a better word, may also have preferential treatment through the back door from a Government that is giving the funds. It is only natural to say that if the Government is going to create this Crown corporation, when the bottom lines are faced in the administration of a new corporation, the fears of the independent fish operators in Nova Scotia have a lot of merit. Until the lines of administration of the new corporation are defined and queried in the Committee I think those concerns are going to stay.

I listened to the comments of the Member from the New Democratic Party who preceded me about some of his hopes and some of the ideology of the New Democratic Party. I cannot understand how we can have blind faith that the Government, which created the problem through this new corporation, is now going to be able to cure it. I can quote the political phrase of a former Minister of Finance who said those immortal words, "short-term pain for long-term gain". I am seriously concerned that because we see the carrot of many millions of dollars to help an immediate problem we are going to have short-term gain for long-term pain in the fishing

industry until we define how this new corporation is going to operate.

Mr. Speaker, the politicians across the way, and on this side too, have said with authority that the new corporation is not a Crown corporation in the sense of a Crown corporation. In actual fact, it is not. It is worse. It is strictly a creature of the federal Government with no one on the board from the private sector in Newfoundland. If we take that as a precedent for what might happen in Nova Scotia, we are getting a situation in terms of an administration of a corporation doing business which has to be approved by both levels of the Government, by the board and by political appointees. The problem is going to be compounded and not resolved. Regardless of how you lay down the rules, the Government is going to become a more dominant player than it already is. The Government already has a dominant interest in the fishing industry through its licensing practice, quotas and all the inspections it does. With all that dominance before the creation of the corporation, I do not have faith that the new corporation is going to be the cure that we are all hoping for in this very important industry.

I sympathize with those Members who have fishing communities in their constituencies where the plants are closed down and the boats are not at sea because the prices are down. If there were a free vote, which there is not going to be, it would be very difficult for them to vote against the Bill because of some of the principles that I think are wrong in this Bill. Philosophically, I have real difficulty, in terms of the history of Parliament, with the creation of Crown corporations to do business, not Crown corporations to do cultural things such as the CBC. The CNR was born out of a morass of bankruptcies in the railways and was a needed and necessary social creation. In some ways I can understand the argument for the social need for the Crown corporation.

Using the analogy of driving a car which goes off the highway and you need some help, you are obviously going to take help from anyone who comes along to give you help. However, you are not going to take help with as much confidence if the person who forces you off the road is the person who offers you the helping hand. I think that is the case here. I do not know if this new Crown corporation is going to be the octopus of the industry which will reach out with tentacles and unfairly choke, in a discriminatory way the independent fish operations. I do not know if it is going to be the shark of the industry which will eat some of the independent fish operators. I do not know if it is going to be a nice little sunfish which will sit in the sea with the other independent operators and get along with everybody in harmony.

Mr. Speaker, when the choice has to be made between the Crown corporation and the independent fish operator, it is only human and natural to say that the Government Crown corporation, which I call FishCan, is going to cut the deck for FishCan and not for the independent operator.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many questions that one has to ask. We all live by the sea in Atlantic Canada. It is part of our pulse. The sea is the womb of the earth. You cannot get away from that beat of the sea. I am proud of it. May I interject now to say that I am glad that my colleague, the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), stood down to let me speak now so that I could catch a plane. He will be speaking later in his most eloquent style.

The sea is fundamental to us. I am appalled as a Canadian that this bounty of the sea is there to feed Canadians and the world. I would like to have the hopes of my friend from the Okanagan who spoke a little while ago. The reality is that we have mucked it up. We need to have questions answered. We have to know about the potential political power of FishCan against the independent operators. We have to know if there is going to be a back door subsidization program greater than what is there now in the infusion of initial funding. We have to know what the reality is about the privatization and the recognition. Is this just a temporary measure to help out an industry that is in dire straits for a time, or is it really going to be there forever and a day?

We used to look around the city of Ottawa and see temporary wartime Government buildings. They stayed there for 45 years. The most temporary law, which is still very much a part of the system of Canada, was the temporary Income Tax Act of 1917. That was a temporary measure. I suggest that we are dreaming in technicolour if we think that this is a temporary measure and the FishCan Corporation will back off once the immediate job is, hopefully, completed and the sales return, the prices rise and people get back to work. I believe we will be moving an amendment which will force Members to show if they believe that it really will back off in a programmed manner as the industry improves. It will be a sunset clause and we will see what happens when the Minister appears before the committee.

● (1610)

I do not get upset over socialization or nationalization. I fully support some of our Crown corporations such as Canadian National, Air Canada and the CBC. These have been creatures of compromise, talent and necessity which, despite the problems they do have, have done well and have provided a social need. That does not bother me. This is the creation of a state corporation but it is being called restructuring, according to the new jargon. I suggest it is misleading, especially for Members opposite who avoid mentioning socialization or nationalization and keep talking about restructuring. A rose is a rose by any name and a rose has thorns as well as a bloom.

I am suggesting most seriously to the House that in reality this is not a restructuring but a back door nationalization of the fish industry.

The Minister will have to be prepared to tell the committee what Canada's position will be with our friends to the south where the great fish market is. What will be the American reaction to public money going into this new FishCan Corporation when the U.S. is already apprehensive about many of our raw resources? They are already attacking the import of our potatoes and other raw resources into the States with countervailing duties, and if they believe there is an unfair advantage from using taxpayers' money to compete against

their private interest, what assurance can the Minister give that the Americans will not slap on countervailing duties when we create the FishCan Corporation here? Because we can be sure that fish lobby in the New England States will say it is unfair trade. There are many questions which the Minister must answer before I will say how I will vote on this legislation at third reading.

The question is, what are the alternatives? They are difficult and, fortunately for Nova Scotia, we are still negotiating. There is not an agreement yet, as there is in Newfoundland. We have not received the assurances as yet from the federal Government, which I presume satisfied Newfoundland. I can think of several compromises in Nova Scotia, one of which would be one company going down and the other running the fleet. I personally believe that the record of Governments coming in after the event, having created the problem, is not good. We must face the reality. While it could happen that companies will fail and the fish stocks and inventories will deflate the market even further, that is the reality. Perhaps we should face that situation rather than postpone it for another two years while building up the infrastructure with the bureaucracy that is necessary to run a FishCan operation.

As I said earlier, I have real concerns about this temporary measure. We will see how serious Members are about its being temporary when the Member for South Shore perhaps moves his sunset provision. I suggest to my friend for South West Nova (Miss Campbell) that the Income Tax Act in 1917 was a temporary measure, and yet. I am not very confident about a return to private industry when I read the words of the Machiavellian author who is perhaps behind the whole thing. He is our friend, Dr. Kirby from Nova Scotia. He is an interesting individual with whom I have stimulating conversations on planes back and forth to Ottawa but, as he said, after the first agreement had been signed with Newfoundland and the Minister was flying to Nova Scotia to negotiate with that Province, as quoted in *The Globe and Mail* of November 5, 1983, as the plane hit the runway in Halifax—

Miss Campbell: It was Port Hawkesbury, not Nova Scotia.

Mr. Nowlan: It says Halifax here. But the quote is the main thing. It is the same as what Churchill said about nationalization, "When you scramble an omelette, you cannot unscramble it." Mr. Kirby must have been thinking of Mr. Churchill when he said:

> Whatever happens now, what we've pulled off—restructuring the industry and at the same time creating a new federal fisheries policy—can never be undone.

That is what gives me concern. We have an immediate problem, and this is a quick legislative fix that I believe parliamentary history has proven does not work. Until more questions are answered in the committee, I am not optimistic, and I believe we have legitimate reasons to try to negotiate a better deal in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member a question. I share some of his concerns about the policy behind the Bill. Without getting into that at this point, I simply want to know how he can base his argument by saying that the federal Government is responsible for the problems in the fishing industry? It was the federal Government, under the former Minister of Fisheries, which told the companies and the Provinces of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland in particular not to overfish in the spring of 1981. Despite this advice they overfished and the Governments of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia were in a war in competition for the northern cod. They opened up some new plants against the advice of the federal Government. It is the companies and the two provincial Governments, particularly the Government of Newfounland, that are responsible for the overfishing in 1981. That is what led to the high inventories when interest rates went over 25 per cent. How can the Member say that the federal Government is responsible when it told the companies and the Governments not to do that?

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that I had to catch a plane.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: There should be no oh, ohs. I said that I was not going to review all the history since it does not resolve the problem. But it is another concern which I have. In his speech the Minister stated that we are setting up a FishCan Corporation—this is where I disagree with Mr. Kirby—because so far there is no new federal fishery policy. It is the same fish policy that got us into the problem. Does the Member believe that creating a new corporation will resolve the problem?

The fact of the matter is that one can read the Halifax *Chronicle-Herald, The Globe and Mail* or the speech by the Member for South Shore. With respect to the fishing quota, restrictions in the St. Lawrence, the restrictions on licenses to boats, on the size of boats, everyone in the fish trade, including Mr. Nickerson of Nickerson and Sons which went under, National Sea Foods which went under, and the three companies in Newfoundland which have closed the three plants, knew that the former Minister of Fisheries and Oceans had a bias against modern fishing operations. He wanted political interference to help support his fishing communities in New Brunswick. He had archaic policies. We now have a new FishCan Corporation, and there has been no indication so far that the policy will change. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, I had many other questions to ask the Hon. Member, but he is in the habit of hitting and running. I am sorry that he could not stay. I will just repeat that his assumption, like that of the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) when he spoke earlier this week, that the federal Government is to blame for the demise of the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada, is wrong. The policy of the former Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and of the federal Government before the Kirby process started was one that would not have led to the problems in the fishing industry we have seen if they had been followed by the fishing companies, the main actors in the industry, and the Governments of

Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. Rightly or wrongly, I cannot question the political motives of provincial Governments. I am not entitled to do that as a member of the public. If they want to pursue a certain political action, that is fine. They should bear the consequences of what they do however. The fact is that the Government of Newfoundland was in competition with the Government of Nova Scotia. When I say the Government I mean the two provincial economies which were in competition for the northern cod and for groundfish. They overfished. They overdid it. The companies did this against the advice of the former Minister of Fisheries, and they got themselves into a jam.

● (1620)

One cannot ignore the fact that the union which Mr. Cashin directs in Newfoundland is not only a union. I guess he would accept the definition himself that it is a social and political movement as well which had the industry on strike in 1980 or 1981. Do you expect that to be without cost? Do you expect to have a total industry in a province on strike without any cost? Are they accepting the responsibility for that? It seems to me that when you put an industry on strike you should know that there are consequences at the end, and the consequences can be bankruptcy, failure. I do not think those people have accepted that responsibility. I am not suggesting they were wrong to go on strike.

Mr. Heap: Oh, oh!

Mr. Breau: No, I am not. It is not for me to decide. When you go on strike and stifle an industry for about half a year, you have to accept the responsibility for what you do. They should accept the responsibility for what they did. Nevertheless, we are in this situation now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we are studying Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishing enterprises. This afternoon, I will not deal with the Bill because, in my opinion, there is no need for such a Bill, we should not have to study the Bill, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (M. De Bané) should not have had to introduce it in the House because, in the winter of 1981-82, there were ways to cope with the situation in fisheries. The problem is that, at the time, the Government decided to have the situation in fisheries reviewed by a group whose political master was not the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. Normally, such issues come under the structural and political responsibility of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. The Government decided to involve a group which would analyze the situation and make recommendations.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the group made a very serious mistake. It made the mistake of wanting to re-invent the wheel. It made a mistake when it listened approvingly to many interested parties in Atlantic fisheries, mostly the large companies and, in certain cases, especially the Government of Nova Scotia which kept saying that everything done by the federal Governement in fisheries was bad, the kind of comments we have heard from the Official Opposition in the past two or three days. Anything done about stock management or about quota management was bad because that was interference in an industry which ought to have much more freedom. In my opinion, the Kirby Task Force naively swallowed that premise. It is partly for that reason that we are experiencing problems today, yet another analysis of the fisheries problems, an attempt at re-inventing the wheel, while we did have the statutory, legal, financial and political means to solve the problem of fisheries in 1981-82, notwithstanding the origin of the crisis.

I would rather not delve too deeply into those issues. Mr. Speaker, the problem with Bill C-170 is not the Bill itself, that is only part of a more serious and much more wide-ranging problem. I am wondering whether there is an orientation and a philosophy in the field of fisheries, or whether we are simply faced with bits and pieces produced by a committee whose approach has been to compromise with everybody. One can compromise to the point where one's statements no longer mean anything.

There is nothing wrong with seeking a consensus, but in a field such as fisheries we just cannot ignore the fact that the Department of Fisheries and Oceans is the federal Department which must be most politically aware, in the sense that it reacts to the people because, through that Department—and possibly it is the only one—the federal Government is related directly to the people. There is not other level of Government. A fisherman knows that he gets his permit from the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, and he knows which jurisdiction, which sectors of fisheries come under the federal or provincial constitutional authority. It is therefore a highly political field.

So, Mr. Speaker, we do need a clear orientation and philosophy in the field of fisheries. And I happen to think that until the winter of 1982, we had a coherent federal policy in the field of fisheries. However, from that time on, it was decided to follow another path. As I said earlier, it turned out to be an attempt at re-inventing the wheel and to swallow faulty premises, therefore the analyses were wrong. And yet, we could have taken a different approach instead of introducing Bill C-170 and its famous concept of restructuration.

There is one thing which must be pointed out. The Hon. Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell) did so this morning. The Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons) spoke in support of the Bill and, although I disagree with some of his conclusions, as I disagree with the Bill, I find it extremely difficult to endorse the Bill. Still, in his definition of the problem, he said something which I found very interesting.

[*English*]

When the Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons) at one point said that the banks had the Government in

a corner—I am paraphrasing what he said, but he said we have to do something—he was right. He defined it well. I believe that, very naively someone early in this crisis, once the Kirby process started, intentionally or unintentionally, gave signals to the banks that there was an easy way out for this, that this matter could be easily solved, that this restructuring concept could fix things. I think that was very naive. I think that is where the mistake happened.

I notice in the Minister's speech as reported at page 28850 of *Hansard* for November 14, that he said this:

> History will note that in the case of all those commercial undertakings which I mentioned—National Sea Products Ltd., Nickerson, Fishery Products, Penny & Sons, North Atlantic, Pêcheurs-Unis—hundreds and thousands of creditors agreed to wait and did not take any action because they knew that we were trying to find a solution.

They agreed to wait. Were they asked to wait? They must have been. Their creditors must have been asked to wait. Who asked them? Was it the political authority that asked them or was it Doctor Kirby?

Then we say that there was no private capital. There was no way for private capital to be involved in the restructuring. There was never any attempt to solve the matter through private capital. Private capital will not buy the debts of the bank. Private capital will not come to a company that is going bankrupt and say, "Hey, Sir, I am going to buy the company and take on your debts". Private capital will say, "Fine. Let the bank get a receiver, put the plant in receivership and then we will see if we will buy." Normally, I thought that was the rule of the game. The banks puts the outfit into receivership; then private capital may look at it. That is when we can ask a private entrepreneur, "Do you have a restructuring plan? What kind of assistance do you want from the Government?" Then we decide what kind of assistance to give. As soon as a signal was given that there was an easy way out or that the Government would not let the industry collapse or go bankrupt, of course the banks and others had the Government in the corner. That is a lousy way to proceed, in my view. It will be disastrous for the future, not only of the fishing industry but of other industries as well. If this Bill goes through and if the restructuring goes through, I am afraid there will be further demands for restructuring. Other banks will come around and say that in other sectors they cannot go on, that the Government cannot let them collapse.

● (1630)

There were ways to deal with difficult situations in the fishery before. The Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) were correct when they said that the federal Government could not just let the companies go bankrupt with their high inventories and that prices could have been depressed through panic sales by receivers, particularly in the United States. I agree. Anyone who knows anything about the fishery knows that there were ways to deal with it. We dealt with that in 1969 and 1974. The Fisheries Price Support Board has the legal expertise and is the financial mechanism by which to do it. I am told that all the companies had to do was sign a piece of paper. If I recall correctly how it was done, there was a confirmation by the bank that it could not hold the inventory any longer. Then the Fisheries Price Support Board could finance the inventory, provide a loan guarantee and hold it until the price was acceptable. That is the way to proceed. That is the way to ensure an inventory is not sold by a receiver in a panic situation. Why was that not done? I know that was tried before they set up this new process of reinventing the wheel. Why did they not do that? That is what they should have done.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we are told—and I am quite willing to believe the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans when he says this because, even though he is sponsoring Bill C-170, he is not responsible for this situation because he did not appoint the Kirby task force, he was not the one to choose its policy or to choose or even negotiate restructuring nor was he the one to negotiate and develop the restructuring plan—but when we are told that these corporations will operate at arm's length from the Government, I am quite ready to believe it, but whether we believe it or not, or whether all the Members of the House agree, it is not important. When a bill is passed and the Government acquires equity in a company, the matter of whether or not there will be political influence is not important.

However, Mr. Speaker, only two years ago, the Government tried to transform the Canada Development Corporation into a policy instrument for Canada. I was in agreement with that philosophy and with the fact that, if the Canadian Government held 45 or 49 per cent equity in the Canada Development Corporation, the Canadian Parliament should have something to say about the policies of this corporation, but there was an outcry at this suggestion and we had to reverse our decision. If we were trying to influence this corporation, why not do the same for this other one? I do not know which minister will be responsible for the equity in these companies one, two or three years from now. It could be someone who will want to make decisions and manage the company and who will put a stop to this. Once Bill C-170 gives the power to sell or buy shares, who can stop a future minister from doing so? Mr. Speaker, there is no danger for the federal Government to be judge and party with regard to fisheries decisions in the future. One of the reasons why the federal Government earned respect in the field of fisheries in the past is that, when the constitutional jurisdiction over fisheries was put into question, the fishing communities gave us their support; it is also because the federal Government has always acted as a an objective referee between small and large companies, between various fleets and between the provinces. But the moment we are no longer considered as an objective referee, because we have shares in companies such as National Sea Products Limited and in the other company in Newfoundland, no wonder the fishing communities are getting very nervous. People are wondering how the ground fish industry is going to survive, particularly in

New Brunswick, in Prince Edward Island, in certain parts of Quebec and Nova Scotia, because not only are we going to have a giant as we had before—we are used to having giants—but now it is going to be a giant owned mostly by the federal Government and the Government of Nova Scotia. Suffice to point out that the agreement with Nova Scotia had hardly been signed that already pressure was brough to bear so that Nova Scotia companies might gain wider access to the ground fish resources in the gulf. Of course, Mr. Speaker, because we can already see a link between the political interest of the new company established for Nova Scotia and the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, when the Minister also says that the new company will look after marketing or will offer its marketing services to the independents.

[*English*]

I am talking here not only about plant owners. There are hundreds of communities in Atlantic Canada which have independent processors, independently-owned fish plants. They carry with them the community—fishermen, people who service the industry and people who work in the plants. There is a community spirit behind these independents. To suggest to independent processors that the federal Government, which provides a marketing regime or structure for wheat, dairy products and milk through the Canadian Dairy Commission, and for eggs, poultry and other products, will tell them that when it comes to fish they will have to go through a super company in Nova Scotia if they need marketing assistance is really very offensive and just about an insult. That is an abdication of the federal Government's responsibility in the marketing of fish, and that should not be allowed to stand as policy.

I was hopeful Dr. Kirby would come up with a clear idea about marketing. As I just said, we have a structure in our system for wheat, milk, poultry and other products. Why can we not have it for fish? What is the ideological sclerosis that we cannot have it for fish?

[*Translation*]

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the political aspect and dimensions of that restructuration cannot be ignored. I said that it was an indication of a more serious problem, and fishing communities are wondering what is going on when all of a sudden the federal Government is concerned about saving the large companies, what is going on when the federal Government buys $14 million worth of Canada Development Corporation shares. A company cannot properly administer its own business, it reaches a point where its operations are down, practically bankrupt, yet the Canadian Government gets into the picture and buys $14 million worth of shares. I for one cannot see any logic in that, yet there is no money to give grants to fishermen to buy boats, there is no money to solve the problem created by the over capacity of herring seiners. I do not know—

[*English*]

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I note from the signal of the Chair that the Hon. Member's time is expiring. I am sure the House would be prepared to grant him extended time so that he can complete this most interesting speech.

• (1640)

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, whether one agrees with his views or not, the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) is always very charitable.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, in any case, I shall be brief. I have already said that the restructuring bill reflects a greater problem and that I wondered whether there has really been a clear strategy for fisheries since the Government decided to create the Kirby Commission. We really have to wonder whether there is a strategy. Sometimes, to be kind and not say that there is a bad one, I tell myself that maybe there is none. In my opinion, when we decided to reinvent the wheel in 1982, we may have rendered the federal Government and the federal fisheries policy completely powerless.

I have already mentioned the problem of herring seiners. There seems to be an excess capacity of herring seiners. Early in August, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans announced a policy stating that the solution would be to reduce the landing capacity. Leaving aside the issue of whether we agree or not, let us look at the mechanism suggested by the Minister. In my opinion, this mechanism is the most unfair that I have ever seen ever since I came to this House, a mechanism through which herring fishermen will be able to purchase the quota of another fisherman without the Government doing anything to reduce the landing capacity. Mr. Speaker, this goes against all the earlier policies developed for fisheries, which were aimed mainly at encouraging independent fishermen as much as possible; this means that a wealthy fisherman, who has already had good years in herring fishing and who has paid back the loan on his boat, will be able to purchase other quotas, while someone who came to the fishing industry a bit later, who is necessarily younger—

Mr. Cyr: During the lean years!

Mr. Breau: —during the lean years, as noted by my colleague for Gaspé (Mr. Cyr), will be able to buy what? He can buy nothing because he has no money. He owes money on his boat. He has just come into the fishing industry. He is young. He has a new boat. He has not seen the good years of herring fishing. What can he do? All he can do is to sell his quota. How can he sell his quota without selling his boat? He is stuck.

Mr. Speaker, this is the most unfair policy ever developed, but once more, I cannot say that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is wholly responsible for this concept, as once again was developed by the Kirby Commission. I wonder how someone who knew anything about the fishing industry could have developed such a concept! Here also, the Kirby report states:

There should not be any subsidies for fishing vessels. Mr. Speaker, the fishing vessel subsidy program was the means through which independent fishermen were able to acquire boats. Today, in New Brunswick, for instance, over 90 per cent of all fishing vessels are owned by individual fishermen and not by companies, thanks largely to the fishing vessel subsidy program. This year, this program has not yet been in effect.

[*English*]

I hope that the Government and all Members of Parliament will look very seriously at this restructuring proposal, consider the broader problems and examine very carefully what went on since January, 1982. I hope we will consider the systems put in place then to deal with this kind of problem to see why they were not used rather than invent new concepts which gave a signal to the banks that we would not let the companies go bankrupt.

In conclusion I say that I was ready to accept the idea of an abnormal approach in Newfoundland. I was ready to accept that in the case of Newfoundland because of the relative importance of the fishery to the provincial economy. I do not think the economy of Newfoundland could absord any more shocks. Broadly speaking, there was justification politically for the Government to do something abnormal in the case of Newfoundland, to look at the problem there differently. The high unemployment rate in that Province is a chronic problem. That Province is isolated geographically. Its economy depends very much on the groundfish industry in particular.

In the case of Nova Scotia, no one will convince me that there was a need for an abnormal approach to restructure, if restructuring was necessary at all in Nova Scotia, other than to be involved in a political reaction because of the fact that Newfoundland would be receiving a restructured industry. Is the only reason for a restructuring proposal for Nova Scotia, an abnormal or different approach by Government, the competition between the two provincial economies as to who will get the fish? If that is the case, the restructuring proposals for Nova Scotia do not make any sense. They are a threat to the groundfish industry all around the Gulf of St. Lawrence in the Provinces of Quebec, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick.

As I speak today, people who own fish plants in the groundfish industry or whose plants involve an important element of groundfish are not sure whether they will have to abandon them. If that happens, the Government of Canada, along with the provincial Governments concerned, will have participated in the demise of an industry all around the Gulf of St. Lawrence. In the case of Newfoundland, that will not necessarily be the result. The threat in the Newfoundland situation is not the same as in Nova Scotia. It is not a mere coincidence that in the agreement signed with Nova Scotia there is a paragraph which deals with access to more groundfish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. I believe that the new company, the federal Government and the provincial Government in Nova Scotia will try to establish a link between the federal fisheries policies and the management of this company. That is inevitable. When people assure me that that will not happen, I believe that it is not their intention, but I cannot accept that as a political answer because I do not know what the political situation will be next spring, next fall or a year from now. I do not know who the Minister will be at that time. I do not know if the link will go much further than a mere peek at what management does. It may go much beyond that. This will mean that independent processors will not be able to obtain financing. They will not be able to maintain their marketing position because of the presence of super companies owned by the Governments, and the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct one or two short questions to the Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) who just made a most interesting speech. He made a number of interesting comments which will certainly have to be looked at as the debate progresses, particularly when we get to the committee stage of this Bill. He said there are other ways in this Bill to go about solving the problems of the deep sea fishery of the Atlantic Provinces. That is a rough paraphrase, but he did say that. He then went on to put all the blame on Kirby and the banks. Obviously he feels very strongly against the method the Government has adopted and he spoke most eloquently in that regard. If there are ways other than the restructuring Bill now before the House, how does he intend to vote on this Bill in its present form?

• (1650)

Mr. Breau: First, Mr. Speaker, when I said that there were other ways, I did mention, in the case of preventing the collapse of prices through a panic selling of inventory, that the Fisheries Price Support Board could have provided loan guarantees, as has been done previously in times of crisis to make sure that the inventory would not be sold at panic prices. That is one of the ways of dealing with the problem.

What I said in my speech, and what I do believe strongly, is that when the crisis occurred in the fall of 1981 and the early winter of 1982, but particularly in the fall of 1981, there were other ways to deal with the problem. Once the Government, either politically or through officials, or the Kirby Commission, started giving signals to the banks and everyone else concerned that the Government would not let the industry collapse or go bankrupt, then I am not sure if any approach other than this one could have been used.

At the time, Mr. Speaker, I think there was a restructuring process occurring, not only for the fishing industry but for other industries. This would occur in a case where a plant was being sold by a receiver, as occurred in my constituency in the spring of 1983. The receiver put a plant up for sale. The bank lost a good deal of its money and, as well, many people lost a good deal of money. A new group came in and said that they would like to buy this plant if the Government would give it assistance and provide the means. The Government, through the DREE Program, provided some assistance, and the plant is now in operation. That is a restructuring process but it is one that does not give off signals that everybody around the plant will be bailed out. I think that that is probably what went wrong in this situation.

The Hon. Member must be aware that according to news reports, the Canada Development Corporation has apparently sold its shares in Fisheries Products to the federal Government for $14 million. In this case, Fisheries Products in Newfoundland run their company into the ground for whatever reason and the result is that the Canada Development Corporation sells its shares in Fisheries Products to the Government for $14 million.

In answer to the Hon. Member's question, I am not sure that there is any other way to go about it now, but there was another way in the spring of 1982. As to the question of how I will vote on this Bill, frankly, I have not yet made up my mind. I will listen to the debate very, very carefully. I said in my speech that I found it extremely difficult to support the Bill. I will reflect and I will listen to debate, after having added my speech to the debate, before I decide how I will vote.

I must tell the Hon. Member that one of the things that concerns me is the way his Party is trying to sit on the fence on this issue. The Hon. Member has not yet spoken and he normally does not sit on the fence. I hope I hear him speak from one side of the fence only. Either Conservative Members are for this kind of intervention or they are not, because there are some powers in this Bill that go way beyond what we were doing with Canagrex, with Canadair and with other Crown agencies, and the Hon. Member's Party attacks us all the time for those. I hope that I will hear that the Hon. Member for St. John's East takes a sincere position that comes from one side of the fence or the other.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, with the kind of opposition the Hon. Member has given this Bill, he does not need any help from this side of the House.

I would like to ask the Hon. Member one question. Many of the restructured plants will require access to the Gulf in order to get at those surplus groundfish stocks. That is a question that is very dear to the heart of the Hon. Member and I have the scars to prove it. I ask the Hon. Member if he would support opening the Gulf to deep sea trawlers so that they can catch that surplus stock and not allow it to die.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, first, the wide-ranging assertion of the Hon. Member that there is a surplus of groundfish in the Gulf is wrong. There is no surplus of goundfish in the Gulf. There is a temporary surplus situation with redfish, which is a kind of groundfish, but it is only a temporary situation. I know that the Hon. Member reads biological reports very carefully, as I do. Perhaps he should have read those reports more carefully in 1979, but I know that he reads them very carefully now. He should know that this is a temporary situation and that the assertion he makes that there is a surplus of groundfish in the Gulf is simply not factual.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I have never been dogmatic on this issue. He must remember the way I approached the question in 1979. The issue here is whether or not the problem in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia with the offshore fleets is caused by a shortage of fish. That is the real question. Anyone who looks at the facts cannot honesty say that the problems are caused by a shortage of fish. Newfoundland has tripled its landings of groundfish since 1977. Nova Scotia has increased its landings of fish by over 100 per cent. New Brunswick is the only Province that has yet to recapture its fish landings from the early 1970s and the late 1960s.

The issue here is one of fairness. Do we give all of the fish to the regions—no, I will say fleets instead of regions because I do not like to talk about this situation in interprovincial terms. Do we give more fish to the fleets that have tripled their landings, or do we preserve the Gulf of St. Lawrence for those fleets that have no other place to fish, do not have the boats to go offshore and can only fish in the Gulf? I approach this issue, Mr. Speaker, from the basic position of fairness. The resources of the Gulf should be kept for those who have access only to the Gulf and do not have boats capable of going offshore. The other fleets which have tripled their landings have problems other than the problem of a shortage of fish. They should address those problems.

While I am on that topic, Mr. Speaker, let me remind Hon. Members that I said in my speech that unions have a great deal of things to say on these matters and they tend to be socio-political movements as well as unions. They should bear the responsibility for the fact that the offshore fleet is apparently not viable now. It is not making profits and it is in deficit. Apparently its way of fishing with offshore trawlers is not a good way to fish. The offshore fleet should solve the problem in ways other than asking us who have access only to the Gulf to be sacrificed in order to subsidize their non-viable operations.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Before I recognize the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), may I deal with the adjournment motion for this evening? It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie)—Fisheries—Newfoundland representation in Cabinet. (b) Agreement between Government and Bank of Nova Scotia; the Hon. Member for Victoria (Mr. McKinnon)—Public Works—Leasing of Department of Veterans Affairs building; the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster)—Agriculture—Stabilization program sought for beef industry.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ATLANTIC FISHERIES RESTRUCTURING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. De Bané that Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishery enterprises, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a most interesting and eloquent speech made by the Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau). In reply to two very simple questions, he told us in one instance that he is very much opposed to this Bill, has reservations about it and is keeping an open mind on it. That means of course, when one reads through that rhetoric, that if the Bill re-emerges at third reading in its present form, he will vote against it if he is to be consistent.

Second, with regard to surplus groundfish stocks in the Gulf, the Hon. Member would have us believe that there are no surplus stocks, and that would mean that the work of our federal Fisheries Department in rebuilding these stocks over the past number of years has been a total failure. That of course is not the case and he knows that.

He also knows, better than anyone in the House, that the capacity of the Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick fleets is such that they cannot catch all of the fish in the Gulf. That is a fact. The stock has grown beyond the capacity of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island fleets and the Hon. Member knows that. He knows that full well, and he also knows, Mr. Speaker, that these stocks, if not caught, will die. I think he also knows, because he was the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries for—

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker I rise on a point of order. I have the highest respect for my predecessor as Minister of Fisheries, but may I remind the Hon. Member that we are discussing a restructuring Bill that deals with some failing companies. We are not discussing the fishing plans for the next year. That is a totally unrelated matter, and I believe he would recognize that the topic he was discussing, while most important, has no bearing upon the Bill that we are discussing.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I am really and truly surprised by that intervention because the question of Gulf stocks is one that is critical to this Bill. I prefaced my remarks by saying that if some of the restructured plants are not given access to that Gulf stock, they cannot survive. That is their whole raison d'être. The plants on the south coast of Newfoundland, for example, that are very much a part of the restructured Newfoundland company, must have access to that Gulf stock if they are to survive and prosper, and the Minister knows that only too well. If he does not know that, then I would say that we are in worse shape than I thought in terms of the administration of the fisheries of this country.

• (1700)

I did not want to get carried away with the question of Gulf stocks, Mr. Speaker, because that is a decision the Minister will have to make. And he will have to learn to live with that politically, as I did.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McGrath: I hear the laughter of the Hon. Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell) and the Hon. Member for Gloucester. But they cannot have their cake and eat it too, because we will be watching very carefully at third reading stage of this Bill to see if they are prepared to put their money where their mouths are. Very simply, Mr. Speaker, they cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. Member for Gloucester went out of his way in his speech to blame the banks, the Kirby task force and the unions for the mess which brought us to the point where we had to bring forth this Bill. And, of course, he blamed the provincial Governments as well. He blamed everyone but the Government, of which he was a member at one time by being Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries for two or three years.

Mr. Breau: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McGrath: I did not interrupt the Member when he was speaking, and these spurious points of order—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Towers): Order.

Mr. Breau: I know my hon. friend always wants to be accurate. Unfortunately, I was never the Parliamentary Secretary to any Minister of Fisheries and Oceans.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Towers): That is not a point of order.

Mr. McGrath: That is not a point of order. Even if I have made a mistake in that regard, he has been Parliamentary Secretary to just about every other Minister. That is perhaps the only one he has not been assigned to. In any event, if he was not the Parliamentary Secretary, it is a known fact that he was extremely close to the previous Minister of Fisheries and Oceans who comes from an adjoining constituency or from the same part of New Brunswick as the Hon. Member.

The Hon. Member for Gloucester proceeded to blame everyone but the Government of Canada. The facts are very simple. When we declared our 200-mile limit in 1977 there was a great aura of expectation, and rightly so, because we were going to get control of our fisheries. There was also a great opportunity, which was missed at that time, an opportunity to put our house in order. Instead of seizing that opportunity, we went on a binge in terms of over-extending to the point at which we got ourselves in very deep trouble.

I will bring you to the point, Mr. Speaker, of the appointment of the Kirby task force, forgetting what happened in between, and the problems which plagued the industry prior to 1977 with the rape of the fishing grounds by the international fleets and the failure of ICNAF to address itself to that problem. We will skip over all that and bring ourselves to the point at which the Kirby task force was appointed by the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) in January of 1982.

The plants were failing one by one during the summer of 1981. Why? They were failing and closing during the summer of 1981 because of a number of things over which this Government had some control, one being high interest rates. High interest rates of 22 per cent were coming about at a time when there was a change in the market in terms of the strengthening of the U.S. dollar, which made our European competitors more competitive. There was a change in consumer habits in the United States resulting from the fact that poultry was becoming more competitive with fish in the marketplace. All these things came together at a time when we had a monetarist policy in this country of 22 per cent interest rates. The companies could not sustain their inventories and the banks had to move in to keep those companies alive.

We made the plea during the summer of 1981. I made plea after plea in the form of telegrams to the Prime Minister and to the former Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to act before it was too late. But nothing was done. The result is that we are paying for it today. Nothing was done until a final realization on the part of the Government reaching right into the Prime Minister's office in the winter of 1981-82, which resulted in the appointment of the Kirby task force.

What happened then? We know what happened. The Kirby task force found itself getting in deeper and deeper, and the report was delayed to the point that when the report did come down, there was no reference made to the question of restructuring. What we have here is not what was contained in the Kirby task force report.

Notwithstanding how we got into this mess, Mr. Speaker, I want to make one thing very clear to the Hon. Member for Gloucester and to this House. This Bill is absolutely critical to the survival of the deep water fisheries in the province of Newfoundland. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. de Bané) will receive no quarrel from me on that. What I do have to argue against and warn against is the danger that this Bill may somehow be presented as a panacea, as some kind of magic wand which will solve all the problems of the deep water fishery. We have no agreement in Nova Scotia. I do not know where that will lead. However, we do have a signed agreement with Newfoundland which not only has the support of the Newfoundland Government, but has the support of the Fishermen's Union and the principal creditors. I say to you, Sir, that if the industry is to survive, then the Minister must have the authority to proceed with this Bill. That speaks to the question of urgency.

The Minister knew all this in July of this year, when he proceeded unilaterally, when he could not get an agreement with Newfoundland. He certainly knew in September, when he finally did get an agreement on September 28, that it was a matter of some urgency. He knew back in the summer of this year that he would require legislation. He was warned that legislation would be required. He could not proceed without it. This was a major departure from normal procedure. It was a major venture for the Government of Canada, and it had to have statutory authority to proceed in this way. Yet, Sir, we were not presented with the Bill until October 31, one full month after the agreement with Newfoundland. We were then told we had to move very quickly. This was a matter of great urgency.

I do not really question the urgency; however, instead of proceeding with the Bill, it was allowed to stand for a week. Finally, when the Government did decide to move with second reading of the Bill, we had one day's debate, and at the eleventh hour, without any explanation, the Government decided to proceed the next day with an Opposition day. I still do not understand why we did not continue with the debate on Monday and Tuesday. If we had done so, this Bill would now either be before the committee or back in the House for third reading. In that case the Minister would not have the problems he now has. I do not blame the Minister entirely, although one would expect he would have a little more influence on his colleague, the Government House Leader. If he was not able to exercise his influence successfully, surely he could have called on his colleague, the Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston), who chaired the committee which brought about this whole affair in the first place. I am sure that between the two of them they could have persuaded the Government House Leader to get on with this Bill, to get on with the very urgent and important business of restructuring.

However, the Bill ignores, and the Minister deliberately ignores, some of the serious problems facing the industry, for example, fleet replacement. Who is going to pay for the replacement of the trawlers? We have 140 trawlers in the Atlantic Provinces with an average age of 14 to 15 years. Many of these trawlers are over 20 years of age. They have to be replaced with new equipment. That is a major financial undertaking. That is one of the problems which the new company will have to face, and very quickly, because that was one of the things which brought the existing companies virtually to the point of bankruptcy. They had to face up to these questions in addition to carrying the burden of debt placed on them by virtue of the high interest rate monetarist policy of the Government. Who is going to pay for these new trawlers? Is the Government going to set up a new Crown corporation to pay for and operate them and therefore totally control the harvesting sector, then, in turn, sell the catches to the giant companies? In other words, it would buy from one of its companies and sell to another one of its companies.

• (1710)

We are dealing with an industry directly responsible for the lives of about 70,000 or 80,000 people in the Atlantic Provinces and Quebec. It is as important to us as the Crow legislation is to western Canada. It is critically important to us

in Newfoundland. Yet no reference is made to the plight of the inshore fishermen. I would have expected the Hon. Member for Gloucester to have addressed that problem. God knows, we have about 48,000 inshore fishermen in the Atlantic region if you classify them as those who operate boats under 100 feet in length. The Minister knows we have serious problems with the inshore fishery regarding income and quality control. This year the inshore fishery in many parts of the Province of Newfoundland was a failure. Yet we still do not have any policy designed to address the problems facing the inshore fishermen which will give them an income they can depend upon and the opportunity to compete and survive. The average inshore fisherman in Newfoundland earns about $8,000 a year and works very hard for it. He has to content himself with unemployment insurance to get him through the rest of the winter.

There is no question in my mind that the moment this Bill is passed, and it will pass in this form or an amended form, someone will have to face these very serious questions of fleet replacement and our inshore fishermen, because you cannot deal with one at the expense of the other. I listened very carefully to the Hon. Member for Gloucester. He talked about the fact there was no underlying philosophy, that the Government was responding to task force kinds of responses in a dispirited way. On that score he was dead right, because that is very much a part of the problem. The Minister knows that full well because he inherited it, just as I did during my brief tenure as Minister. But at least we made an attempt to put our House in order. One of the first things we did as a Government was to order a total review of fisheries policy to try to get around some of the mistakes of the past, to try to get some kind of philosophy so that those depending upon the industry for their livelihood would know where it was going. That would deal with the question of fleet replacement, quality control and developing new markets. It would deal with the problems in developing new species and new markets for new species, which speaks to the whole question of research and development. All of these things were tragically ignored by this Government immediately it took office because it went right back to square one.

We put in place a total review of fisheries policy, which was immediately scrapped when the Liberal Government took over in 1980. We put in place a policy for rationalizing over-the-side sales, which at that time were chaotic. Both fishermen and Canadian processors would be able to take full advantage of this new marketing technique, but that policy was immediately undone by the incoming Government. We put in place a new salmon policy which called for the building of new hatcheries to preserve the Atlantic salmon. The only part of that policy followed through successfully by the Government was the conclusion of an international convention.

We are paying for these mistakes, Mr. Speaker, and paying dearly. We will continue to pay. What we have in front of us today is a Bill which is a direct result of the knee jerk, band-aid reactions of this Government to one problem after another facing the industry. I say to the Minister that the Bill he has in front of him today is the only thing he can do right now. I do not agree with the Hon. Member for Gloucester. The Minister had no choice. There was no other way he could go, he had to save the industry. In order to do that, there had to be massive federal and provincial Government involvement as well as that of the creditors. It is all very well to dump all over the Bank of Nova Scotia, but it is going to carry its share of the new company as well. I have no grief for the bank or the other creditors, and there are other creditors, but they will have to work with the two levels of Government to ensure the viability of this company to the point where not only will they become economically viable and be able to stand on their own two feet and compete in the markets of the world, but to the point where they can be handed back to the private sector where they rightfully belong.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, I wonder how the Hon. Member for St. John's East can, on the one hand, express concern for the inshore fishery and, on the other, argue for increased access to the resources of groundfish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence by larger trawlers. Can he reconcile those two positions? I do not really think they can be reconciled.

Secondly, when he says that the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island fleets do not have the capacity to catch the groundfish in the Gulf, how does he arrive at that conclusion? Traditionally, we were fishing upwards of 60,000 tons of groundfish through the new Brunswick fleet alone.

Mr. McGrath: That can be reconciled by information which is available to anyone in this country from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. It is available to the Hon. Member. If he was open-minded enough to make the inquiries, he would get the same information I was able to get. The fact is that the Hon. Member knows full well that is a trans-boundary stock anyway. He knows there are trawlers involved in catching that stock. He also knows full well—if he does not, he should—that there are plants on the South Coast and in parts of Nova Scotia which, if they do not have access to the surplus stocks—and I say "surplus" because the inshore fishermen must have first priority—then it is very questionable in most cases whether they can be viable, and in some cases they cannot survive.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member knows, I was at one time the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans so I know a little bit about it. As he and I both realize, one of the best warehouses is the sea but once a fish is caught, if it is properly taken care of, it is one of the most nutritious and best food products man can consume. Does he not think it has been a pretty poor marketing job?

• (1720)

Mr. McGrath: I cannot agree with the former Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of the Environment.

Mr. Whelan: It used to be fisheries and forestries, and then we made it the environment.

Mr. McGrath: That is right. When it became the Department of the Environment, fisheries became a mere service

within the Department of the Environment. That was taking place at a critical time in the growth of the industry. That is part of the problem as well. I am glad the Minister gave me a chance to put that on the record.

He talks about the fact that the ocean is probably one of the best storage facilities for fish. The difference is that if the fish stay in the ocean, they die. If they are caught and kept in cold storage, they are there to be marketed over a period of three months. The Minister put his finger on a very important problem which is going to be one of the major problems facing the new company. If we do not get access to the European market for groundfish these companies cannot survive. The Minister knows that full well and I am glad he gave me the opportunity to put that on the record.

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Environment was created when I was with the Minister of Fisheries. It was not put in force until afterwards. It did not take over fisheries. There was still the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry at that time.

We know that when you catch the fish from the sea or from fresh water it is a product that can be used in many societies all over the world. I am accused of trafficking too much of it. I find in many instances our fish does not reach those people in the condition that it should. Mr. Speaker, that is bad marketing. This is what I am pointing out. I just returned from the World Food and Agricultural Organization meeting. I chaired the meetings attended by Ministers of Agriculture and Fishery. A lot of them in the Commonwealth countries have dual capacity and authority. Fisheries was one of their main topics. They are concerned about their own fisheries and needing assistance from countries like Canada that, they feel, have the know-how in conservation and the catching of fish. We know that we can improve that in Canada. I am sure the Hon. Member agrees.

Mr. De Bané: We need a "Fishagrex".

Mr. Whelan: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries says we need a "Fishagrex". Here is a product that we need to be distributed in the world. We need it to be marketed in a fashion that it can be put on many people's dinner and supper tables in such a fashion that they can afford to eat it. I am sure that if it is improved in the fashion that my colleague, the Hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bané), wants it to be, the fisheries can become the fisheries that we want it to be, one that will be economically viable and look after itself.

Mr. McGrath: Will you repeat the question?

Mr. Whelan: Mr. Speaker, I understood I could either ask a question or make statements.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions and comments.

Mr. Brian Tobin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of Bill C-170 which is now before the House for second reading. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) on Monday gave Members a detailed account of the measures that the Government proposes to take under this Bill. He has described very vividly the urgency of the situation which has caused the Government to introduce it.

Given that kind of introduction to Bill C-170, I have been somewhat disappointed in these last two days of debate to see that so many Members, rather than addressing themselves to the particular circumstances that now exist that give cause for this kind of legislation or to the fact that the legislation arises out of agreements that have been or are about to be reached with provincial Governments regarding the situation in the deep sea fishery, have instead applied themselves to talking about every kind of issue now affecting the Atlantic fishery, the inshore, deep sea, industrial, harvesting, processing side.

The Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) warned the Government that this Bill is not a panacea. It cannot solve all the problems. I want to inform the Hon. Member opposite that the Government has never claimed this Bill to be a panacea that will solve all the problems of the fishery. We have said instead that this Bill is designed to prevent what is clearly, and has been accepted on both sides of this House, a disaster. This point seems to have been lost as every Member seeks to raise before this House his own personal priority as far as the fishery is concerned.

I intend to stick to the subject matter at hand. The deep sea sector of the fishery is the cornerstone of the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada. It is a sector which had sales in 1982 of $770 million, a sector which has meant jobs for 44,000 people, 20,000 fishermen and 24,000 plant workers. I ask Members to reflect for just a moment on what 44,000 jobs mean in a region as economically depressed as Atlantic Canada. More particularly, what do those jobs mean when you break them down to a few hundred in this community and a few hundred in that community? Regionally, the rate of unemployment is 25 to 30 per cent, but on a community basis where these jobs are located unemployment is sometimes tragically at 40, 50, 60, 75 per cent. That is what we are talking about, not every side issue that may be on somebody's personal agenda to be addressed using this Bill as an excuse.

When one relates the figures to the population of Atlantic Canada one can see the significance of these activities to the economy of the Atlantic region. In relative terms, the deep sea fishery is as important to the Atlantic Provinces as the automotive industry is to central Canada. This is not an expendable industry. It is too large, too central to the life of the Atlantic region. Beyond that it is too richly endowed with potential for us to allow it to go under.

When smaller companies and industries fall by the wayside, many times the effects can be contained and corrected without too much difficulty. The price of buying them out is oftentimes low enough to be tackled by private investors with relatively small resources. If a fast food franchise goes bankrupt, the communities in which they operate can absorb the shock.

When a giant like this one stumbles, the earth begins to shake. I assure you there have been tremors in recent months

in Atlantic Canada. The deep sea industry cannot be allowed to fall, because in doing so it would create havoc and chaos throughout the industry. Because of its size, because it is a giant and because of its financial situation we cannot look to private sources to put it back on its feet. The Government knows this. We have looked. The industry, and the banks in particular, know this. They have looked to no avail. That is the reason why in this instance it takes the combined efforts of provincial Governments, the federal Government, and private financial institutions to get this industry back on its feet. Quite simply it is not feasible in this case to let the companies go bankrupt and wait for some entrepreneur to come along and, at so many cents on the dollar, pick up the pieces, and perhaps only some of the pieces, while 44,000 people are displaced directly. Indirectly, many thousands more are displaced in the name of private enterprise at any cost. I believe in private enterprise but not at any cost.

● (1730)

Let me give Hon. Members an example of the burden we are talking about. It has been estimated by financial analyses that the two consolidated companies visualized under this Bill will have to generate capital expenditures in the order of a quarter of a billion dollars each over the next five years. That is what they need for fleet replacement, maintenance of their plant capital, for new equipment to improve their productivity and other purposes. These are the kinds of obligations private investors, if you can find them, would be facing. Given the current condition of the industry, one cannot be surprised that investors are not lining up for the opportunity to shoulder them. If this lack of investment appeal were likely to be a permanent condition, we would face a much different situation. We in the House would probably be considering some very different action. But the evidence tells us that the condition is not permanent. There are solid reasons for long-term optimism.

There are many reasons why the deep sea fishing industry is in trouble. Inherent weakness and inadequate potential are certainly not among them. I am not one of those, as I have seen to my disappointment Hon. Members opposite do, to stand in the House and suggest that somehow all the problems in the current crisis that besets the Atlantic fishery can be written down in ten easy explanations and attributed to the policy of a single government. Anyone who really knows anything about the Atlantic fishery and who is really interested in making some helpful observations in the House will say that it is one of the most complex problems because of its socio-economic nature—I emphasize socio-economic nature—and one of the most complex industries that exists in this country.

The jurisdiction in the fisheries is shared. It is provincial Governments, not the federal Government, that control licences. It is provincial Governments that say how many fish plants there should be, where they should be, how big they should be and what they should process. It is not the federal Government. If one wanted to be strictly technical and was more interested in jurisdiction than in responding to a very real problem affecting human beings, we would say as federal Members that, if it is not under our jurisdiction, then let us toss this Bill aside, not discuss the problem and let the Provinces handle it. That is where negotiations began at the table. There were the Provinces, the industry itself, the banks and the federal Government. Only one player reached into his pocket to put money on the table. It was the federal Government. Why? Because we wanted to spend $200 million or more of taxpayers' money? Because we wanted to get into the business of processing fish because we believed we could do it better than the private sector, the Provinces or the banks? No. Quite frankly, if we were to list 100 activities in which we would want to become involved, the processing and fishery business would not even be on that list. But we are interested in people, and that is why this Bill is before the House and that is why it needs an urgent and quick passage.

Let us address ourselves to the Bill. What are the consequences of not proceeding with this legislation on an urgent basis? We will see continuing uncertainty in the Atlantic fishing industry and in the communities which, as I have tried to describe, are so vitally dependent on it. We will see a continuation of existing plant closures and possibly further closures and lay-offs. I believe we will see distress selling by companies facing financial difficulty, with serious consequences for independent producers who have managed so far to keep afloat. What does distress selling mean? It means that there are a handful of corporate giants that are in serious financial trouble and are technically bankrupt in many cases. If we do not provide an infusion—not a bail-out of cash—by way of equity, those giants who are in trouble will find it easy to take all of the fish that they have warehoused and dump it on the market at drastically reduced prices, driving those small independent private enterpreneurs, who have survived and made a dollar, into bankruptcy together with them. They will not be able to compete, and that would be a consequence of not moving with this Bill.

We would see increased difficulties for creditors. There are many small companies throughout Atlantic Canada that are owed millions of dollars in total. Those dollars will not be paid, driving yet many doezens of other small companies into bankruptcy.

Labour contracts are currently expiring. These can be renegotiated only after new management is put into place.

The independents have been expressing a great deal of concern about the notion of having a couple of super companies in which the Governments have equity. I want to say that I have a great deal of sympathy for those independent producers and small operations which have managed to survive the rough times and still make a dollar. They have every right and should be concerned, and I understand that. I do not say that their concerns are justified or that I believe for one second that the consequences they envisage will occur. However, I do have some sympathy, because anyone who has been able to survive the last three years in this industry only to see now a couple of large companies being created which they believe threatens their existence, has every right to be concerned.

However, I suggest that the removal of a major uncertainty facing the entire industry will have a positive effect on the independents. If the Governments had not acted to forestall the collapse of the large processors, the entire industry, including independent processors, would have been threatened with collapse.

The restructuring focuses on the restructuring of strategically important companies whose size and socio-economic importance are of industry-wide importance. The restructured companies will provide an urgently required stability that will be beneficial to the entire industry, including the independents. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has said in the House and elsewhere in Canada during the last few months that these large processing giants will not be allowed and will in fact be specifically instructed against taking any action that will have a negative impact on small independent processors.

Many Members opposite, as well as some on this side, have suggested that this Bill is in some way a bail-out of the Bank of Nova Scotia. The Bank of Nova Scotia has not been bailed out nor given preferential financial treatment. The bank still has substantial outstanding loans made to the companies concerned with restructuring and has agreed to convert a major portion of that debt to equity. It is not walking away from the table. It has very much a stake in ensuring that this restructuring works because it still has a substantial amount of capital tied up in the two companies that have been created.

I was pleased to see the Hon. Member for St. John's East stand in his place today and indicate that there is absolutely nothing more urgent before Members of the House than Bill C-170. The Hon. Member indicated that quick passage is essential to the economy of Newfoundland and indeed to the economy of Nova Scotia. The Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) spoke eloquently in presenting his views from where he sits and as he sees them. I was pleased to see that he so well recognizes the urgency of this Bill, fundamentally to deal with the problem as it exists today.

● (1740)

I am not going to debate how we got where we are today. The Hon. Member for St. John's East said, "We are where we are today because the federal Government has mismanaged the industry, but when I was Minister and my Government was in power we had taken bold new strides". But Mr. Peckford, I recall, during the 1980 election campaign said that he preferred the former Minister, who supposedly created all these problems, to the Hon. Member for St. John's East. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that both the Hon. Member for St. John's East and Mr. Peckford are members of the same Party. I recall campaigning in my riding and, to my delight, saying "Yes, I agree with Mr. Peckford. Let us get Roméo LeBlanc back on stream." It is not good enough to say simplistically that the problems have been caused by one administration. No one administration, no one level of Government, even if it wanted, can cope with the complexity of the Atlantic industry. That is why I say to Hon. Members that this Bill is not a panacea. This Bill does not pretend for a moment to deal with or attempt to resolve every problem, every item that needs to be debated. This Bill, only as a first step, will ensure that the deep sea industry does not collapse. This Bill will ensure that the capital required for equity taken by Governments to maintain that industry, to renew it, to retool it, is available. It will ensure proper management and a businesslike approach. Then, in a number of years we can divest ourselves as Governments of these companies and turn them back to the private sector, back to private investors and risk takers who are prepared to run a profitable organization. That is what this Bill does, I say again, not because we want to be here but because we have no other choice. And if we had any concern for the 44,000 people in Atlantic Canada who, believe me, if they knew and were aware this debate were taking place would listen with bated breath, with patience, and would pray that this House of Commons will move quickly to see this Bill pass second reading, go to committee and finally go through this House and to the Senate, and that is what we should do.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill C-155, an Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof, without amendment.

* * *

THE ROYAL ASSENT

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received which reads as follows:

Government House
Ottawa

November 17, 1983

Madam,

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable Brian Dickson, Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 17th day of November, 1982, at 5:45 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to certain Bills.

I have the honour to be
Madam,
Your obedient servant,
Edmond Joly de Lotbinière
Administrative Secretary
to the Governor General.

ATLANTIC FISHERIES RESTRUCTURING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. De Bané that Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishery enterprises, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary. We have not even formed a new company to save the Atlantic fishing industry and already the Parliamentary Secretary is talking about divesting the Government of ownership in that company. In view of the problems that communities such as Burin, Grand Bank, St. Lawrence and St. Anthony have had under private ownership, I wonder whether the Parliamentary Secretary may not fear, if this is turned back to private enterprise, that those same communities that were in fear of closing down permanently would not be in the same situation in the future? Would the Parliamentary Secretary answer the question about the community ownership and co-operatives in communities rather than turning them strictly back to free enterprise? Would the Parliamentary Secretary consider that an alternative to his haste to get rid of this company and put it back into private enterprise hands?

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, to respond to the Hon. Member opposite, I want to assure him that the reason for my remarks was not to indicate that we should try to pass the Bill today and sell the companies tomorrow, but rather to point out that the Government really has, as a first motive, no interest in being in the fish business for the sake of being in the fish business. The Government really has as a first motive no desire to say that we own X amount of equity in the fishing industry. The Government only has as a motive a social responsibility, a responsibility as an elected Government to respond to a very real need that affects a great number of people in Atlantic Canada.

I want to say to the Hon. Member that to suggest that somehow when private capital is involved we run the risk of closures and people being negatively affected is really a philosophical question that we can address to any industry in Canada. The Hon. Member knows that his Party's position is one of public ownership wherever possible. I do not happen to share that view. My own view is that the private sector can do it best and can generate the greatest amount of wealth but that people sometimes fall between the cracks. That is where Government should be and that is where Government should step in, otherwise Government should not be there. This is an example. If you want to call it a crack, it is almost like the San Francisco fault line. But there is a heck of a big crack. Private capital is not available right now. We should move in but move in very clearly with the idea of running this company on a businesslike basis. That is why we said that if the company, if its board of directors, said if X or Y or B or C plant is not viable and it will close down, and if a Government wants that particular plant to stay open, then it is the Government, not the company, that will pay the cost of keeping an unproductive plant open. I simply suggest that it be run on a businesslike basis and that when possible the Governments divest themselves of their equity position in these companies.

Mr. Anguish: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of comments to address to the Parliamentary Secretary. First, I can appreciate the importance of the Atlantic fishery. The fishermen, I am sure, have been under a lot of hardship lately. I fully intend to support this piece of legislation although I might not agree 100 per cent with all that has been said this afternoon. But in listening to the speeches that have been made today I have a little better understanding of what has been happening in the Atlantic fishery.

I would like to point out to the Parliamentary Secretary that during his speech he said that the fishery in Atlantic Canada was just as important as the automotive industry is in central Canada. I would like to extend that a little further by saying that the Crow rate was that important to the farmers of western Canada as well. I would have hoped that some of the Members would have given consideration to that at the time the same way as some Members in the New Democratic Party are now paying attention to this piece of legislation, and we will be giving some support to it.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I have been dealing with the Minister's office for some time trying to get resolved a fishing problem in my own constituency which has a freshwater fish industry. I can appreciate that the Minister has had a lot of his own personal time taken up with dealing with this piece of legislation and the larger fishing industries in Canada. I would like to see, as soon as this Bill is passed, the Parliamentary Secretary, if the Minister cannot find the time, join with me and some other Members in taking a very close look at the freshwater fishing industry which is getting into severe problems in places like northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, in response to the Hon. Member's comments, I want to assure him that the Department, indeed, the Government, recognizes the great value, the activity that takes place in the freshwater fishery. I avail myself in my position as Parliamentary Secretary of the opportunity to travel west and to see firsthand some of the activities in western Canada. I can assure him that if I can be of any assistance to him in resolving problems he is experiencing, on behalf of the Minister I would be delighted to do so. I would be glad to sit down at any time with him, as would the Minister, I am sure, or his officials to discuss with the Hon. Member any problems he would like to bring to our attention.

• (1750)

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Parliamentary Secretary to a problem which may or may not be ahead. Perhaps he could reconcile the difficulties we will have when consideration of Bill S-31 has been completed. As the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary will know, this Bill will restrict or limit provincial participation in transportation to 10 per cent. In other words, it will put very

severe limitations on a provincial Government or an agency of a provincial Government to buy up more than 10 per cent of a corporation, particularly if it is directly involved in transportation or that transportation is the major sector of it. It seems that the provincial involvement under the agreement between the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and the federal Government will be extended to more than the 10 per cent interest in the restructured product. How will that square with the content of Bill S-31, the measure now before the Senate?

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his comments and his question. It gives me an opportunity to make a very important point which I attempted to make during my speech. My throat was becoming a little raw; perhaps the House could not understand what I was saying. The interesting thing about this particular Bill and the circumstances—

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to my hon. colleague; I know the Messenger from the Senate is on his way. However, I need to put on the record an agreement which has been reached with my colleague, the Hon. Member for Yukon. Before I reached the agreement with the Hon. Member for Yukon, I spoke with the House Leader for the New Democratic Party.

Therefore, I can state that we have reached an agreement, although I do not need an agreement, to undesignate next Thursday as the last allotted day of this supply period. Instead, I will designate the following Monday, November 28, as the last allotted day of this supply period.

In so doing, we have agreed that the Supplementary Estimates will be deemed to have been reported on Friday, November 25, at five o'clock. Notwithstanding the disposition of Standing Order 62(15) which indicates that the Supplementary Estimates are deemed to have been reported on the third day before the last allotted day, the agreement is that the Supplementary Estimates will be deemed to have been reported on Friday, November 25, at five o'clock and that the last allotted day will be Monday, November 28. That is the agreement between the two of us and, as I indicated, I talked with the House Leader of the New Democratic Party. He told me—and I want it on the record—that he was prepared to accept that kind of agreement. I did not indicate the specifics to him, but it is within our understanding of the subject we were discussing. In other words, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain knows that I was to undesignate Thursday, possibly, and to push it a little further ahead to allow more time for the committees to study the Supplementary Estimates. Since this agreement produces exactly that result, I can say that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is in agreement.

Mr. Nielsen: That is correct, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, it should be pointed out that I alerted him earlier in the day that the committees had not had the opportunity to examine Supplementary Estimates (B) and that the result of the designation of the allotted days made by the Government House Leader today meant that Parliament would not have the opportunity to examine Supplementary Estimates (B). He indicated that any arrangement made between myself and the Government House Leader which would enable such an examination would be acceptable.

For the sake of clarity, it should be understood that the votes which will now occur on November 28, the final allotted day, will be those votes which would normally dispose of the Estimates, the appropriation legislation and the like. In other words, the votes would all be on the Monday now rather than on the Thursday.

Mr. Huntington: Could we not make it on the Tuesday?

Mr. Forrestall: Some of our Members will be away.

Mr. Nielsen: A further problem has just been drawn to my attention. I do not think it would inconvenience the House to put the vote over to sometime on Tuesday from the Monday at six o'clock. It would just be the vote. It would not be taking up any House time except the time it would take to vote.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, this is a slight change in the agreement we have reached. I prefer that we stick to the agreement as we made it. However, I will be very openminded in having a further discussion about the possibility of postponing the votes to sometime early the following day. For the time being, failing a firm agreement, we will stick to the provisions of Standing Order 62(10).

Mr. Nielsen: That sounds eminently sensible. The factor of which I was not aware when we had our discussions was a commitment that will keep many of our Members in British Columbia. They will not be able to return until late in the day on Tuesday. I do not think that will cause any inconvenience, but I am sure we can overcome it by agreement.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, it seems that we are carrying on a somewhat unusual procedure at this time. I most certainly accept the word of the Government House Leader and agree to the arrangement. However, if there are any other changes, we certainly hope that our House Leader will be consulted.

Mr. Pinard: Sure.

Mr. Nielsen: He was consulted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed and so ordered.

Adjournment Debate

● (1800)

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*Translation*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Deputy to the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Deputy Speaker with the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And being returned:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House went up to the Senate Chamber, the Deputy Governor General had been pleased to give in Her Majesty's name the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill C-169, an Act to amend the Canada Elections Act (No. 3)—Chapter 164

Bill C-163, An Act to establish the Canadian Aviation Safety Board and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof—Chapter 165.

Bill C-168, An Act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (No. 2)—Chapter 166.

Bill C-152, An Act respecting the organization of the Government of Canada and matters related or incidental thereto—Chapter 167.

Bill C-155, An Act to facilitate the transportation, shipping and handling of western grain and to amend certain Acts in consequence thereof—Chapter 168.

● (1805)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

FISHERIES—NEWFOUNDLAND REPRESENTATION IN CABINET. (B) AGREEMENT BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, on September 12, I again had the unfortunate experience of addressing a question to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). It was, of course, a complete waste of time. I do not know where his mind is but it is not with us here in the House of Commons. Today he is riding his umbrella pursuing the peace cause around the world and we wish him well at that. We wish him more success at that than he has had with our domestic concerns here in Canada.

I asked the Prime Minister, in the context of the economic crisis in Newfoundland with 43,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed or 19 per cent of the labour force, what steps he was going to take in connection with the fishing industry. Of course, he has taken no steps. I asked him whether we will have a representative on the Cabinet from Newfoundland. I asked him if he would appoint to the executive council a Member from Newfoundland. There are seven of us here in the House. I am prepared, if necessary, to make the sacrifice in order to help the people of Newfoundland. In any event, there are five Liberal Members and two Progressive Conservative Members elected to the House from Newfoundland. When the Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark) formed his administration, both Conservative Members from Newfoundland were Members of the Cabinet. That is the kind of representation that Newfoundland then had in the House.

Today there is no representative from Newfoundland in the Cabinet of Canada and one of the Liberal backbenchers, the Hon. Member for Bonavista-Trinity-Conception (Mr. Rooney), says that Newfoundland is actually doing much better without a Cabinet representative than it was doing when the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) was a Cabinet Minister. Now there is solidarity for you.

● (1810)

By the way, Mr. Speaker, there is opposite me today a young Hon. Member who might well, in 50 years or 60 years time, have sufficient experience and calibre to be a member of the Government of Canada and in the Cabinet.

The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that we do not now have a representative from Newfoundland in the Government of Canada, nor will we, and we are suffering as a result of it. There are five representatives from Newfoundland here and the Prime Minister has turned his back on all five. Like the witches in Macbeth, the Prime Minister has had a look at them and does not like the looks of any of them. He dismissed the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador from his Cabinet. He found him not to be of sufficient calibre to be in his Cabinet. The Prime Minister has found no replacement since he appointed, for the ten days that shook the world, the Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons). He has found, since then, that the other three are not desirable, either; not of sufficient quality to be in his Cabinet. Imagine, not one of the five Liberal Members in this House from Newfoundland could even be Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport. Not one of them is fit to be Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport, not to mention "le ministre des pêches". Not one of them is suited to be Minister of Fisheries. Not one of them, apparently, is suited to be Minister of Mines. Not one of them could bear the responsibilities of being a minister without portfolio. The Prime Minister will not even give one of them a portfolio. He will not give them nothing; no way. And the people of Newfoundland are suffering as a result.

We see that today, when we notice facts like these. In constant dollar terms, DREE expenditures in the Atlantic region fell by 41.4 per cent from 1970-71 to 1977-78, while elsewhere in Canada DREE spending rose 5.9 per cent. That is complete political prostitution of the whole program to over-

come regional disparity. For the Atlantic provinces which suffer from that regional disparity, spending has fallen 41 per cent, while elsewhere in Canada, in Quebec and other politically important areas, the spending has gone up 5.9 per cent. We need a Cabinet Minister from Newfoundland to stop that kind of discrimination, that kind of twisting of the DREE program for political purposes.

Is the Prime Minister going to appoint a Cabinet Minister from Newfoundland? Are we all waiting with bated breath to see what happens in a certain court case—which shall be nameless—on December 2? Is there not one of the other three Hon. Members who has the pristine purity to be appointed to the Cabinet now? What is to happen if the results in early December are not as the Prime Minister would like them to be? Are we to continue for the next year or year and a half without a Cabinet representative from Newfoundland?

Why is it, for example, the International Centre for Ocean Development was just established in Halifax rather than in St. John's, which is the natural home for it? St. John's is the whole centre of the North Atlantic, and the most suitable area, with the best facilities for an International Centre for Ocean Development. But instead of that, it now resides in Halifax.

Nova Scotia has two Ministers in the Government. One of them is at present hopping with the kangaroos in Australia, the Minister of State for International Trade (Mr. Regan). The other is in the House here, but we cannot understand what he is saying in any event. He is a bafflegabber. However, he has a lot of respect, apparently, and power within the Government. Nova Scotia has two Ministers; Newfoundland has none. When are the backbenchers on the Liberal side going to rise up against this and persuade the Prime Minister that he should stay at home, look after the backyard and see that Newfoundland gets some kind of equal and fair treatment in this House? When will the Hon. Member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin), a young man with his future still very much in his past, put a stop to the way the Prime Minister is treating the Province of Newfoundland? When is he going to tell the Prime Minister to stay home and bring peace to Canada before he attempts to bring it to the rest of the world? When is he going to make an effort to solve our domestic problems here in Canada? We have unemployment at 19 per cent and the Prime Minister is going to spend all his time in the next three weeks in Bangladesh and Southeast Asia dealing with the problems of the Commonwealth and the world. Soon he will be dealing with the problems of the universe. There is no problem he cannot deal with, as long as it lies in the ethereal realm outside Canada, outside the real world and outside of helping the real people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister or his assistant to appoint a Minister from Newfoundland quickly and do something to help with the desperate situation in that Province.

• (1815)

Mr. Brian Tobin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I must say it is with a great deal of sadness and disappointment that I stand here. I understood this time of the day was to provide more in depth and detailed information to Members who are seriously interested in the business of this nation. So I did a great deal of research and prepared quite an answer on the fishery. But I should not have been surprised because the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), if nothing else, is consistent. An unguided missile! Not only do we not know where his tongue will lead him when he begins to talk, he does not know.

That has been the story of his life, Mr. Speaker. I remember when I was a great fan of the Hon. Member opposite when he was a Liberal—yes, a Liberal! Not only was he a Liberal, but a young Liberal. I remember when he was not only a young Liberal, but a young Liberal for new leadership. Now he tells me that an old, distinguished and experienced fellow like myself has my future behind me. He is not to be taken seriously, Mr. Speaker. I have visions of the future and I want to assure him, when he talks about Cabinet representation, that I remember we had two Ministers, the ministers of fish and chips; very dignified fellows. They performed so magnificently for seven months—

Mr. Crosbie: The golden days.

Mr. Tobin: —that in the subsequent election the people of Newfoundland returned five Liberals, including yours truly, out of seven seats. That was the response to your performance.

Mr. Crosbie: They will not repeat that mistake.

Mr. Tobin: When he talks about how Newfoundland is being represented, I want to assure him that if the people of St. John's West are unhappy with their representation, or if the people of St. John's East are unhappy with their representation, there is a Newfoundland beyond the city boundaries of St. John's. There is a wider Newfoundland. There is Humber-Port-au-Port-St. Barbe; Burin-St. George's; Bonavista-Trinity-Conception; Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador where people returned five Liberals to contribute to this majority Government in 1980, much to his dismay, Mr. Speaker. Get ready for a repeat, John. Your ability to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory is renowned. You are consistent, we are going to do it again.

So with great disappointment Mr. Speaker, I answer this question with all the seriousness and intelligence of the manner in which it was asked. I would have preferred a much more sober performance.

PUBLIC WORKS—LEASING OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUILDING

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I find that a hard act to follow, particularly that of the young man who claims he has visions.

I wish to extract some information from the Government on the subject of the lease arrangement for the new DVA Building in Charlottetown. On November 4 I posed a question to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. LeBlanc) on the subject. He was unable to respond at the time but assured me he would

look into the matter and write to me directly. To date the Minister has not done so. Perhaps this debate will elicit some response to my original question, which was:

Can the Minister indicate to the House the cost of leasing the DVA Building from Rampart Enterprises during the term of the lease which is, I understand, for 35 years?

I also requested that the Minister table in the House the leasing agreement. Since then I have tabled a notice of motion demanding that these papers be tabled.

● (1820)

The saga of the DVA building in Charlottetown is a long one and it seems to be getting longer. A claim was made by this Liberal Government when it decided in 1980 to move the building to a site in downtown Charlottetown from the shoreline site which had been chosen by the Conservatives that construction would be faster downtown. The Minister of Veterans Affairs at that time said that the building would be completed by the end of 1983. The building is now supposed to be ready by the Spring of 1984.

The construction of that building was supposed to follow one pattern, but has followed quite a different one. It was supposed to be completed in two phases. Phase one was the foundation and superstructure of the building. It was to be constructed for the Department of Public Works through tendered bids. The cost of that phase was $2.8 million and was completed in December of 1981.

Phase two took off in a different direction and tenders were let for the completion of the building by a developer who would construct and own the building and lease it back to the federal Government. This is a very strange way for the Department of Public Works to go about constructing government buildings. Rampart Enterprises of Toronto received the contract to complete the building. Under this arrangement Rampart is given title to the building and Public Works leases it for use by the Veterans Affairs Department over a term of some 35 years. The federal Government also has the opportunity of purchasing the building from the developer at some point during or at the end of the lease.

Some clarification is needed on a number of points of this agreement. What are the exact terms of the lease to purchase contracts? What is the annual cost of the lease? How much will the Government have paid by the time it purchases the building? All this information should be made available to the House of Commons as soon as possible.

When the Supplementary Estimates came out a few days ago I had hopes that we would be able to extract this information from either the Department of Veterans Affairs or Public Works during the committee meetings on those Supplementary Estimates. I have yet to hear from the Chairman of that committee, the Hon. Member for Labelle (Mr. Dupras), who I thought would be in touch with me by now to see when we could arrange to have the committee meetings of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

I hope that the Minister's representative will tonight be able to answer some of these questions. If he is not, I hope that he will urge his Minister to reply to me as he promised to do in the House of Commons on the November 4, providing me with the details of the very unusual method that has been set in motion to construct the DVA building in Charlottetown.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to answer the question put by the Hon. Member to the Minister responsible for Public Works (Mr. LeBlanc) on November 4 of this year, concerning the cost of leasing the DVA Building located in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, and owned by Rampart Enterprises.

It is important to remember the facts. On April 25, 1982, the Minister of Veterans Affairs announced that a new building intended to house the central administration services of the Department would be built on property belonging to the Canadian Government and located on the corner of Kent and Grafton in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. In December 1981, the first stage of the project, which consisted in the construction of foundations and the concrete structure, was finished as a project carried out by the Crown.

In April 1982, Public Works Canada proceeded to let tenders for the construction of the rest of the building, according to the lease-to-purchase formula. So that the Department could assess all tenders on the same basis, bidders were asked to tender their bids on the basis of a 17 per cent interest rate for financing.

Among the five builders who tendered bids, Rampart Enterprises made the lowest offer. With a financing rate of 17 per cent, Rampart's bid worked out to $191 per square meter for the first five years of the 35-year lease. These figures will be adjusted when the building is completed, taking into consideration the current Government of Canada rate for five to ten-year bonds.

Mr. Speaker, the building is expected to be completed and ready to receive its occupants by the beginning of 1984. Since interest rates have dropped considerably since tenders were let, it is now estimated that the annual rent over the first five-year period of the lease will be $150 per square meter. As for the rest of the lease, the annual rent will be adjusted upwards or downwards, depending on financing costs for each subsequent period.

Mr. Speaker, regarding the last part of the Hon. Member's question, I can inform him that the Department would be glad to table in the House the complete leasing agreement between the Crown and Rampart Enterprises or to make a copy of it available to interested Members.

● (1825)

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE—STABILIZATION PROGRAM SOUGHT FOR BEEF INDUSTRY

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to talk about a beef stabilization program for Canada. On September 15, 1983, I put a question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) asking him what progress was being made by the Department of Agriculture in the negotiations with the provincial Governments to establish a red meat stabilization program which would cover not only beef but pork as well. I understand that some progress has been made on this in the last few weeks but I would like to urge upon the Minister and the Department of Agriculture the importance of the red meat industry to the rural parts of our country.

During the past two years there has been essentially no increase in the price of beef cattle for the cow-calf operators, many of whom are in the Algoma and Manitoulin area and produce a significant percentage of the production in the Ontario region.

I want to quote briefly from a letter I received from Mr. Allen McKenzie, a beef producer in my constituency, from Tehkummah, Ontario. He says:

> I am writing about our concerns of the farming industry in Ontario particularly the cow-calf farmer of which we are one.
>
> I believe Ontario is the only Province without a program to subsidize the cow-calf man and it is here where the cattle industry all starts. Without us, there are no feeder cattle. What happens if we all go out of business because of low prices? One very startling fact is this: in 1973 we received an average price for our calves of 65 cents per pound.
>
> In 1983—ten years later—we received an average price of 75 cents per pound. Can you imagine a 10-cent per pound increase in ten years? You figure the percentage increase in our income for this period and then think of the percentage increase of all our feed, seed and machinery which we have to purchase and tell me how a farmer is to keep going.
>
> What percentage of increased income do most Canadians receive in one year? I'll tell you it is more than the one per cent that we have got for the last ten years.

I should point out that he has a herd of 35 stock cows, and the average increase in income over that ten-year period has only been $245 per year gross.

He concludes:

> Do you not feel from this example that something needs to be done now? We sure do. We must remember that the cattle industry starts with us and without us where would we be. Thank you for your time.

I sent a copy of that letter to the Minister of Agriculture in order to make him aware of the desperate plight that faces much of rural Canada, especially those parts of our country which depend on the beef industry.

As I pointed out earlier, the actual returns are something like 25 per cent or 30 per cent less now than they were four years ago and, as Mr. McKenzie points out in his letter, there has been barely a ten-cent per pound increase average for cow-calf operators during the past ten-year period.

● (1830)

As an indication of that plight I think we only have to look at the general downgrading that has taken place in rural parts of our country that depend on the beef industry. There are other sectors like the dairy industry and so on which have administered prices, or prices established by a formula, that are relatively more successful. But clearly for the beef industry some stabilization, some marketing program has to be put in place. I understand that the Ministers of at least four provinces met this year during July, August and October—I believe they met even more recently—and are in agreement at this stage, but that a final decision and agreement has not been reached.

I would like to urge upon the Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary the importance of making a tripartite agreement very soon. I understand a tripartite agreement is what is being considered among the beef producers, the producing provinces and the federal Government. I think it is significant, as I understand the negotiations to date, that the four Provinces which have shown an interest in participating in the tripartite agreement represent over 80 per cent of the beef production in Canada.

If we look at the dairy industry we find stabilization payments of over $300 million. If we look at crop insurance, we find stabilization of $145 million. If we look at other forms of stabilization provided, for instance, in the grain industry, we find $140 million. In the federal budget there is $1.292 million for the entire budget of the Department of Agriculture, $682 million of which is for stabilization programs.

We are not just talking about assisting a few beef producers, we are talking about a large number of people. We are talking about that important sector of agriculture which really forms the backbone of many of our agricultural communities. I want to urge upon the Minister of Agriculture and his provincial colleagues, of which the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario is one, the urgency of establishing a stabilization program that is fair to the country, and fair to these valuable producers so that they may continue to operate in Canada and produce this valuable food for the consumers.

Mr. Maurice Bossy (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) I would like to respond to the question raised by the Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) on the progress being made toward a new red meat stabilization program for beef producers.

By way of background, the Ministers of Agriculture from four Provinces, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, agreed on the general principles of a new stabilization program at the time of the federal-provincial Ministers meeting in Prince Edward Island in June. A task force was established, including representatives from these four Provinces and the federal Department of Agriculture.

After a series of meetings, a draft plan was established for cow-calf producers, slaughter cattle, hogs and lamb. On October 31, the federal Minister of Agriculture chaired a meeting in Ottawa, at which time three of the Provinces agreed to the principle features of these plans. The Manitoba Minister of Agriculture did not attend that meeting, but indicated it was

because of a prior personal commitment and not because he was no longer in support of a national program.

The Provinces that have agreed account for the majority of red meat production in Canada, and consultations are proceeding on the basis of the October 31 agreement.

The Governments involved have decided not to release the details of the plans at this time because they are changing as consultations proceed. Yesterday, representatives from the four Provinces and the federal Government discussed the proposed beef plans with the Canadian Cattlemen's Association. This morning they met with the Canadian Federation of Agriculture. This afternoon they met with the Canadian Pork Council. Tonight they are meeting with the Canadian Sheep Council.

In addition, arrangements are being made for meetings with the provinces that have not yet agreed to the principles of the new red meat stabilization program. If all goes well in these consultations the new, improved program could be in place by 1984.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at eleven o'clock.

At 6.36 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 18, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

PAKISTAN—PLEA FOR RELEASE OF TARIQ AHSAN, IMPRISONED UNIVERSITY STUDENT

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Mr. Speaker, two years ago a Carleton University Ph.D. student, Tariq Ahsan, was arrested and jailed in Pakistan for political reasons, on a trumped-up charge of possessing seditious material. After 17 months of imprisonment, Mr. Ahsan finally came to trial in April of this year. He was sentenced just last week to two years' hard labour, a sentence to begin at the trial, not even at the beginning of his imprisonment. Mr. Ahsan's physical condition was poor when he left Canada two years ago, and according to his family has worsened considerably while in prison. A sentence of two years' hard labour may be a death sentence for Mr. Ahsan.

Mr. Ahsan's teaching assistantship position is being held open for him at Carleton University, as well as additional scholarship funds. His colleagues in the political science department are anxious for his safe return to Canada.

This imprisonment constitutes a serious infringement on the most fundamental of civil liberties, and Members of all Parties and all levels of Government have already made their views known to the Government of Pakistan. Were Mr. Ahsan a Canadian citizen we could do more for him. What we can do, and what I urge all Members of this House to do, is to write to the Government of Pakistan and the Ambassador for Pakistan, appealing for Mr. Ahsan's release so he may return to Canada and continue his studies.

* * *

THE DISABLED AND THE HANDICAPPED

CLOSING OF RADIO READING SERVICE IN ONTARIO

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Special Committee on the Disabled and Handicapped I was shocked to learn recently that the Oakville-based radio reading service, which provided reading service for an estimated 3,000 blind and visually impaired persons, was forced off the air because of the provincial Government's refusal to provide any further funding for the service.

The station, which used voluntary readers to broadcast verbatim in-depth accounts from newspapers and other readings, was itself a newspaper to the blind. Its broadcast area extended through the Golden Horseshoe, Scarborough, Guelph, and Kitchener, and as far away as Simcoe. Last year the station had its operation cut back from seven days to five days in an effort to extend its limited budget. However, this did little to ameliorate the problem of inadequate funding.

It is important that the federal Minister of State (Mr. Joyal) responsible for the status of the disabled meet his provincial counterpart to inquire into this matter and recommend that careful consideration be given to reinstating the radio reading service so that the visually handicapped persons who were able to take advantage of it can continue to function in a more complete way.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REPORTING OF INCIDENTS IN OKANAGAN-SIMILKAMEEN AREA OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Fred King (Okanagan-Similkameen): Mr. Speaker, the CBC, in its program "The Journal", reported in a most irresponsible and inflammatory manner on a subject which deserves to be treated with sensitivity and understanding. People in the Okanagan-Similkameen area of British Columbia are incensed by the airing of unworthy statements which allege that they have a bad racist attitude, intolerance is institutionalized, that they practise harassment of minority groups such as Doukhobors, Chinese, Japanese, and now Québécois, and that there is a hard core of really bigoted people in the area. I say shame to the CBC for a distorted sensationalization of a lamentable situation where tensions have arisen in certain communities between farm workers from Quebec and a minor provocative element, some of whom are also transient to the area.

• (1110)

The CBC highlighted untruths, and generalizations such as "Orchard workers are classed as no good", and "People think that transient workers are simply a bunch of dirty hippies", the inference that the rape of two girls from Quebec was racially motivated, and the implication that people who resent the action of one who urinated openly on a Main Street store front are displaying racial intolerance. The CBC's mandate is to be a national instrument dedicated to unity and reconciliation.

The CBC contributes nothing by engaging in such objectionable programming.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

THE CASE OF DONALD MARSHALL—LEGAL EXPENSES OF COURT SYSTEM VICTIM

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, both the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) and the Minister of Indian Affairs (Mr. Munro) are now saying that they cannot provide funds to cover the legal costs of Donald Marshall. Ministers of the Crown stand helpless in the face of a gross injustice done to a fellow Canadian.

Mr. Marshall spent 11 years in prison for a crime he did not commit. Whether or not this comes under provincial or federal jurisdiction becomes irrelevant in light of his unjust suffering. Mr. Marshall's punishment for a crime he did not commit is a stain on Canada's entire justice system. It is something about which all Canadians should feel ashamed.

Considering other cases, such as that of Susan Nelles, the subject of general compensation for victims of faulty court proceedings would make a good subject for this House to consider.

Mr. Marshall faces more than $80,000 in legal expenses. The Government does not need to be helpless. It can bring in a Bill to pay these costs. My Party promises to deal with any such Bill expeditiously. I am sure the Conservatives would also want to pass such a Bill with a minimum of debate. I urge the Government to take action and not to stand by helplessly in the face of injustice.

* * *

POLITICAL PARTIES

PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY LEADERSHIP CAMPAIGN MEMORANDUM

Mr. Jack Burghardt (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of countless requests which have been made to this House by the Official Opposition, I would ask for the tabling of a remarkable leaked document. The document is referred to in detail in a fascinating book called "The Contenders". The book is a modern day version of Julius Ceasar, recounting how the Member for Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney), in the role of Brutus, betrayed his leader on the way to the forum in Ottawa. The book reprints a confidential memo allegedly written to the Leader of the Opposition by one of his then key campaign officials, John Thompson. The memo tells the Tory Leader just how he is perceived by the delegates and members of the public generally. This is what the memo says, and these are direct quotes:

> Your image is fuzzy and people are scared of your candidacy because . . . they are scared off by your organization and they don't trust you . . . people perceive you to be both left and right—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has some question about the validity of this.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

THE CASE OF HUGH HAMBLETON—REPORTED OFFER OF PROSECUTION IMMUNITY

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see both the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) in the House. During his trial before the Old Bailey in the United Kingdom, a former CIDA official, Mr. Hugh Hambleton, a Canadian being tried on espionage charges for passing information to the KGB, admitted to having seen in Canada in April, 1980, official confirmation from the Department of Justice to the effect that he would not be prosecuted in Canada if he were to "co-operate" with Canadian security authorities in determining the exact nature of his contacts with the KGB. The existence of any such offer has since been denied by the Solicitor General.

It is time some clarification of this matter was provided to the Canadian public. Why did the Canadian security authorities make such an offer? Why was Hambleton allowed to travel freely to the United Kingdom where, obviously, he expected to defect? Why was he warned twice, once before leaving Canada and secondly upon arrival in the United Kingdom, that he would almost certainly be tried in Britain on charges of espionage under law identical to the Canadian Official Secrets Act? Who prevented the Canadian authorities from bringing charges?

* * *

● (1115)

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

IMPACT ON CNR EMPLOYMENT IN WINNIPEG

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, the Crow rate is now history, and the railways have had their way with the Canadian taxpayers. Years and years of striking by the railways, in the transportation of grain, have paid off handsomely and now farmers and Canadians in general will be paying for the investment and upgrading that far-seeing and responsible railway management would have put in place a long time ago.

In the course of creating the political context for killing the Crow, the CNR deliberately created the impression that changes to the Crow rate would result in a great increase in jobs at the CNR shops in Transcona, thus trying to undermine the position I was taking as the local Member of Parliament, and displaying, one might argue, an unusual and perhaps inappropriate interest for a Crown corporation in an issue with such obvious political dimensions. Nevertheless, the expecta-

tion of more and new jobs as a result of the Crow change is there.

I remain very skeptical, and I put the Minister of Transport on notice that employment levels at the CN shops in Transcona, and in Winnipeg in general, had better go up to and beyond their traditional levels, or he will never hear the end of it from me about the snow job CN did him and on other suckers like him in the Government.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

CORPORATE SHAREHOLDING LIMITATION ACT

POSSIBLE LIMITATION ON FREEDOM OF ORGANIZATIONS TO INVEST PROFITABLY IN CANADA

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister, because it relates to the general responsibilities of the Government and not to a specific department or minister.

The effect of Bill S-31 would be to drastically restrict the freedom of organizations, such as the Caisse de dépôt et de placement du Québec, to invest profitably in Canada. This morning, the Government said it intended to introduce new amendments to the Bill. Will these be substantial amendments, as requested by almost all intervenors, in Quebec and elsewhere? Will these amendments deal with the objections expressed to date and when will they be tabled?

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, amendments to Bill S-31 were introduced in the Senate some ten days ago and are now being examined by the Senate Committee. We have indicated that we are considering further amendments and will table those in good time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mulroney: My question was addressed directly to the Acting Prime Minister because it deals with a national policy that, as we shall soon see, has been approved by the entire Government, and we shall see whether Bill S-31 also has the approval of the Quebec caucus. That we would like to know, and we soon will.

The Caisse de dépôt et de placement du Québec is a major instrument of economic development, not only for Quebec but for Canada as a whole. Its expansion is seriously threatened by this Bill, as was pointed out by many intervenors from all levels of our society, and these were people I would call moderates.

Could the Acting Prime Minister today give millions of Quebecers, whose pension funds are administered by the Caisse, the assurance that this vital instrument will not be prevented from proceeding legitimately to invest the assets of our taxpayers in Canada?

[*English*]

Mrs. Erola: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is taking a very shortsighted approach to this situation. If he had considered it in terms of the national interest of this country and in terms of the interests of the people of Quebec, he would recognize that this is a very valid law and one that is generally supported by all of the Provinces. They see this as the kind of infrastructure that must be in place, parallel to the kind of law that exists in communications and in banking. I suggest to him that he take the long term approach and look at the national interest rather than the narrow definition which he is giving to the current situation.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY RESPECTING EXPORTATION OF JOBS FROM QUEBEC AND ALL OF CANADA

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Minister's answer contains some very serious errors, and I would invite her to think about that. I can guarantee those errors are there. When I hear someone in the Government asking us to act in the national interest, after everything they have done to divide this country, that takes a lot of nerve.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Government is using a Bill to do to Quebec what it is afraid to do openly. That is what they are doing.

My question is: Considering the fact that one of the consequences of the Bill would be to oblige the Caisse de dépôt et de placement du Québec to invest the assets of Quebec taxpayers elsewhere, in the United States, for instance, could the Government inform the House how many jobs, as a result of this policy, will be exported from Quebec and from Canada, considering the unacceptable limitations the Government wants to impose on the Caisse de dépôt et de placement du Québec?

● (1120)

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this is being taken totally out of context.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Erola: No one is limiting the amount of investment Caisse de dépôts can make. They are limiting their own investment to 30 per cent, I would like to point out to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. We are limiting only those voting rights. They can invest as much as they want in this country, and should be encouraged to do so.

REASON FOR INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION IN SENATE

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, if the Bill has no effect upon the activities of Caisse de dépôt or other provincial emanations, why in the world is the Government bringing it in?

Let me ask this question. Why is the Government not finding the courage to bring this Bill directly to this House? Why is it sneaking it off to the Senate where it hopes the scrutiny will occur without full public debate and without the benefit of televised Question Period?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Will the Minister also tell us, now that she has announced her second round of amendments, why she will not give the Senate the whole Bill? Why do we have a sort of peep show approach to this Bill, where it is shown to the Senate piece by piece, and then changed amendment by amendment? Will the Minister withdraw this Bill until she knows exactly what she is preparing and then give this House, not the Senate but this House, the full Bill so that we can consider all of its implications at once?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I should like to assure the Hon. Member that the Bill will come to the House, that the Senate Committee has been giving it a very thorough investigation, hence the amendments, and the amendments that were brought forward the other day were warmly received by the Senate, with some further refinements which we are now considering. It is because of that full inspection, that very, very close inspection which the Senators have given it, that the amendments are coming forward. I can assure the Hon. Member that that Bill will come to this House.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the assurance with which the Minister purports to tell us what the Senate will do. I can assure her that if that Bill comes to this House, it will stop in this House.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

LIMIT ON PROVINCIAL AGENCY ACTIVITIES

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, let me put, either to the Minister or to the Acting Prime Minister, the following question. This Bill has as its principle to place a 10 per cent limit upon the activities of provincial emanations, of provincial agencies. Why, in the name of consistency, if the Government is going to limit government activities to 10 per cent positions, is the Government not applying that same standard to federal agencies? What is there in law that would stop the CDIC, for example, from taking control of CP? Why is the Government of Canada trying to follow a double standard which imposes upon agencies of provincial Governments limitations that it will not impose upon agencies of the federal Government?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that the answer is not totally obvious to the Members of the Opposition—

Mr. Andre: Why are you always so amazed?

Mrs. Erola: —because it is assumed, in fact it is supported by the people of Canada, that federal Crown corporations would act in the best national interests of the people of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Dick: Even your own colleagues do not believe that one.

Mr. Beatty: You are going to regret that one.

* * *

FORESTRY

GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS—PROVISION OF FUNDING

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada told us yesterday that unemployment at its present level will likely stay with us for many, many months. I am directing my question to the Minister responsible for Canada's number one industry, the forest industry.

The economic development auction will be taking place among selected cabinet ministers next Tuesday. The Minister is well aware of the plight facing the forest industry in terms of high unemployment levels, necessary restructuring, as well as the abysmal state of reforestation. Will he tell the House, and indirectly the people of Canada, particularly those involved in the forest industry, what request he has before the economic development auction which will take place next Tuesday, and what additional funding we can expect to enable us to continue with provincial-federal agreements in reforestation programs?

● (1125)

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is referring to a meeting of a Cabinet committee and he is asking me to put on the floor of the House matters that are still to be decided upon. May I indicate to him that of course I am very committed to the question of forest renewal and forest research. He knows that we have this year, in terms of forest research facilities, funded expansions to the tune of $22 million in the Maritimes, $10 million in the Laurentian research facilities, $30 million in the Great Lakes area, and $14 million in the Pacific research facilities.

In addition, under the pulp and paper research agreement sponsored by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the Government is making some $17 million available, $15 million of which will be made available to the Province of British Columbia. In terms of fire-fighting, we have jointly agreed with the Provinces, under the Special Recovery Program, to the construction of some 29 fire-fighting bombers, 17

of which will be built with federal funds and 12 with provincial funds.

Since the inception—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Caccia: —of the use of Section 38 of the Unemployment Insurance Act, we have made available in the forestry field for the creation of jobs some $140 million, $45 million of which will be available to the Province of British Columbia. I regretted very much to learn that the British Columbia Government withdrew from the subsequent implementation of this particular program for creating jobs in forestry.

Mr. Riis: If one listens carefully to what the Minister has to say, the amounts of money being set aside for reforestation in our country are pitiful. As a matter of fact, if we add up the figures for reforestation which he suggested, the Government of Canada gave more than that to the countries of Zaire and Rwanda in the last two years.

LEVEL OF AID TO FOREST INDUSTRY

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada has given $430 million to a variety of countries for their reforestation programs. We in this Party support in principle that type of foreign aid development. Will the Minister at least make the same commitment to the Provinces of Canada and to our forest industry, that he will see a reciprocal amount of money spent in Canada? With $430 million for reforestation in other countries, can we not expect the same for our own country?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am amazed with the narrowmindedness of this type of question emanating from a Member of the New Democratic Party which claims to be in the forefront of foreign aid, in particular aid to developing countries in need. I remind the Hon. Member that when Canada becomes involved in aiding Zaire and Rwanda, it is because the climate of the world benefits by reforestation enterprises which are entertained in the Sahel region and in regions where desertification is taking place.

As to the "pitiful amount", and I am quoting the Hon. Member, I ask him whether he considers $80 million in reforestation, which is the amount that has been steadily made available to the Provinces throughout the years, is a pitiful amount of money in addition to the $140 million under unemployment insurance for the creation of forestry jobs of which, as I reminded him earlier, $45 million went to the Province of British Columbia, a Province which has withdrawn from the project itself.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF HON. PAUL MARTIN AND MRS. MARTIN

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would like to call the attention of the House to the presence in the gallery of a distinguished former Member of the House, the Hon. Paul Martin and Mrs. Martin.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Joliette.

* * *

● (1130)

[*Translation*]

CORPORATE SHAREHOLDING LIMITATION ACT

INVESTMENT BY FRANCOPHONE GROUPS—INQUIRY WHETHER NATIONAL INTEREST HARMED

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs—

[*English*]

Mr. Riis: A supplementary—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has recognized the Hon. Member for Joliette. The Chair will take care of these matters in the course of events.

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: I realize from the answers the Minister gave earlier that she was not very knowledgeable about the consequences of Bill S-31, the Bill being sponsored by the Minister, for Quebec interests and national interests as well and the fact that millions of Quebecers are very concerned about this legislation. The Minister must be aware of the fierce opposition of people who believe in federalism with respect and who are opposed to this legislation.

Therefore, could the Minister who wants to defend this legislation on the basis that it is in the national interest, inform the House whether expansion of a Francophone group through investments inside our country is against the national interest she was trying to defend this morning?

Mr. Prud'homme: The Bill is going to die in the Senate.

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Of course not. The question is totally irrelevant. French Canadians, as any Canadians, have a right to invest in this country. I think I understand this Bill a great deal better than the Hon. Member for Joliette understands it, because it is in the national interest. I want to reinforce once again that there is no limitation to the amount that anyone can invest. There is a limitation only in the area of voting rights. It is

legislation parallel to the kind of legislation that currently exists in banking and in communications. It is not unique legislation. It is legislation that is of the very fabric and structure vital to our country.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY WHETHER LIBERAL MEMBERS OPPOSE LEGISLATION

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Government's hypocrisy with respect to this legislation is too obvious. The Minister knows perfectly well, and there are seventy four Liberals on the opposite side who are from Quebec and can explain, that Quebec is violently opposed to this legislation.

My question is simple, Mr. Speaker. Quebec would like to know how many Quebec members on the opposite side of the House have expressed their objections to this Bill, and I think the Minister should inform the House whether any Quebec members have objected to her Bill, which is unacceptable in the present circumstances.

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to inform the Hon. Member that the Members on this side of the House are always in favour of the national interest, and his is a very narrow one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair will recognize the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap on a short supplementary. I call to the attention of Hon. Members that long supplementaries are not part of the Standing Orders.

* * *

FORESTRY

FUNDING FOR REFORESTATION

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for forestry. While we support the Government giving $50 million to Zaire, $15 million to Upper Volta, $35 million to Peru—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member put his supplementary?

Mr. Riis: Will the Minister guarantee to Canadians involved in the forest industry, particularly those involved in and concerned with reforestation, that he will give the same attention to Canadians that the Government has given to those in Upper Volta, Sudan and others, to the tune of $450 million? Will he do the same in terms of reciprocal behaviour?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion we have been and are pumping into the forest industry some $80 million each year. That $80 million a year is being made available by the federal Government for the renewal of our forests. If the Hon. Member can multiply 80 by the number of years involved, he will arrive at a substantial figure, that is, if he can count. In addition, as has already been brought to his attention, we put in some $140 million of Canadian taxpayers' money under Unemployment Insurance, some $157 million—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Hon. Minister is repeating information that he has already put before the House. With all due respect—will the Minister please be seated? This raises questions about which all of us have been concerned. Where there is a repetition of a supplementary and a repetition of an answer, this denies other Members of the House the opportunity of participating in the Question Period.

* * *

NATIONAL REVENUE

MINISTER'S POWERS TO OBTAIN PERSONAL INFORMATION ON TAXPAYERS

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Minister of National Revenue. Yesterday the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead asked the Minister of National Revenue whether, in his view, there were any inquiries about personal information which could not be made by the Minister under the Income Tax Act. The Minister's response was "I do not think and I am even positive there are no inquiries." Upon reflection, is it the position of the Government of Canada that there are no limitations upon the range of personal information which can be demanded by the Minister of National Revenue under the Income Tax Act, including information held by municipalities, school boards and hospitals?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I think the question should be put to my colleague when he returns to the House Monday. In any case, the question put yesterday concerned enquiries made by Revenue Canada to municipalities, including requests for information that is already available to anyone in Canada who takes the trouble to ask the municipal authorities, for instance, how many commercial contracts were authorized by the municipality in the past year. That is public information, and the Hon. Member can check this with his municipality.

[*English*]

ACCESS TO MUNICIPAL DATA BASES—INVESTIGATION BY PRIVACY COMMISSIONER

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, that answer is absolutely incredible, as the Minister will find if he reads yesterday's *Hansard*.

Today I have laid a complaint with the Privacy Commissioner against the Department of National Revenue, under Section 29 of the Privacy Act. Will the Acting Minister order a freeze upon such requests for direct access to data bases of municipalities, hospitals and school boards, pending the results of the investigation by the Privacy Commissioner who, after all, is an officer of this Parliament?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I think that in a case like this, wisdom dictates that the matter should be left up to the Commissioner, and it is not up to me to tell him what to do.

* * *

[*English*]

PIPELINES

ALASKA GAS PIPELINE—CONSTRUCTION OF NORTHERN LEG

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. I congratulate him and the Government on their victory over me in the pipeline lawsuit. I have a simple question on the Alaska pipeline. Will the Minister please tell the House when the first shovel of dirt will be dug to begin the construction of the northern leg of the pipeline, in view of the ironclad guarantees that the Government gave the Canadian people that the pipeline would be built?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the Hon. Member lost anything. He went to court and he received justice under the law.

We have completed the prebuild. The Americans have decided not to proceed with getting gas from Alaska to their markets. In the meantime they are buying some Canadian gas. I do not know when the next section of the Alaska pipeline will be constructed. We passed a Bill in Parliament some years ago, on the undertaking by President Carter that it was urgent and that the Americans wanted to have it passed. After we passed the law, the Americans did not proceed. We proceeded under the law with the prebuild. That is where we are today. I cannot give the Hon. Member a date.

GAS SALES TO UNITED STATES

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, at the Canadian-American Parliamentary Conference, Senator Murkowski of Alaska and Senator McClure of Idaho said that the Americans would not build the line as long as they could get cheaper Canadian gas. What is illogical about that? What is he telling the Canadian consumer? The fact is that the Canadian consumer will have to pay for expensive Alaskan gas in the future after we have sold out all of our Canadian gas to the Americans.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is quite out of touch with reality. The only gas that we are selling to the Americans is what is surplus to the Canadian need. The NEB has ruled that we take the consumption of gas for one year and multiply that by 25. It is only the amount above that which is sold to the Americans.

● (1140)

The 17 trillion cubic feet of surplus gas we have today does not include the gas in the Northwest Territories and does not include the gas that has been discovered off Sable Island in Nova Scotia, because that gas is not in a position to be delivered to the market. Canada is in a good surplus position with natural gas and it is in the best interests of Canadians to sell that surplus at this time.

* * *

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SIZE OF CANADIAN CONTRIBUTION

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Defence. In New York yesterday several unnamed United States officials were highly critical of Canada's contribution to NATO, to which the Minister is quoted in the press as replying:

> Canada contributes as much as the average within NATO. I'm not saying that it's sufficient; I'm not saying that it's permanent.

How can the Minister make that statement in view of the fact that Canada spends less than 2 per cent of its GNP on defence versus a NATO average expenditure of 3.5 per cent? Could he explain to the House what he means by saying that our contribution to NATO may not be permanent? Is he planning to make some changes in our relationship with NATO?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to point out to the hon. gentleman that Canada is sixth in order of importance in terms of expenditures for defence within the NATO alliance. Next year Canada will be spending $8.6 billion; this year, it is spending $8 billion. That figure does not include the facilities that we provide to our NATO allies in Suffield, Alberta, in Shilo, Manitoba, and indeed in Goose Bay, Labrador, to permit NATO troops to train within Canada. Neither does it include the cost that Canada bears for the CAST Brigade which has been identified for the north flank of Norway.

There are a number of factors that must be taken into account when Canada's contribution to NATO is identified. As I said in New York yesterday, Canada needs to take a back seat to no one in terms of its NATO contribution.

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Blais: In terms of our contribution to NATO, Mr. Speaker, I wish to identify to the hon. gentleman that, of

course, this Government is always looking at ways of improving our relationship with our NATO allies. As I pointed out yesterday, Canada has a history of depending for its security upon multilateral defence alliances.

Mr. Andre: Mr. Speaker, at meetings of NATO parliamentarians at The Hague in October there would not have been a single parliamentarian or military person from NATO who would agree with the Minister's contention that Canada is carrying its fair share of the weight. Canada is last among the 16 NATO nations in contributions to defence.

POSITION OF NATO MEMBER NATIONS

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister say that it is sufficient to be last among the 16 NATO nations in contibutions to defence, and how can he indicate that we are carrying our fair share of the weight in view of the fact that no one else in any other NATO country agrees with him?

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, that is absolute balderdash. I received my NATO ministerial colleagues in Montebello, Quebec, two weeks ago. We had meetings there, and at that time none of my allies came to me and made any allegations of the kind made by the hon. gentleman. If the hon. gentleman has one iota of patriotism, I would hope that he would refrain from making those sorts of allegations and statements.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

FORTHCOMING UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs who will know that the United Nations is sponsoring an international meeting in Mexico City next year on the subject of population and development. In view of the Prime Minister's interest in this subject, and in view of the fact that Madam Speaker headed a Canadian delegation to Bucharest in 1974 on this same subject, could the Secretary of State tell us today what plans he has for appointing a delegation to go to Mexico City, and could he tell us if any preparations have been made for the briefing of that delegation?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the preparations for this meeting are obviously under way in the Department, but we have not yet selected the delegates. The meeting is to be held quite some time in the future. It is not normal to select delegates at this point. However, when they are selected, they will be well briefed and well prepared.

DEPARTMENT'S PLANS FOR CONFERENCE

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister a brief supplementary question. I wonder if, while the Minister is stating that preparations are under way, he could at the same time tell the officials in his Department whom we must contact now that such plans are under way. At the moment, they know nothing about those preparations.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his misinformation.

* * *

FORESTRY

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING ON REFORESTATION

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is a follow up to the question put by the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap to the Minister of Forestry. I appreciate very much his reiteration of the commitment of the Government to the principle of renewing our forests. However, rhetoric will not relieve the backlog that has been created as a result of the deliberate policy of neglect of this Government over the last 15 years. May I ask the Minister what specifically he has done in preparation for this coming Thursday to assure that the earlier commitment to spend $130 million for the purposes of forest renewal in the next few years will be implemented and to assure that that figure is thrown into the arena, and what he has done to assure himself of adequate funding to meet the commitment that has been made by himself and by his predecessor to this very important area?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what I can say that would be new to the Hon. Member, or what I could say that would be in addition to what I said earlier. The Hon. Member's question is exactly the same as the one posed by the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap. I did indicate to that Hon. Member that he was asking me to give him information relating to matters upon which a decision still must be made.

In his question the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River makes reference to rhetoric. I would have to come back to him and snow him under with figures that are mounting into the hundreds of millions of dollars, as I did previously when making reference to unemployment insurance funds for the creation of jobs.

I realize that you are getting impatient with me, Mr. Speaker, but I must deal with the Hon. Member's approach. I would have to remind the Hon. Member about what has been done with regard to firefighting equipment and the expenditure of some $150 million for water bombers. I would also have to remind him of the fact that, under DREE, the federal Government has been pumping, into renewal of the forestry industry and similar approaches, some $80 million a year.

However, what the Hon. Member does not seem to realize is that the Premier of his Province has a big responsibility in the field of forestry. If forestry is in such poor shape in his Province, it is also the fault of the provincial Government for neglecting that responsibility.

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, the federal Government takes in in excess of $1 billion a year as revenue from the forestry and wood-converting industries. The figures he has announced this morning are pitiful in relation to the commitment that was made two years ago to spend $130 million—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please ask his supplementary question?

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FORESTRY AGREEMENTS

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, when will the Minister follow up on yet another commitment to put in place the forestry agreements with the Provinces of British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario, a commitment that was to be fulfilled last year? When will these agreements be completed, and what will the Minister do to convince his Cabinet colleagues that the federal Government has a very real and direct responsibility in this area that cannot be passed on to the Provinces?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Hon. Member for giving me the opportunity of saying that I am personally committed to the cause of the forestry industry, as is everyone on this side of the House. We know of the contribution that the forestry industry makes to the economy, to the national interest, and to the long-term interest of future generations of Canadians. I would like to assure the Hon. Member that I will put forward my best efforts in this cause.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CORPORATE SHAREHOLDING LIMITATION ACT

REASONS FOR GOVERNMENT PRESENTING LEGISLATION

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Minister is trying to defend Bill S-31 by saying it is essential to protect the national interest. Since the Canadian Transport Commission already has the power to intervene in matters concerning interprovincial transport companies, how can the Minister justify a Bill that is really a present for friends of the Liberal Party, especially Mr. Ian Sinclair and Canadian Pacific?

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the question does not even deserve a reply. However, I shall attempt to make one. As the Hon. Member is probably aware, the powers of the CTC are not sufficient to meet the problem in this case. It was obvious that we needed the kind of legislation that would be clearcut and could easily be applied across the country in the national interest; hence, Bill S-31.

As I have said previously, the legislation is supported by the Provinces. We have had a number of meetings with my provincial counterparts who see the need for this kind of infrastructure legislation, and who see the need to enact it now in order to prevent problems in the future.

• (1150)

I would add—and I want to make this very clear—that the reason, for instance, the Caisse de dépôts is not trading on the Toronto Stock Exchange is because it has, by refusing to disclose, prevented itself from trading there. Let us make that very clear here before we proceed with the assumption that there is a move afoot to prevent it from trading.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN INTERESTS—GOVERNMENT'S POSITION ON ROLE OF MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): I have a supplementary for the same Minister. The Minister knows perfectly well that Quebec taxpayers and the Caisse de dépôt et de placement du Québec have lost millions of dollars owing to the retroactive provisions of Bill S-31. Why is the Minister willing to entrust our interests to multinational corporations, while she opposes any action taken by provincial governments that are trying to serve the interests of their people by investing in Canada and not in Europe or the United States, and why does she favour the multinationals and not the Provinces?

Mr. Prud'homme: The Bill is going to die in the Senate anyway.

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): There is absolutely no move afoot which would suggest we are favouring the multinationals. Bill S-31 is there to protect the national interest. As to the Caisse de dépôts losing, I find that very difficult to accept. If the Hon. Member has examined the Bill, he will see that it is grandfathered and that those shares owned by the Caisse de dépôts, which are at the moment 9.6 of the total, are protected. That is why there is a grandfather clause—to protect the ownership of those shares which are in existence now. The amendments which we have put forward give them an increase in that area of protection. I would find it very interesting if the Hon. Member could produce for me, in dollars and cents, the loss which he alleges.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A number of Hon. Members are seeking to be recognized and the Chair proposes to recognize Hon. Members for single questions only, without supplementaries, for the balance of the period.

Oral Questions

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CANADA-UNITED STATES RELATIONS

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The Minister will know that about a year ago the improvement of Canada-U.S. relations became one of the three priorities of Canadian foreign policy. Will the Minister tell us specifically what he has done to improve Canada-U.S. relations, particularly having in mind NATO, FIRA, the National Energy Program, and any other of the other perhaps score of issues where he might tell us what he has done specifically?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member asks a question which would take a very long answer, and perhaps we could deal with it in the standing committee. However, I would like to mention to the Hon. Member that we have established a process of consultation between the Secretary of State for the United States and myself, which is unprecedented in our history. We have agreed to meet on a regular basis four times a year, at which time we discuss bilateral questions. The fifth meeting in such a series took place recently in Halifax, and I regard that enterprise as a major effort and a major success in Canada-U.S. relations.

* * *

RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES COMMISSION

REPORT ON JAVELIN INTERNATIONAL LIMITED—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. On September 26 the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission reported to the Minister on an investigation into the affairs of Javelin International Limited which is in a scandalous state of affairs. Mr. Doyle, the controller of that company, is residing in Panama. Has the Government taken any action since receiving this report? Is the Government going to wind the company down in an orderly manner? Is the Government going to take action to put Mr. Doyle's shares in trust? And has the Government contacted the Panamanian Government to guard against any further erosion of the interests of the shareholders in Panama, as is recommended by the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the Hon. Member that we are now investigating ways to implement the recommendations of the report of the Commission. I have been in touch with the Secretary of State for External Affairs to see what moves can be taken to protect the interests of those shareholders of Javelin. I can assure the Hon. Member that we are moving in this area.

CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MINISTER'S SPEECH—CONSEQUENCES FOR WINNIPEG'S CULTURAL COMMUNITY

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Communications. The Minister may know that Winnipeg's cultural community was very upset with the comments of the Minister in which he inferred, at least, that Winnipeg would be bypassed as a cultural industry development centre in relation to a policy being developed which would centre itself on Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. Could the Minister indicate to the House whether or not this is, in effect, the policy? If it is not, could he placate any fear which members of Winnipeg's cultural community may have at the present time?

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, when one talks about the federal Government's programs in the field of culture, one must realize there are a number of programs, many of which have different objectives. As far as the Canada Council programs are concerned, for instance, the mandate of the Canada Council is to fund excellence wherever it is found in this country.

When I speak about "centres of excellence", I am basically taking about certain cultural industries which require a critical mass to develop and become productive and efficient. I noted, for instance, that the movie and program production industry in the United States has developed essentially in three cities, New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. I query whether in this country we believe we can have centres of excellence in program production in the field of film and television programming in more than three or four centres. That is basically what I am saying.

I am not in any way saying that Winnipeg and other cities of that kind will not receive their fair share of cultural moneys. As a matter of fact I recently announced a contribution of $2 million to the Royal Winnipeg Ballet in order to allow them to build appropriate facilities for the schooling and training of people involved with the Royal Winnipeg Ballet. I am presently discussing with my counterparts in Manitoba the possibility of negotiating an ERDA sub-agreement on culture.

* * *

FORESTRY

GOVERNMENT COMMITMENT TO FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL FUNDING

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for forestry. There is an understanding in the Canadian Forestry Service that the Cabinet has approved in principle $130 million a year in federal-provincial agreements to be committed each year for five years. Would the Minister like to make that commitment on behalf of his Government and inform the Canadian Forestry Service, and this Parliament, if indeed the Cabinet has made that approval in principle?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I compliment the Hon. Member for the originality of his question. It has already been asked by two Hon. Members previously, one of them from his own Party. As I indicated to the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, that matter has not been decided as yet. It is to go to Cabinet. The question of the commitment, therefore, is one to which I cannot give him an answer right now, except to recite again the amounts of money which the federal Government has made available to forestry across this nation, for research, for water bombers, for the creation of jobs, for forestry schools, and the like. These amounts of money, as I mentioned earlier, run into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

CONTROL OF ACID RAIN—ANTICIPATED INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION IN UNITED STATES

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. A few days ago our Ambassador Gotlieb was quoted in the press as saying that he would expect there would be legislation in the American Congress in 1984 with respect to acid rain control. Can the Minister tell the House whether that anticipation is based on an expectation of administration sponsored legislation, or does the Minister believe that legislation would come as a consequence of the initiative of both Republican and Democratic Senators and Representatives?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, at this stage it is extremely difficult to engage in forecasting from where the legislation will come. I raised this matter yesterday in Indianapolis with Mr. Ruckelshaus. I have asked him where, and when, he thinks he would be able to put forward a proposal which would be acceptable to his administration. It seems to me that at this point, Mr. Speaker, in light of our experience so far, the issue of acid rain between Canada and the U.S. is becoming a leadership issue which the President of the United States must resolve himself in order to come to a decision. The administration is divided on this matter.

* * *

CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

PRIME MINISTER'S STATEMENT ON PREPAYMENT OF MORTGAGES—MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. A few years ago the Prime Minister issued a statement on consumer affairs in which he said:

> In the mortgage field, the Liberal Government intends to make it your legal right to prepay the mortgage on your home during the first five years of the mortgage agreement, if you wish to. This will enable many Canadians to achieve significant savings at a time of high mortgage-interest costs, and will protect the home buyer from excessively high prepayment penalties.

● (1200)

In view of the statements coming from the Minister's office, where does she stand? Is she trying to help the more than 750,000 Canadians who are trapped by high interest mortgages? Her statements do not indicate that. Or is she merely a tool for a handful of trust companies?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is aware, I am sure, that our Department has been investigating the situation for a couple of months now. We are very much concerned about the problem of those people who are locked into high interest mortgages. I would like to assure the Hon. Member that a contract is a contract, and we must be very careful to honour contracts, but also allow people an equitable way of reaching a solution. That is one of the reasons why my Department is acting, perhaps as an intermediary, to see if there is not a way to reach a solution.

I might add that in many circumstances we have been able to be of considerable assistance. In the meantime I can assure the Hon. Member that I, and the Minister of Finance, are looking at ways in which this Government could move to alleviate those very real problems that home owners are facing.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

THE CASE OF HUGH HAMBLETON—REPORTED OFFER OF IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. While he is coming into the House, and I hope he will, I would like to recommend, Mr. Speaker, that you have glasses prescribed for the Government front bench because they seem unable to distinguish between Mr. Speaker and Madam Speaker.

Since the Solicitor General is not in the House I shall address my question to the Minister of Justice. The question relates to a former Canadian official of CIDA who was tried about a year ago in Britain on charges of espionage on behalf of the U.S.S.R.

It is clear from the evidence brought forward in public hearings at the Old Bailey that an offer of immunity was made to Mr. Hambleton, which offer has since been denied. Has the Minister read the evidence given at the Old Bailey, and has the offer of immunity been denied, or have there been second thoughts about the denial? Would he also examine the matter of who it was who warned Hambleton not to go to the United Kingdom, and why the warning was made?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I was not able to read all of the proceedings in that case because some of the evidence was taken secretly. I understand a summary of the evidence was made available to the RCMP,

and I had that summary available to me. I do not believe there was, in fact I can say categorically that there was nothing in that evidence which would cause us to change anything that either I or my colleague, the Solicitor General, have said before in this House on this subject. We regard the matter as closed.

* * *

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petitions presented by Hon. Members on Thursday, November 17, 1983, meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

VACANCY

NEPEAN-CARLETON—WALTER BAKER BY DECEASE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a communication advising me of the following vacancy which has occurred in the representation, namely, the Hon. Walter Baker, by decease. Accordingly, I have addressed my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer for the issue of a writ of election for the said electoral district.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

LAW REFORM COMMISSION

TABLING OF REPORT "ALCOHOL, DRUGS AND DRIVING OFFENCES"

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to lay upon the Table of the House, in both official languages, a copy of the report of the Law Reform Commission of Canada entitled "Alcohol, Drugs and Driving Offences". I would ask that the report be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

* * *

PETITIONS

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION REPORTS

Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of the people of Labrador, several thousand of whom have signed this petition calling upon the House of Commons to create a separate seat in this House for Labrador.

Labrador is unique in geography, culture and economic possibilities. It is my duty and pleasure to support this petition calling on Parliament to send the report of the Newfoundland Electoral Boundaries Commission, tabled in the House on May 27, 1983, back to the Commission to change its recommendations from a Labrador-St. Anthony district to a Labrador district and/or to introduce a Bill to create a district for Labrador.

Mr. Roger Simmons (Burin-St. George's): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of approximately 2,400 people in the communities of Port aux Basques, Ramea, La Poile, Fox Roost, Margaree, Cape Ray, Petites, Harbour Le Cou and Pool's Cove, all being in the riding of Burin-St. George's.

The petitioners express their dissatisfaction with the report of the Newfoundland Electoral Boundaries Commission tabled in this House in May, and the prayer of the petition is essentially that Parliament overturn the recommended changes included in that report. It is my honour to present this petition and support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member varied a little bit from the usual form of petitions.

* * * * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I suppose if I make the same effort to save your tongue and the House's time it will be met with the same position from the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) as it has in the past, but I once again make the offer to have all of those matters put to the House and if any Member wishes to rise he might do so.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I dispense with the reading of the motions?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, some day I will explain the reason why, I am sure, but I would prefer that we deal with these matters in a normal and proper fashion.

Motions stand.

* * *

● (1210)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,961, 5,300 and 5,308.

[*Text*]

ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Question No. 4,961—**Mr. Corbett:**

1. In the past six months were appointments made to the Enterprise Development Board from Atlantic Canada and, if so, who and from what locations?

2. Do any of the appointees have past active political connections and, if so, what are they and to what extent?

3. Have any of the individuals ever received other federal appointments to boards or commissions and, if so (a) what appointments (b) on what date and for how long?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The reply for the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Regional Economic Expansion is as follows:

1. No such appointments were made to either the Central Enterprise Development Board or to any of the four Atlantic Region Enterprise Development Boards during the period in question (December 8, 1982—June 8, 1983).

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

FISHING VESSEL INSURANCE PLAN

Question No. 5,300—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. Is there a $7.25 million surplus remaining in the Fishing Vessel Insurance Plan and, if so, for what reason did the Government recommend a rate increase?

2. Was the rate increased in the Scotia-Fundy area for 1983-84 in a manner disproportionate to that in other parts of Atlantic Canada and, if so, for what reason?

3. Is the Plan adhering to the 6 per cent and 5 per cent guidelines for rate increases and, if not, for what reason?

4. Does the Government intend to place the surplus into an interest bearing account with the interest received accruing to the account of the Plan?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): 1. There was a balance of $7,250,171 in the Fishing Vessel Insurance Plan operating reserve on March 31, 1983. Premium rates have been increased because of the heavy losses experienced by the Plan in the three year period ending on March 31, 1983. The balance in the reserve fund fell by $3,375,112 in that period.

2. No.

3. Premium rates charged by the Plan are set so that premiums cover indemnities paid. They rise or fall as is required to pay indemnities and are not limited by the six and five program.

4. No.

TELEPHONES COMPATIBLE WITH HEARING AIDS

Question No. 5,308—**Mr. Young:**

Does the Treasury Board have a policy with respect to the availability of telephones compatible with the hearing aids of government employees with a hearing loss?

Mr. Peter Lang (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): The Treasury Board Policy on Increased Participation of Physically Handicapped and Mentally Handicapped People in the Federal Public Service (PMM-Vol.4, Chap. 16 5.3.6.) states that Departments and Agencies shall: "ensure that funds are made available for the purchase of work-essential technical aids and services as required and feasible wherever the hiring or promotion of a physically handicapped person in an appropriate position requires such equipment or services".

A telephone handset compatible with hearing aids is clearly a work related technical aid and such handsets are installed when requested by hearing aid users.

[*English*]

Mr. Evans: I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Stand.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ATLANTIC FISHERIES RESTRUCTURING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed from Thursday, November 17, 1983 consideration of the motion of Mr. De Bané that Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishery enterprises, be read the second time and referred do the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When the proceedings were interrupted the Hon. Member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe (Mr. Tobin) had completed his remarks and was open to a ten-minute period of questions and answers. Are there Hon. Members wishing to ask him questions? If not, I recognize the Hon. Member for Malpeque.

Mr. Mel Gass (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be given the opportunity to speak on this Bill today. Bill C-170 is an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishery enterprises.

This Bill is being put through this House and Parliament to try and restructure the fishery of Atlantic Canada. We are all well aware of the problems of the fishery of Atlantic Canada. Different Provinces and different sectors of the fishery are going to be affected differently by this Bill. In this Bill "Atlantic fisheries" means:

—all the activities relating to the harvesting, processing and marketing of fish in the Provinces of New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward

Island and Quebec and in the fishing zones of Canada, as defined pursuant to subsection 4(1) of the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act, on the Atlantic coast of Canada—

According to the interpretation clause, "control", in respect of a body corporate, means:

(*a*) control in any manner that results in control in fact, whether directly through the ownership of shares, stocks, equities or securities or indirectly through a trust, a contract, the ownership of shares, stocks, equities or securities of another body corporate or otherwise, or

(*b*) the ability to appoint, elect or cause the appointment or election of a majority of the directors of the body corporate, whether or not such ability is exercised;—

According to this Bill "fishery enterprise" means:

—any person that is engaged directly or indirectly in, or controls or is controlled by a person that is engaged directly or indirectly in, the Atlantic Fisheries;

"person" includes an individual, a body corporate, a partnership, an association, a trust, a cooperative and any trustee or legal representative thereof;

"restructuring", in respect of a fishery enterprise, includes the reorganization, refinancing, modernization, rationalization and expansion of the enterprise, and any similar activity directed toward making the enterprise economically viable.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to facilitate the development of viable Atlantic fisheries that are competitive and privately-owned through the restructuring of certain fishery enterprises. That part of the Bill is something which is worthwhile and I can certainly support the objective of this Bill, but the Bill goes much too far in its powers.

As described in the Bill the powers are:

4. (1) To carry out the purpose of this Act, the Minister may, on behalf of Her Majesty,

(*a*) acquire, hold or dispose of or otherwise deal with shares, debentures or other securities of, or any security interest in, any fishery enterprise;

(*b*) pledge, hypothecate or charge any share, debenture or other security, or other security interest, acquired or held under paragraph (*a*); and

(*c*) enter into any agreement or arrangement necessary or incidental to any activity referred to in paragraph (*a*) or (*b*).

The guarantees under Clause 6 are:

To carry out the purpose of this Act, the Minister may, with the approval of the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Finance, on such terms and conditions as the Minister specifies, guarantee the repayment of any portion of the principal and interest owing on any loan made to a fishery enterprise.

(2) The aggregate amount of guarantees given under this section that are outstanding at any one time shall not exceed one hundred million dollars.

In Clause 7 the Minister is authorized to exercise specific powers:

The Governor in Council may by order authorize any minister of the Crown, other than the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, to exercise in respect of such fishery enterprise as is specified in the order such powers referred to in this Act as are specified in the order.

Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of jargon that is hard to understand. It is definitely difficult for me, as a layman, to understand the full implications. My understanding of this Bill is that it is going to give the Government, through the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) or some other designated Minister, complete control of the fishery in Atlantic Canada. There are many "anys" in the Bill. The Bill gives the Minister the power to buy, sell, trade or hold "any" sector of the fishing industry. It also gives the Minister the power to loan or guarantee "any" amount of money to "any" fishery enterprise.

I will give you some background to the introduction of this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Due to the condition of the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced the appointment of a task force on Atlantic fisheries in January of 1982. The main purpose of this task force was to recommend "how to achieve and maintain a viable Atlantic fishing industry with due consideration for the overall economic and social development of the Atlantic Provinces". The Chairman of this task force, Mr. Michael Kirby, worked primarily with 11 other people in developing the Kirby report.

Mr. Speaker, the Kirby report is the most positive report seen in decades. It was presented as an interlocking package. The federal Government is threatening the integrity and future of the report by changing some of the recommendations. The federal Government seems to be picking, choosing and switching, to suit their needs, from a report which must be viewed as a whole package in order to be effective. In the Kirby report, in a section entitled "The Harvesting Sector", recommendations in the area of fishing licences are discussed. The federal Government must accept the licensing review process. This term should be explained as the process of licensing is currently political and controlled by the federal Government.

● (1220)

There are no written guidelines established for companies and fishermen to follow, should they wish to expand or develop their businesses. It is the damage done to the private sector fishing industry by many years of Liberal fisheries policies which has left no alternative but to restructure the industry. The Liberal Government has encouraged excessive expansion through federal improvement loans. It has shown political interference in licensing and capital expenditures. It has been inconsistent in policy areas and has not been effective in consultations with the Provinces.

The President of the Eastern Fisheries Federation expressed his concerns about the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada by stating that the use of Government incentives had ballooned in Nova Scotia's two largest companies to the point where so much money had to be made to stay afloat that the result is too much fish on the market. He feels that the fishing industry needs to be built by people who have an interest in the fishery rather than a bunch of bureaucrats.

So far under this restructuring, only large companies are being taken over and those companies not involved could find themselves penalized for their independence. Independent firms have already reported greater difficulty in getting bank loans since the announcement of the restructuring.

Governments will be able to distort the free market system and their criteria for assistance programs in favour of their own companies. The federal Government must ensure that independent fish processors retain their share of the industry and remain prosperous to be capable of buying back the industry in the natural process of expansion. The federal

Government must follow its agreement to return the fishing industry to private ownership as soon as possible.

The restructuring of the fishing industry is a mixed blessing. While it restores needed employment in Newfoundland and offers a chance for greater provincial participation in the fishery, it also creates a situation which may lead to greater nationalization of the industry, worse economic performance and a greater dependence on Government subsidies.

The Maritime Provinces and Quebec are opposed to the federal intervention evident in the restructuring plan. These Provinces are concerned about the effects on the independent businessman and the future of these people in the fishing industry. Some Provinces are strongly opposed to the restructuring while others are reluctantly participating because they fear federal reprisals in the form of reduced quotas and expenditures.

In Nova Scotia, the largest fish processor in Atlantic Canada, H.B. Nickerson and Sons, Ltd. is to be dismantled and most of its assets turned over to National Sea Products, making that company the largest in Atlantic Canada. The amalgamation of Nova Scotia's two largest fish processing companies shows that the Governments are more interested in rescuing large corporations than in protecting the livelihood of fishermen, plant workers and small processors.

The Province of Quebec is strongly opposed to the restructuring due to federal intervention in the fishing industry. The industry is rallying fishermen and other groups to oppose the plan and is offering various types of assistance to companies or co-ops that wish to remain independent. Their main objection is that the federal plan would interrupt and delay the provincial program for plant modernization and product quality improvement. The federal Government's plan would interfere with privatization that is now taking place in the Quebec fishing industry.

Nova Scotia has agreed to take part in the restructuring largely because it fears federal reprisals in the form of reduced quotas, reduced small craft harbours funding and other types of discrimination. The Province has not signed the actual agreement as it is seeking stronger guarantees on matters such as returning the controlling interest to the private sector within a specific time. The major objections for Nova Scotia are that about 90 per cent of federal investment in the new company would go directly to repay the bank, leaving little for real industrial rebuilding; federal control in the companies; and an insecure future.

New Brunswick is also opposed to the federal Government controlling interest in fishery enterprises and the effect of the restructured companies upon independents. The industry in New Brunswick also sees a conflict of interest when it comes to distributing fish quotas, subsidies, funding and so on.

In my own Province of Prince Edward Island, the fishermen and people generally are opposed to another form of the old absentee landlord system. They fear that there will be a loss of local decision-making in the fishing industry with a negative effect on the Prince Edward Island independent companies. They are not confident that the federal Government will look after the interests of the P.E.I. fishing industry as it will have to meet demands of larger companies and Provinces, and the larger companies will be given more preference than the independent processors in matters of loan guarantees, subsidies, etc.

The main concern can be summed up in the lack of confidence in the federal Government's handling of an industry which is so important to the livelihood of the Province and indeed to all the Maritime Provinces. It is the lack of trust that makes the Provinces so leery of the whole restructuring plan as the Government has a tendency to change parts of an agreement to suit the needs of the federal Government. An example of this is the way the federal Government has changed the Kirby report. It took a very detailed and comprehensive report and changed portions of it to suit its needs.

While understanding the need for restructuring the Atlantic coast fisheries, one can see that the current action of the federal Government will only create more problems as it tries to nationalize the fishing industry. Do not be fooled when the federal Government says that this is not a plan to nationalize the fishing industry. I personally believe that this is a federal Government plan to nationalize the industry. First, it will nationalize the Atlantic fishery and then move to the West Coast next year and nationalize the West Coast fishery as well.

I am most concerned about the smaller businesses. We do not have any large companies in the fishing industry in Prince Edward island that are suffering financially and about to go bankrupt. In Prince Edward Island there are fish processors, family-owned companies, and there are co-ops owned by the fishermen. Most of these companies are surviving though not as well as they would like. However, they are still in business and are not looking for Government bailouts. They are concerned about the restructuring of the Atlantic fishery because they fear that the Government controlled fishing companies will squeeze them out of business. They are also afraid to come to Ottawa to present their concerns in front of the standing committee. I suggest it is a sad state of affairs when citizens of this country are afraid to come to Ottawa to voice their concerns to the Government.

Mr. Tobin: Nonsense.

Mr. Gass: The Parliamentary Secretary says nonsense. I have talked to processors from Atlantic Canada and those are the exact words they spoke. They are afraid to come here to voice their concerns before the standing committee because they depend on the federal Government for other forms of assistance to keep them in business. They depend upon the federal government to dredge their harbours and to put money into their harbours. They are afraid and it is not nonsense.

In his remarks on the first day this Bill was before the House, the Minister, as reported at page 28852 of *Hansard*, stated:

In entering into this agreement, the Government is acutely aware of the need to consider the situation of smaller companies in the five Provinces and the way they will relate to these three new large entities.

That is somewhat reassuring to the small independent processors but the Minister also goes on to say:

Some of these—

Referring to the small companies.

—are watching developments with a certain degree of uneasiness.

I might say that in all of the Minister's remarks about the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada, the greatest understatement he has made is that these small companies are looking at these developments with a certain degree of uneasiness. They are terrified. The processors in P.E.I. to whom I have talked are terrified of this Bill. In fact, two small processors in Prince Edward Island have told me that if the Bill passes in its present form they are seriously thinking of not opening their doors next spring. Why would they do that? They are afraid that the Government will slowly squeeze them out of business. They have decided that they may as well quit now while they still have some money in the bank rather than wait until the effects of this Bill have squeezed every last dollar out of their businesses and they have to close their doors because the bank has moved in.

● (1230)

The small processors in P.E.I.—and it is P.E.I. that I am speaking mostly for today—and other processors in Atlantic Canada say this new Bill will cause the total demise of the small independent processors as we now know them. They have also informed me that this Bill through restructuring will probably cause the demise of the Fisheries Council of Canada because a lot of the people who participate in the Fisheries Council of Canada will be absorbed by this new company.

You might be appreciative of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the independents have formed a new organization in the Maritime Provinces. They call it FISPAC, the Federation of Independent Seafood Processors of Atlantic Canada. The people forming this new organization are putting their own money into this organization to prepare a brief, an argument, to present to the Standing Committee expressing their concerns about this Bill. I was delighted to hear that they were going to spend their own money because they believe so strongly that this Bill is not the Bill they want to see come forward. I repeat, these people are forming this organization because as individuals they are afraid to come before the Standing Committee on Fisheries because of the reprisals they see down the road from the Government in some other form.

During the course of this debate there has been some discussion as to whether or not the non-Gulf-based fleet should be allowed into the Gulf to catch the supposedly surplus stock in the Gulf. It depends upon whom you listen to as to whether or not there is a surplus of stock in the Gulf. The biologists tell us there is a surplus. The fishing companies and the fishermen of Prince Edward Island tell me their catches are going down. In fact, in 1982, with a total allowable catch in the Gulf of 31,000 metric tonnes, the total fishing capacity of the Gulf-based fleet caught only 26,000 metric tonnes. They were not able to catch the amount of fish there for the catching because the fish were not there to catch.

In 1983, with the same quota of 31,000 metric tonnes, with the same effort, the fleet in the Gulf caught a total of 21,000 metric tonnes. Their catch was down 20 per cent in 1983 from 1982. Does that indicate, Mr. Speaker, that there is a surplus of fish in the Gulf? To me it indicates there is not a surplus of fish in the Gulf, especially when you take into account the fact that, with the same fishing effort in 1983 over 1982, the total catch was down 20 per cent.

The other concern which the independents have is the marketing approach and the countervailing U.S. tariffs that may be applied if this company is set up and the U.S. sees it as a heavily subsidized Government-operated company.

I see you are indicating that my time is up, Mr. Speaker; I will conclude quickly. The bottom line in this Bill, as far as my appraisal of it is concerned, is purely and simply that there are just too many "anys" in this Bill. I have counted them and would you believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are 13 "anys" in the Bill? Those "anys" give the Government power to do anything it wants to do. Thirteen is a very unlucky number. Thirteen is the number of coils or loops on a hangman's noose. It is the independent processors in the fishery in Atlantic Canada who are afraid they will be hung out to dry by this Bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Comments, questions, answers? Debate.

Mr. George Henderson (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity today to speak to Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic fisheries for the purpose of restructuring certain fishery enterprises. This Bill is obviously one of the most important pieces of legislation that has come forward as far as its impact on Atlantic Canada is concerned since I came to this House in 1980. I say it is important because it affects the lives of many people throughout Atlantic Canada, not only the lives of those who are primary producers—for instance, our fishermen—but also the lives of the plant workers, the lives of the processors, large and small, and, of course, the lives of the many people who are involved in the service industries.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member but I do want to listen to him. Regrettably, the conversation behind the curtains is coming across his microphone.

Mr. Henderson: This Bill affects the lives of those many people who are involved in the service industries who service the fishermen, the plants, the structure of the plants and, the physical infrastructure which makes the total fishing industry what it is. I suppose since it is a Bill that is creating controversy and has a lot of changes in mind, that is why many of the speakers before me have made eloquent speeches. They made those speeches not altogether in terms of the over-all impact of

all Atlantic Canada, but being politicians from all sides of the House Members are inclined to be protective of our own areas. That is exactly the way it should be.

I suppose that because it is a Bill that affects the lives of so many people, that is the reason for so many divergent opinions. My colleague, the Hon. Member for Malpeque (Mr. Gass), mentioned there were 13 "anys" in the Bill. I did not take the time to count the "anys" but I must say that when you have a Bill with those kinds of powers it will cause a great deal of concern to those people involved. Probably it is not what is in the Bill so much that accounts for concerns but possibly what we do not see in the Bill.

I have been around legislatures for a number of years. I was in the provincial Government of P.E.I. before I came here. I understand it is very difficult to provide a piece of legislation that is all encompassing for debate in a House. Not only is it difficult but there has to be a certain amount of latitude left in any piece of legislation so as not to be so restrictive that when passed it will be no good because it will not fulfil what it is intended to do.

I do have a number of concerns, especially about the small independent processors and fishermen. I represent a riding in Prince Edward Island. In the Province of Prince Edward Island fisheries is the second largest industry next to agriculture. In my riding it is probably the number one industry. There are a number of processing plants which are large by the standards of Prince Edward Island but perhaps small by the standards of Atlantic Canada.

• (1240)

I would like to mention specifically a few of them. For example, there is Tignish Fisheries which is co-operatively owned by fishermen. A new plant has been built to replace the old one that was there for many years. It has been the lifeblood of the Village of Tignish. It employs about 200 plant workers. It probably purchases fish from upwards to 250 fishermen in the area. The service industry in Tignish and surrounding areas service both fishing vessels and the plant itself and would employ probably another 30 people to 40 people. It is an industry, a company or a co-operative which has a great deal of involvement in the area. It has been the example of a very well-managed business, probably the best in the Province of Prince Edward Island and perhaps the best co-operative business anywhere in Atlantic Canada. It took part in the federal program of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, built its new facility and modernized. That Government program was available to all small business and industries. Also the co-operative members put a lot of work into the industry itself, not only the co-operative members of today but their forefathers and indeed their grandfathers.

Also there is the Acadian Fishermens Co-op, another company with one of the most modern plants by any standards in the country. However, it has a problem as a result of the lack of resource going to that plant. I could also speak of an independent company in my riding, Polar Seafoods. It employs less people but it almost works on a year-round basis. It processes lobsters, buys and ships eels, and processes smelts in the wintertime. Of course, it has a great impact upon my riding.

Another company in my riding is Paturels, a division of National Sea Products, one of the corporations which will be absorbed by this Bill. While that plant generally operates on a five-month to six-month basis, it is also important. Then there are a number of smaller processing plants, mainly buying stations throughout the riding, such as Alberton Fisheries, Milligan Fisheries, Howards Cove Seafoods and so on.

I would be very dishonest today if I rose in the Chamber and said that I was not concerned. I took the time to telephone and talk with the managers of most of those plants about the Bill. They told me about their concerns. I would also be dishonest if I did not indicate that at least three of the managers said that perhaps they do not understand the Bill. It is unfortunate that the industry found itself in its present situation and that the Bill had to come forward at this time. However it appears to be the lesser of many evils. They recognized that something had to be done for the industry.

The Minister and the Parliamentary Secretary indicated in their speeches that this was not a panacea for all ills of the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada. I am sure it is not. However, I have not heard any speeches in the House on this Bill—and I have read most of them—which provide any clear-cut alternative to the situation with which we are faced.

The Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons) made an excellent speech yesterday on the restructuring Bill. He indicated in glowing terms what it meant to his area. I can fully agree with that because it means an awful lot to the Province of Newfoundland. The Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) said that he was supporting it because it meant a lot to his area; he has many plants in his area. Other Hon. Members indicated to the House in glowing terms that although they were not totally satisfied, it was necessary at this time in order to save an industry which affects so many people. I have read the speech of the Hon. Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell). She expressed the same concerns as many of us. However, as I went through all these speeches, I could not find any suggestion better than what is contained in the Bill before us today.

I spent four years in the Province of Prince Edward Island as the provincial Minister of Fisheries. I remember back in 1977 when the federal Government, under the former Minister of Fisheries, negotiated and signed the 200-mile limit agreement for the country. I think everyone hailed it as a great step forward as far as the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada was concerned. However, I also remember the headlines in the Nova Scotia newspaper. The former Minister under the former Government and Ministers thereafter hailed it as such a tremendous agreement that they must immediately jump in, expand the industry, replace vessels and build new vessels. I remember the former Minister of Fisheries and Oceans for Canada telling them at that time to go slow, that we had the

catching capacity. At that time there were talks about $200 million and even more to be invested.

I heard some Hon. Members opposite laying the total blame for the situation today on the shoulders of the federal Government. I do not agree that the total blame should fall on the shoulders of the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans. As a former Minister of Prince Edward Island, I know that we all tend to be parochial. Provincial politicians have to be parochial and we can understand that. They would not be doing their jobs if they were not.

Let me look at the management of some of the businesses. A number of years ago managers were scrambling for DREE grants to improve their facilities, to expand their facilities, to buy up quotas and so on. They put pressure upon the federal Government for larger quotas and more access to fish. I remember also the provincial Governments of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland saying that they want more. They are still at it. Very little came from the 200-mile agreement for the Provinces of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick or the Gulf-based ports and fishermen.

• (1250)

There are concerns. This Bill is totally necessary for the Province of Newfoundland. We are here today to discuss a situation. We can look back and blame whoever we like, but that is not why we are here. The situation has to be addressed as it is today. An industry in Newfoundland is facing total collapse. There are problems in Nova Scotia as well. What happens if we allow those companies to go bankrupt? What happens to the small independents? There is concern about inventories and fire sales. There may be some vehicles within Government to prevent that, but I have not seen any vehicle that would be satisfactory to all Governments and all people.

The independents have some concerns and I hope they will be addressed when the Bill goes to committee. One concern is what will happen with the market situation. Will the small independents have the same access to markets as the large corporations? These questions must be addressed. Government through its shares will be a partner in these corporations. They will control the allocations. Will these allocations be used to the advantage of the corporations, thereby creating unfair competition for the independent plants? That question must be addressed.

Will these corporations use the profits from one species to subsidize another species? For example, will profits from groundfish be used to subsidize lobster, or vice-versa, there by creating unfair competition? These concerns can be addressed. I do not think it is the intent of Government to create unfair competition. However, once this Bill goes through, there must be some direction as to how these Crown corporations operate. They must help the small businessmen and the fishermen rather than work in opposition to them. I am sure no Member would agree with Government creating unfair competition for the small businessman.

When this Bill goes to committee, I hope we will hear from the small independents, the fisheries groups and all those involved in the plants, the catching sector and the marketing of fish. I hope they will air their concerns before the committee and that the Minister and his staff will be able to alleviate some of these concerns.

That is the main problem for the small independent processors. If they are convinced that this Bill will not provide unfair competition, they will have no problem accepting it. Like the rest of us, they understand the impact of the fishery on all Atlantic Canadians. The processors and fishermen from my area realize what this Bill means to the Provinces of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec. However, other Provinces than those around the Gulf expect a fair shake from this restructuring.

I do not want to prolong this debate. I hope all Provinces will take an objective view of this and bring their concerns before the committee. We are here to help all those involved in the industry, whether they be involved in catching, processing, marketing or in the servicing of the industry. I appreciate the opportunity to make these remarks.

Mr. Gass: Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment. I listened closely to the Hon. Member for Egmont (Mr. Henderson). He shares some of my concerns for the independents. Toward the end of his remarks, he made a statement on which I would like to comment. He referred to unfair competition for the independents as a result of this large corporation owned and controlled by the Government. I believe he was sincere when he said that this large corporation would not get involved in unfair competition.

I would point out that in the past Government-owned companies have become involved in unfair competition. Petro-Canada has taken out giant, full page ads in Atlantic Canada and elsewhere to advertise giant tire sales in direct competition with tire dealers in Atlantic Canada, paid for by the taxpayers of Canada. There have been $100,000 ads in local papers in direct, unfair competition with tire dealers in Atlantic Canada. I hope there will not be this type of unfair competition for independent processors in Prince Edward Island and other parts of Atlantic Canada.

Mr. Henderson: Mr. Speaker, I will just respond briefly. I said in my speech that these concerns must be alleviated for the small, independent processors so that there will be no unfair competition. Over the last number of years, with regard to the setting of shore prices for lobster, for example, processors have been in competition with National Sea Products and Nickerson's which over the years have received tremendous sums of money from Government, far more than the small independents.

They have had to compete with those people. I said in my speech that sometimes the large corporations would use the profit from one section of their operation to try and put the small businessman out of business. That is not fair. We should look at that and ensure that competition is fair. The managers of the independent processors are not afraid of fair competition. We must do our best to ensure that competition is fair.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order. The Chair has been made aware through the courtesy of some Hon. Members that there may be a wish to accommodate the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey), who I understand has a plane to catch this afternoon. So far as I understand, it would be appropriate if I were to recognize that Member and call it one o'clock so that he might begin promptly at two. That understanding includes the idea that since there would have been two Government speakers in a row, I would look twice to the Official Opposition for Members to speak. I know that these consultations have been limited. Provided Hon. Members seem to be content, we will proceed that way.

• (1300)

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, on the question that you have raised, the procedure that you have just outlined to the House will be entirely acceptable to those of us on the Opposition side.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I thank the Hon. Member. Accordingly, the Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) to be seen at two o'clock for purposes of debate.

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

At 1.02 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Hon. William Rompkey (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I will begin by thanking my colleagues on the other side of the House, particularly the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro), for allowing me to speak in this specific order. I will be brief in my remarks. However, I do believe it is important to place certain things on the record with regard to this Bill. It is certainly not my intention to hold up the passage of this Bill but to give it support.

I remember very well, Mr. Speaker, the earlier discussions we had with regard to the restructuring of the fisheries on the Atlantic coast, resulting from the Kirby report. One option certainly was to allow the companies as they existed at that time to declare bankruptcy and then to allow the private sector to pick up whetever pieces it could. That particular option, although it lent itself to the consideration of the Cabinet at that time, was not considered because of the dislocation it would cause, particularly among those who worked in the various plants. There would be a wide disruption throughout the Province.

Also, although it is important to have the private sector front and centre—and I hope eventually the private sector can regain its prominence in the fishery in Newfoundland—it seemed to a lot of us, including myself, that having the Government of Canada involved was the best option we could follow. Ensuring federal support would ensure the success of that particular company. Indeed, it was not clear how it could be done otherwise, in view of the fact that the investment required was obviously not readily available in the private sector. Therefore, I believe this option, although not perfect, is the best option to follow.

• (1410)

That view, of course, is shared by this Government and the Government of Newfoundland, I believe by the fishermen in Newfoundland, and indeed by a lot of the companies in Newfoundland. However, there are some small independent processors in the Province who have some concerns.

I believe the present arrangement is a good compromise and I want to congratulate this Government and the Government of Newfoundland for working out this particular compromise. I want to pay particular tribute to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané). Without him we would not have had the agreement we have now. Indeed, had he been allowed full rein at a much earlier date we would have had this settlement much earlier on. The judgment, concern and personality of the Minister was no small factor in arriving at this compromise. He is from rural Canada and understands what our Province is all about and what the fishermen and processors in the small communities need and want. I pay tribute to his personal work in bringing about this compromise we have.

However, there are some concerns among the independent processors in the Province. Their fear is that they will be swallowed up by this giant company and eased out of the marketplace. We have to assure them that is not going to be the case. I for one will ensure that once this agreement is in place and both Governments have put the new company into operation, the interests of the small, independent fish merchants in Newfoundland are looked after, both in processing and marketing. They have survived the recession. They have prospered, survived and provided employment. It is the big players in the industry who have conducted themselves in such a way as to need this help. That is regrettable, and all the more reason why we have to make sure that even though this does not address in particular terms the interests of the small independent processors in the Province, those concerns have to be addressed and I am sure will be once this restructuring is in place.

I am also concerned about the Kirby report recommendation for what is called the resource-short plant program. Plants along the northeast coast of Newfoundland and along the coast of Labrador have been seasonal operations principally because there has not been the supply of fish readily available. A lot of these plants depend on the inshore, small boat fishery and the supply of fish has been such as not to allow them to operate for the major part of the year. This throws fishermen and plant workers on unemployment insurance, which they do not want, and the only way to resolve the problem is to ensure a steady supply of fish throughout the greater part of the year. That can be done only through a supply of offshore fish with a

dragger operation. There have been negotiations in the Province between those who own the draggers and trawlers and those who own the small plants along the northeast coast with regard to ensuring that steady supply of offshore fish. There is a stalemate at the moment, no agreement, and I want to say we must have that agreement. We must have assurance of supply for the northeast coast and for the coast of Labrador if we are to ensure the prosperity of those small plants and communities, indeed of that whole area. I hope putting this agreement into place, the restructuring, and the creating of a new company, will be a positive factor in bringing about an agreement to deliver offshore fish to those resource-short plants.

I want to address something not contained in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, which gives me a great deal of concern. It is an idea that I for one have had for a number of years now, although it did not rest solely with me. There are a number of other people in the Province who had it as well, including the president of the fishermen's union. The idea was for a northern development corporation to operate those plants in the northern part of Newfoundland and along the coast of Labrador which were not being operated very well or at all by private enterprise. The Government would create for them and that area north of the 50th parallel a special northern development corporation. That idea is not contained in this particular Bill although it was recommended in the Kirby report. After looking at a number of options for northern Newfoundland and Labrador, his recommendation is as follows:

> Amend the Saltfish Act to allow the Canadian Saltfish Corporation to buy, process and market fish and fish products in addition to saltfish in that part of the Great Northern Peninsula of Newfoundalnd north of 50° and in Labrador and the Québec north shore of the Gulf. In particular, the Canadian Saltfish Corporation might purchase and operate the plants such as the one it operated in the summer of 1982 at St. Anthony, though it would not have any monopoly on the purchase, processing or marketing of uncured fish in this area.

In the summer of 1982, Mr. Speaker, Fishery Products decided it would close its plant at St. Anthony. The people there were left with no place to land and process their fish, so the Government of Canada asked the Saltfish Corporation to step in. They did so, operated the plant well and at a profit. Certainly for several years before it had been operating at a loss. What Mr. Kirby is saying is that we want that idea to continue to be enshrined in legislation and to continue in the foreseeable future for the people of that area. What he says to supplement and support his recommendation is as follows:

> The key to economic development in the area is to ensure that the fishery is organized for the benefit of local participants, and that cross-subsidization takes place internal to the local area. Thus, for example, profits from shrimp allocations might be used to cross-subsidize losses on groundfish plants, or revenues from possible over-the-side sales could be channelled into investments in shore processing facilities and infrastructure.

He goes on to say:

> The Task Force favours the use of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation (CSC) as the 'designated instrument' for fisheries, economic, social and community development in the northern area of Newfoundland and Québec. However, we do not recommend that it be given a monopoly over fish processing or marketing in this area.
>
> The vulnerability of the area to outside decisions not in the best interests of the area became clear this spring with the closure of the plant in St. Anthony—a problem that was resolved only by federal government intervention to re-open the plant. This experience showed how well plants can be operated if all concerned appreciate that they are working for themselves and their community rather than for the benefit of a distant head office.

He then says:

> We favour a change in the mandate of the CSC over the option of a more broadly based development corporation because the Saltfish Corporation is already operating in the area and because a new agency would take time to set up. Moreover, a new agency would create another level of bureaucracy that would have to co-ordinate (or be co-ordinated by) a multitude of federal and provincial agencies. We believe it would be preferable to use the present fisheries Crown corporation, with its existing expertise and presence in the area, to act as the agent for change, with its activities, and those of other federal and provincial agencies, co-ordinated by existing mechanisms.

● (1420)

He also says:

> We reject the view that the change in the mandate of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation would result in its special role eventually creeping into other areas. Its role would be defined in legislation, and any expansion of the geographic area to which its enlarged mandate would apply would require amendments to that legislation.

After having looked at options, Kirby is clearly on record as saying that the best, easiest, quickest, most profitable and effective option in the long term is to amend the mandate of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation to allow it to act as the agent for change in that particular area.

I would like to talk about that particular area. A lot of the Members in this House will not know it, but it is an area which I would term as one of the most disadvantaged in Canada. It may be economically poor but I would not say it is the poorest. It is disadvantaged in terms of development and the possibility of taking advantage of the vast resources off its shore.

The richest cod stocks we have are off the coast of Labrador. Yet Labrador fishermen and plant workers probably benefit least of all from those stocks. There are giant shrimp stocks which only now, thanks to the previous Minister of Fisheries, are we able to take advantage of. There are char and salmon. Yet in spite of having those stocks, the development has not taken place.

We have to look after the companies and the structures that are in place, but I intend to see that attention is paid to those who live in disadvantaged areas of northern Newfoundland and Labrador. If this Party is serious about its philosophy of helping first those who need help most, it will look at the situation in northern Newfoundland and Labrador and will give a lot of support to this particular idea.

The Province of Newfoundland has said that it is in favour of the Saltfish Corporation per se, and is not against having it as a vehicle. The Premier said in a speech in the House of Assembly recently that although the Province supports in principle the idea of a northern fisheries development corporation, it feels that there have to be checks and balances to ensure a strong provincial and federal influence in fisheries development. He feels the current amendment does not offer the Province those checks and balances.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see an amendment to this particular Bill which will put into practice what Kirby has

recommended. The Government of Newfoundland has said it would like more time to study this matter. At a future date I may propose an amendment to this Bill which will put into practice what Kirby has recommended but which will not proclaim that amendment in law until such time as the Provinces of Newfoundland and Quebec, if this is to apply in that Province too, have been consulted.

Possibly there are other ways of doing what we want to do but I have not been shown them to the present time. I can accept that people may need more time to study this particular matter. However, I cannot accept that those plants will not open next Spring. At this time there is a great danger that if something is not done, not only will St. Anthony not open, but there will be plants along the Labrador coast which will not open next year. I cannot support or tolerate that, Mr. Speaker.

It is my intention to put forward at a later time an amendment that could possibly be of help. That amendment will propose changing the Saltfish Corporation Act to allow it to do what Kirby has recommended and what we believe should be done. If that particular vehicle is not the answer, I hope some other mechanism can be found. Until such other mechanism is found, I can only stand behind what the Kirby report has recommended.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I support this particular Bill. I believe it should be speedily passed by the House because it is extremely important to our Province. The fishery is the mainstay of Newfoundland. Possibly it is not the most lucrative industry that we have, but it is the most important in terms of culture and heritage as well as economically. The communities in rural Newfoundland and Labrador which are based on the fishery capture the heritage that has been passed on to us from the past. Without a strong fishing industry the very communities that give Newfoundland its unique culture and flavour would be very severely jeopardized. I hope this Bill can get speedy passage and this restructuring idea can be put into practice very swiftly indeed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there Hon. Members seeking to ask questions of the Hon. Member who has just spoken?

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the idea put forward by the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) that he would like to see a northern fisheries development corporation put in to effect to look after the fishing industry off the coast of Labrador and possibly northern Newfoundland. Could the Hon. Member elaborate on the way that such a corporation might be controlled? Who would sit on its board of directors? Does he envisage both provincial and federal membership? If such an organization ever came into being, how would it be financed? How much money is he looking for? Is it $50 million or $100 million? Where would that money come from? Would some of it come from the fishing operators? Would some of it come from the Province? What would he expect the federal Government to put into the kitty?

Mr. Rompkey: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that question was asked. The Government of Canada has already approved $15 million for the capitalization of this new venture. Although it has not yet gone through all of the Government channels that money has been approved by the Government of Canada and is ready to be spent on the capitalization of this new company once approval has been received. It is understood that plants would have to be bought and upgrading would have to be done.

The details regarding how it would operate have not been worked out. We are talking about the principle of setting up a northern development corporation. I can give an example of how the Canadian Saltfish Corporation has operated in the past, and that is to use agents. The Canadian Saltfish Corporation has operated as a clearing house for agents in the private sector up to the present time. It has told small companies that if they catch and process saltfish they will be the agents of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation and the Corporation will buy it from them. The Corporation will market the fish and if it gets a better price than it pays the fishermen, that money goes back to the actual fishermen involved.

I think the fishermen in Newfoundland would say that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation has been a blessing to them. All through this time when the fishery itself was suffering severely, the Canadian Saltfish Corporation and saltfish market was a positive force in the fishery in Newfoundland. In 1982 the Canadian Saltfish Corporation ran the plant at St. Anthony. It had a subsidiary company. Although we did not have an actual board of directors from the community, there was an advisory group in the community that advised the Saltfish Corporation.

I would be open and flexible regarding how this would operate. I fully support the idea of the Government of Newfoundland having a say in this because fish plants are a provincial operation. I welcome the co-operation that we have seen between the two Governments. I would not want to see it dissipate. I believe there are ways of ensuring that the provincial voice is heard in the operation of this particular company.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey). My question relates to that underlying misgiving that I detected in his comments relating to the uncertainty of the role that the individual processor can have under this Bill.

• (1430)

Given the deplorable record of his Government in handling the fisheries problems off the East Coast, what gives him any encouragement at all to feel that under this Bill, where there is nothing explicit in this regard, due account will be made for these individual processors? I would like to hear his comments. I suspect that he has real misgivings here that the Government may not take into account the proper role of the individual processor?

Mr. Rompkey: Mr. Speaker, my approach is to fight one battle at a time. I do not think we can solve all of the problems

today. I believe we have laboured long and hard to get where we are today.

I said that this Bill is not perfect but it is the best that we can do. It is the best that the human mind could come up with and the best on which two Governments could agree. It is a step we had to take today and I think we should take it quickly because I believe it is important for the industry in Newfoundland.

It does not answer all the concerns. I do have concerns about the small, independent processors. However, I will say that they have survived in the past in spite of the fact that we know what has happened to the larger companies. I think the Government of Canada has been cognizant of their operations and indeed I know specific instances where Government programs were used to support the small, independent processors.

I do have some concerns. I do not believe that all my concerns are answered today by this Bill but that is a battle we will have to fight at a later time. All of us who are concerned about those small, independent processors will have to make sure that within the mechanism that is set up and within Government policy generally, those small processors who have survived and have given employment to small communities are not left out in the cold but are looked after. I believe that very firmly and strongly.

I make the commitment to the Hon. Member that I, for one, will see to it in the days to come that their interests are not neglected but indeed very much looked after.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I was interested in hearing the Hon. Member from Newfoundland talk about the importance of the fisheries in terms of the heritage of Newfoundland, the importance of these corporations and agencies and why we in Parliament should be very supportive of him.

My brief comment is that I am just a farm boy from the Prairies and I do not know much about fish. However, I support what he says and the way he said it with respect to the necessity to recognize this as an important part of the heritage of the people of Newfoundland. I am hopeful that the House will be very supportive of helping the fishermen.

Why did he not support us when we talked about the importance of the Crow rate to the heritage of the Prairies? Why did we not get the same kind of support from him? I put that in the form of a question because I am curious why we could not persuade him to support us for something that was very important to the heritage of our country and to what our pioneers built? Why was the Member not very supportive of us and would he be more supportive of us in the future?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not obliged to answer a question.

Mr. Rompkey: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for his support for this particular Bill and for what I am trying to accomplish. However, I would have to say to him, as he said, that I am from another part of the country and perhaps I do not fully understand the implications of what the Crow is doing. But in answer to his question, I would just read from an editorial in the *Edmonton Journal:*

> The federal NDP fought for the old Crow as though it were fighting for its own life—which it is in Manitoba and Saskatchewan.
>
> The federal Tories counselled delay as they tried to come down on both sides of the fence.
>
> In the end, the Liberals came to Western Canada's rescue, mostly under the leadership of former Transport Minister Jean-Luc Pepin. For this, the Liberals deserve our thanks.

I put that on the record as being as impartial, I suggest, as one would want to get—certainly from my perspective—from the *Edmonton Journal*. If it says good things about the Liberals it should not be questioned. That would be my answer.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: One short comment because time is almost up.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, I do not care what the Edmonton paper says; I want to know what the Member feels because I would like to support him and what is important to his heritage. I want to know how he feels as a Member about my heritage and my part of the country.

Mr. Rompkey: Mr. Speaker, in order to accomplish things in the long term sometimes tough decisions must be taken which are painful in the short term. We have experienced this in the Atlantic region. I can tell the Hon. Member that in the same way he may feel some people are experiencing this in the West, we have seen changes in CN Express in Newfoundland. We have seen some changes in the marine coastal operations. We have also seen a lot of improvements. We in the Atlantic Provinces feel that we should be putting our money into what is important in the long term for our area. While that may cause some change and short-term pain, I believe in the long term that the politics that are put into place will be beneficial.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for that exchange which took place just now because I think we must regard this particular legislation in the same way as the Prairies regarded the Crow Bill. Fisheries and fish are to the East Coast, and particularly to Labrador, what grain and grain shipment are to the Prairies. There is no question about that in my mind.

Whether this Bill is doing the right thing or not is another matter but it is an important Bill. I call Bill C-170 the FishCan Bill because I think we are looking toward the emergence of a creature of Crown proportions which we might call FishCan. My initial comments on this Bill relate to the unusual form which this Bill takes. I do not know how many Members have noticed that it is almost in the form of a resolution rather like the Constitution with all its "whereases". In fact, there are four whereas clauses before we come to the Bill's short title. I examined a couple of Bills in the consolidated statutes to see whether there is any parallel to other legislation. It may very well be that when this Bill is published in the Statutes of Canada, the preamble will vanish and it will begin with the short title. However, I still find it rather unusual that there should be these reasons for bringing

the Bill forward through the "whereas clauses". I hope the Minister or some other Member opposite will be able to explain that to us. This Bill has been brought forward in an unusual form.

I wish to confine myself to three or four comments on specific areas related to this Bill. My first comment concerns a caution that we must all bear in mind. We are seeing emerge from this Bill a monstrous creature of two Governments which, by what must be a very formal agreement, are deciding to act in concert for the salvation of an important industry. During the preparation of my speech I saw in the material the notion that this Bill is not going to create a Crown corporation. I find that extremely difficult to understand. Perhaps it is a two-Crown corporation since the federal and the provincial Governments are entering into the agreement together. It will have to be a double Crown corporation similar to the dual monarchy in the Austrian-Hungarian empire. Perhaps that is why I have read that it will not be a Crown corporation.

Nevertheless, the manner in which this particular creature of Governments will be acting will be similar to a Crown corporation. This leads me to the conclusion and fear that this may just be a model for something that is going to come about on the West Coast as well.

● (1440)

In this connection I would draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, the reply made yesterday by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) to a question put to him by the Hon. Member for Nanaimo-Alberni (Mr. Miller). As reported at page 28940 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans replied to that question as follows:

> I hope that early in the new year I will be able to put before cabinet an important program to give a new start to the Pacific fisheries, exactly as we have been doing for the Atlantic fisheries.

I am sure the NDP will be delighted at this particular operation. It looks very much as though we are going to have two Crown corporations, one on the East Coast and one on the West Coast. I think though that it will be done in the face of a great deal of opposition.

The direction by Governments of industries of this sort is contrary to the whole philosophy of the fishermen on the West Coast. I speak with some knowledge of one particular group, and I venture to say that even the UFAWU might have some misgivings at being bunched under the same Crown with a number of other enterprisers in that part of Canada in an effort to model, direct, control and put fisheries into a common mould on the West Coast. I wonder how, given the dreadful record of this Government in managing anything in the enterprise field, it should have the temerity to stand before us and bring forward another management technique. However, it was a decision in many respects, I suppose, which was forced upon them by the consequences of past performance. I will come to that in a few minutes. In order to bail itself out and to bail out those enterprises which the Government has virtually destroyed, it has had to resort to this particular means.

I do think it is worth entering a word of caution at this stage about the impact and the long-term significance of a move of this sort—the creation of a Crown corporation, with virtually unlimited powers, to enter a field of enterprise.

My next comment relates to a peculiar what I think must be described as a conflict, if not of laws, at least a conflict of Bills. In Bill C-170 we have the proposal that the federal and provincial Governments enter into agreements to run a fisheries enterprise. They are doing this in any manner that results in control in fact, whether directly through the ownership of shares, stocks, equity or securities. In other words, there will be an equity position of Governments in this operation.

I see in the Newfoundland agreement, the only one so far of which there is any text, that the proportions as between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland of the common shares of the enterprise shall be for the Government of Canada to hold 60 per cent and for the Government of Newfoundland to hold 25 per cent, with the remainder partly being held by the Bank of Nova Scotia and a small proportion being held by the employees. More employee participation would obviously be welcomed. But the point I am trying to make—and I think this needs to be underlined—is that the Government of Canada, once the restructuring is completed, will hold the shares in the proportion of 60 per cent, with 20 per cent held by the Government of Newfoundland. That is as foreseen by an agreement that will depend on Bill C-170.

I have before me Bill S-31 which we shall be seeing, no doubt, in the not too distant future. I would like to read Clause 3 of that Bill into the record because it deals with limitations. It reads as follows:

> Subject to section 6, no government shall hold or beneficially own more than ten per cent of the shares of any class of shares of a corporation.

Let me point out that the Bill states 10 per cent. We are talking on the one hand of 60 per cent ownership by the federal Government and 25 per cent ownership by the Government of Newfoundland in Bill C-170. But here is Bill S-31 which has a specific purpose in mind, but it has limitations of ownership in any corporation and any Government. The definitions make that quite clear as follows:

> "government" means Her Majesty in right of a province and includes
>
> (a) an agent of Her Majesty in that right, and
>
> (b) a body corporate that is controlled by Her Majesty in that right.

That limits that Government's participation to 10 per cent. We are talking about an agreement that has already been concluded, according to the Government of Newfoundland, giving a 25 per cent share in this enterprise. I have a funny feeling that this Government does not know what it is doing. Its right hand does not know what its left hand is doing. Mainly it is left-handed; I mean that in the philosophical sense. I am not talking about ambidexterity at all; I am talking about philosophical leftists. That is the problem. I guess it has two left hands and one of the left hands does not know what the other one is doing.

Ten per cent as against 25 per cent causes me considerable concern, Mr. Speaker. We will in the course of time, no doubt,

be asked to look at Bill S-31. Unless we are aware that Bill C-170 has already accorded to a Government a holding of more than 10 per cent in a corporation, then we may just blunder into accepting S-31 without thinking.

There is one proviso we have to recognize also. This is the other side of the story; it is to be found in Clause 6. Clause 3 does say "subject to Section 6". Clause 6(2) of Bill S-31 reads:

The Governor in Council may by order declare that setion 3 or 5 or both shall not apply in respect of any corporation or class of corporations specified in the order.

Section 3 above referred to is Clause 3 I read earlier. The Governor in Council "may" order. In other words, this is not going to be a parliamentary decision; this will be a Government decision. If Bill S-31 were to be passed and be matched side by side with Bill C-170, we would find that the Government would eventually catch up to itself and that it had passed some inconsistent legislation. Then, without reference to Parliament, it will by order declare that Clause 3 shall not apply. This is a danger which I think is worth drawing attention to.

My next comment relates to international agreements. I noticed something in the agreement worked out with Newfoundland, and this is drawn from a press release issued by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans dated October 31. There is provision in the agreement the federal Government worked out with the Province of Newfoundland for the creation of a resources utilization task force composed of equal representation from the two levels of Government. One of the prime objectives of the mandate of this task force will be to review and report upon, first, the displacement of foreign fishing effort and, second, the harvesting of underutilized species and the development of markets for those species.

● (1450)

This takes us back a few years to the days just before the unilateral declaration by the Government—and it is an honourable declaration—of a 200-mile exclusive economic zone, in particular the 200-mile fishing zone. Prior to that declaration there was forethought; there is no question about that. However, what was behind the conclusion of the agreements with foreign countries for the exploitation of stocks, particularly on the East Coast, was the assurance that the countries with which Canada was concluding agreements would be on the same side as Canada in the discussions relating to the Law of the Sea Conference. That was a worthy objective.

What happened in order to buy that support for subsequent meetings of the Law of the Sea, which is very important to us, was that certain countries, some for historic reasons and some for perhaps philosophical reasons, were granted authority to fish stocks in our waters within the 200-mile limit, stocks which were not utilized by Canadian offshore fishermen. I am speaking only of the East Coast at the moment. It may be of interest to Hon. Members opposite, who may not have looked into the matter very deeply, to learn that the countries with which Canada concluded agreements to use surplus stocks and stocks Canadians did not use, did not have to process them in Canada. I will come back to that in a moment, but they were to take off the stock for use in their own countries or for use in barter deals with third countries.

The countries with which Canada made arrangements at that time were Bulgaria, Cuba, the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Romania, an interesting collection. In addition, of course, there were the historical fishermen off the East Coast—Denmark, France, United Kingdom, Portugal and Spain. Probably Portugal and Spain were fishing off the East Coast before any Canadians were here. They had their historical rights. As for Romania, I wonder. Was Romania fishing there before Canada was settled? Was Bulgaria fishing there before Canada was settled? What about Cuba? Perhaps Cuba, through Spain, was fishing there. Were the German Democratic Republic and Poland fishing off the East Coast before Canada was settled?

Mr. Waddell: The German Democratic Republic was looking for red snappers.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): That is probably what they were after. As a matter of fact, they were fishing for capelin and other unused and surplus stocks. What was forgotten in the conclusion of those agreements was that once those surplus stocks were caught, they should have been brought to the mainland or to Newfoundland to be processed. That is part of the dismal record of the Government. It did not ensure that what was caught in our waters was processed on our shores. Now we find that it has to resort to extraordinary devices such as dual Crown corporations which have been devised in order to rescue an ailing but important industry.

I do not deny—and I mentioned it right at the beginning—that the fishing industry on the East Coast is extremely important, as it is on the West Coast. However, I am talking mainly about the East Coast because we are dealing with an East Coast matter. This is another aspect of the Bill which has not been given proper attention. Are you feeling uneasy, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Your time has just about expired.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): That being so, I thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and will conclude my remarks. I have more, though.

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro). I was very interested in his presentation and in the facts to which he referred about the amounts of Canadian fish being taken by countries that cannot claim to have historic fishing rights off Newfoundland, countries such as Bulgaria and Romania. If the Hon. Member suddenly became Secretary of State for External Affairs or Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, how would he approach the problem? Presumably we have agreements with these countries that cannot be abrogated out of hand. How would he go about reducing the catch taken by these other countries?

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) for his

question. It would not be an easy matter to abrogate treaties. I do not think treaties can be abrogated. Canada has no tradition of abrogating treaties. However, the treaties are for a term and when they come up for renegotiation, the most suitable manner of renegotiating them would be to allow the take to continue, provided the processing was done on Canadian territory.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I have just a short question for the Hon. Member. It follows on the heels of something which he raised. It deals with the matter of putting their position on the record. We probably share some common positions on the matter. However, since he raised it and since there are many outstanding issues, would the Hon. Member put on the record his Party's position on cancellation of B fishing licences? What kind of action would his Party take against chartered banks that have been very difficult on fishermen over the last couple of years with vessel seizures in some of the most nefarious circumstances which could be conjured up?

What is its position on the removal of such things as the punitive tax on fuel which is extremely difficult for fishermen? What position has his Party put forward on that? What is its position on the delay in providing adequate harbour facilities? As he knows, the fishing industry is under tremendous strain. What is his Party's position on icing facilities, harbour and mooring facilities? We know its position on restraint, but where does it stand on assisting and developing the economy? What is his position on fleet reduction and fleet structure when the reduction is complete? Finally, what is the position of his Party on royalty and the proposal for finnage tax? The previous speaker did raise the spectre of parallels between East Coast solutions and West Coast solutions. His Party had better put some of those positions on the record very quickly so that people can make judgments.

● (1500)

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. My friend from the New Democratic Party is, of course, playing a game this afternoon. This is a very serious debate on a Bill which is designed to alleviate a crisis situation in Atlantic Canada. The question that my NDP friend from the West Coast of British Columbia is asking of my colleague who just spoke has almost no relevance whatsoever to what we are discussing today. He knows perfectly well that on all of those questions there has been plenty of evidence in committee and in other places and at meetings I have attended as well as press releases I have made on the West Coast which has given adequate answers. I urge, Mr. Speaker, that you exercise your prerogative and rule him out of order.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Hopefully the Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) will keep his comments short.

Mr. Skelly: Yes, Mr. Speaker, very definitely. The problems in some areas are common to fishermen on both coasts. Second, the previous speaker raised the matter in a somewhat flippant and frivolous manner. If they continue to do that, they should put up or shut up on the issue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) has a brief period in which to comment, if he cares to do so. However, the Chair would caution him on relevance.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I shall be absolutely relevant to the questions that were asked.

Mr. Skelly: Don't flounder now.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I am no piker, I can assure you of that. The quickest way to find out what are the policies of a Progressive Conservative Government would be to support the Progressive Conservatives in a call for an election. Then you will find out that there is a much more co-ordinated and rational policy on the West Coast and on the East Coast for the fisheries.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is the Hon. Member for Western Arctic rising for questions and answers?

Mr. Nickerson: For debate, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I was concerned that the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) was standing both this morning and again this afternoon. I do not have in front of me a list of speakers. If the Hon. Member for Western Arctic is agreeable, I will recognize the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway. I am reminded that earlier today I indicated that there would be two Official Opposition speakers as a result of the consent that was given in the House. Perhaps I should look the other way. I will ask the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway to stand down for a moment and I will recognize, pursuant to the agreement made earlier today, the Hon. Member for Western Arctic.

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I enter this debate unhampered by any degree of first-hand knowledge of the issue we are discussing. Therefore, I can assure you that my views will be entirely objective. I also want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that despite my name being Nickerson, I have absolutely no conflict of interest with this Bill. As far as I know, I have no relationship with the well-renowned Nickersons of Nova Scotia who have had a long and honourable association with the fisheries business. In discussing the Bill before us today, Bill C-170, which seeks to facilitate the reorganization of the Atlantic Fisheries, I want to go back a bit in history.

Canada is extremely well endowed with natural resources. Not only do we have fish on the East Coast, West Coast and the inland areas, we also have minerals, oil and gas and a lot of good agricultural land. Despite this endowment by nature, we are not the world's wealthiest country, which we should be. I suspect that our climatic conditions may have a little bit to do with this, but I am sure that the main reason in the other resource industries is the same as in the fishing industry, namely that we have been pursuing the wrong policies for

many years. The Government of the day always wants to concentrate on those sexy industries in central Canada.

We get carried away with computers and microchip technology and forget that probably the real wealth of Canada is in the resource industries, agriculture, timber husbandry, mineral development and, the matter we are discussing today, fisheries. Europeans first came to Canadian East Coast waters in the sixteenth century, I believe, to exploit the fantastic potential of the fisheries in that area. They have been there ever since.

Just a few years ago on the occasion of the extension of Canada's fishing boundary up to the 200-mile limit, I remember reading in publications such as the *Financial Post* that the future of the Canadian East Coast was assured because these moves had been taken. It looked like that part of the country was to become the most wealthy part of Canada. I wonder why this never took place. It never worked out the way the predictions said it would happen.

I guess that costs continued to escalate in large part because of the Government's inflationary policy, high interest rate policy and taxation on petroleum products, which are so important to the fishery, and also because of its high income tax on fishermen. The Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey), who I would have suspected would have had the best interests of fishermen at heart when he was Minister of National Revenue, came down harder than any previous Minister of National Revenue in Canada on the fishermen whom he represented. Therefore the costs have increased.

The market demand for the products of the East Coast fishery unfortunately has not escalated in the way we had hoped. Perhaps some of the problems brought to light by my friend, the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro), such as the continued volume of East Coast fish being taken by foreign competitors, has something to do with that. Because the market demand has not been there, prices have not risen as we anticipated. In fact, they decreased considerably in many instances.

My colleagues from the East Coast described the failure of the Liberal Government fisheries policy much better than I could do. They demonstrated in this House how these failures of Liberal policy have exacerbated a bad market situation. We come to the present time where the major part of East Coast fishery, the deep sea industry and the operators of large plants, are bankrupt to all intents and purposes. Faced with this question, what is it that a Government should do? I guess that if we could look at this in strictly academic terms and run the whole fisheries of Canada out of the building across the way from here and did not have to bother with the social issues the way they should be faced, the Government would have to do very little or nothing. We could let the fishing companies, the processors and the banks take their losses. I suspect that after awhile, the industry would reorganize itself. It would not need a Bill from this House. Somebody would eventually come along and buy out the assets at ten cents on the dollar or whatever the market value of those assets were. Some of the smaller marginal plants would probably be closed down and the purchaser would get the industry going again. Perhaps some of successful smaller companies that exist at the present time would take over some of the plants that are not operated economically by the larger companies.

● (1510)

It is unfortunate but true that we cannot allow that to happen. I do not think any Government of Canada could allow that to happen because, Sir, the social consequences would be disastrous. I listened carefully to the speech made by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Tobin) yesterday, and I am convinced that what he said could happen in those parts of Newfoundland that he represents would come true were the Government to do nothing. Therefore, the Government must do something and must be seen to be trying to do something.

The plan that we have before us now would see possibly two large fish companies coming into existence with part Government ownership at the provincial and federal levels in which the bank and the fishing companies would have some interest. It would appear that an agreement has been reached in the case of the Province of Newfoundland, but unfortunately it appears that negotiations have already broken down with the Province of Nova Scotia.

I have listened to the debate so far in the House, Mr. Speaker, and I have found it quite interesting. It is a debate that has not broken down along Party lines. It has broken down along geographic lines with Hon. Members representing the deep sea areas where these large companies operate generally being very supportive of the Bill. The two Hon. Members who represent the constituencies of St. John's East and St. John's West, for instance, and the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries have spoken in favour of the Bill. We on this side of the House have listened to those arguments and see the reason in them. For those reasons, we will not oppose this Bill on second reading.

However, we on this side of the House have also listened to Members such as the Hon. Member for Gaspé (Mr. Cyr) and several Hon. Members from Prince Edward Island on both sides of the House. We have listened to the Hon. Members for Gloucester (Mr. Breau), South Shore (Mr. Crouse) and South West Nova (Miss Campbell). The Hon. Member for South West Nova was extremely vocal on this issue yesterday. These Hon. Members representing the inshore areas and the small plant areas have a very different perception of the Bill.

The people in those areas are scared of what might result from this Bill if it is taken to its logical conclusion in the years to follow. They see a very large Government backed competitor possibly becoming a monopoly. They see these large organizations having a great power in the marketplace that is not available to the smaller operators. I can see that possibly, a couple of years down the road, the Government will be coming back to the House of Commons asking for an exclusive monopoly on marketing by these corporations. I certainly

would be very scared of that if I were a small fisherman or small plant owner or operator.

The Government, Sir, controls all of the rules of the game in the fishing business. It controls the quotas and the regulations governing the way in which one might fish. The Government decides where improvements such as wharves and harbours might be built. This would cause me great concern were I to be a small fisherman or small fish plant operator. Those small fishermen and small fish plant operators are scared of the competition from highly subsidized Government backed competitors.

In a way it is ironic, or perhaps it shows how the market system operates fairly well when left alone, that many of these small operators, even with today's depressed prices, have still been successful, especially those who concentrate their business on a selected area of the market. We have heard of the experience of plants specializing in lobsters or scallops, for instance.

I believe that the fears voiced by these people are fully justified. I have had some experience with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. The experience we have had in the West and the North is that when the Government first comes in, it is not satisfied until it gets full control of the market. It keeps getting a little bit more and a little bit more control until it ends up with a full and complete monopoly. All of the small fish buyers in my constituency were swallowed up by this Crown corporation and the industry has been nationalized. The fisherman has no alternative but to sell his product to the nationalized company at the prices it dictates. There is no freedom left in the industry.

If the Liberals stay in office in this country, and I do not believe there is much of a possibility for that to happen, then I am sure that what has happened with the FFMC would also happen on the East Coast. This, Sir, is feared by many, including myself, as being the first step in a wholesale nationalization of the East Coast industry. If I have time, toward the end of my presentation I will make suggestions for possible amendments to the Bill which would see that these worst fears will not be realized.

As well, Sir, judging by the experience I have had with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, I can guarantee that nobody but nobody is worse at selling fish than those in the Government. Bureaucrats simply cannot sell fish. They are not equipped to sell fish. There is no way that they can sell fish.

There was once a viable industry in the Slave Lake area of my constituency. People went fishing in that lake and in the inland lakes nearby with the idea that they could make money, and they usually did. However, since the Government took the industry over, there is no longer a viable industry. It is entirely dependent upon subsidies. If those subsidies were to be taken away, the industry would die overnight. It is more like a welfare system than it is like a living industry at the present time. I would not want to see that happen to our friends on the East Coast of Canada.

The plan that is now before us was described by the Hon. Member for Egmont (Mr. Henderson) as being the lesser of many evils, and I am inclined toward that way of thinking. If we must accept that plan, then let us examine the Bill to see if it does what the Government says it is designed to do or if it can be improved. My first observation is that this is a typical Liberal Bill. It is designed to grant the Government wide-sweeping powers. The Hon. Member for Malpeque (Mr. Gass) spoke about these powers in a great deal of detail so I will not repeat what he said.

The Bill seeks to give the Government virtually carte blanche authority to do anything the Government wants with the East Coast fishery industry. Not only that, Sir, the Bill goes on forever and ever. The authority that the Government is seeking from Parliament never comes to an end but goes on forever. The Government says it needs extraordinary powers in order to reorganize the fisheries at the present time, but this Bill would give the Government those powers forever. The Government would have those powers not simply in the case of the present emergency but forever and ever. I think that that is unacceptable.

This Bill needs a very critical examination in committee. For instance, Subclause 8(1) gives the Government authority to invest up to $138 million until March 31, 1985. However, if we look at Subclause (2), we will find that there is no limit in the future. The Government can go through the normal Appropriation Act procedure whereby that Act is deemed to have been approved even if we do not debate it in the House for five minutes. So there is no real control over those appropriations. Government can come back in 1986 and put $300 million into it, and the following year a billion dollars, and there is nothing that Parliament can do.

● (1520)

I believe there has to be within this Bill a guaranteed maximum spending limit so that if the Government wants to exceed that, it has to come back to Parliament. I am pleased to see there is a limit on the amount of guarantees it can make. However, in my opinion, a limit should certainly be there in respect of the amount of cash it can spend and invest. To assuage the fear of back door nationalization, which has been spelled out by those Members who represent the smaller aspect of the industry, there should be within this Bill a specified limit of Government participation in any one of these entities which they intend to create.

My last point is that if we look at the Bill in its present form, it is like a lobster trap. We can get into it very easily, Sir, but it is going to be very difficult ever to get out unless we make the necessary amendments. There must be a way specified within the Bill as to the way it will end and the way we can get the East Coast fishing industry back into private hands where it really belongs. I would foresee a schedule laid out in the Act where the maximum participation which I mentioned previously would decline over a number of years. There would be a declining maximum participation specified over a period of a number of years.

Most important, there must be a termination date as to when the authority, which the Government is asking be granted to it by Parliament, comes to an end. By that date, the Government should make sure that the industry is returned to private hands and that the state no longer has an equity position in the East Coast fishery.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions or comments? Debate.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could say right away that I find it very ironic that what we are really faced with here is a Bill which nationalizes a very troubled East Coast fishing industry, at least the major part of the industry, creating the largest fish company in the world out of the rubble of the Nickerson National Sea empire. This is done by a Liberal Minister and that famous or infamous wheeler-dealer, Mr. Michael Kirby, and by two Conservative Premiers in Nova Scotia and in Newfoundland, and which is supported in the House today by the Conservative Party. I find it ironic because if we in the New Democratic Party were to do that, we would be condemned for being nasty socialists who were nationalizing a troubled company. Yet here are all these Hon. Members supporting this Bill.

I believe the Bill is a good idea and I am going to say something about that in my remarks. However, I want to say right away, Mr. Speaker, that, as the last speaker admitted at the beginning of his speech, I also am not an expert on fish. I am a long way away from being an expert in the fisheries. As a matter of fact, my riding is probably the only riding in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia which does not front on the ocean. However, I did want to say a few words today because I am very sympathetic to the Atlantic Canada region. I find certain similarities with my area of the country, namely, British Columbia. It is a region where one industry dominates, as in our part of the country where we have the forest and mining industries.

I can sympathize with the people of Atlantic Canada who, I am told, out of a population of two million, have about 100,000 directly employed in the fishing industry. Of course, many other people are employed as a result of spin-offs from the fishing industry. If you consider that there are nine million people in Ontario and about 75,000 are auto workers, which is one of the major industries in Ontario, you can understand how important the fishing industry is in terms of people being employed in Atlantic Canada. There is an additional problem in Atlantic Canada. If you look, Mr. Speaker, at the eastern seaboard of the United States, you find that people who are fishing there, when fishing is difficult, can always quit and go and work in manufacturing, then come back to the fishery a few years later. You cannot do that in Atlantic Canada because of the general economy there and the lack of a manufacturing base. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I understand that when you close a fish plant, just as when you close a mine or a pulp mill in British Columbia, it means a death sentence to a community.

I would like to ask why the fishing industry is in trouble. Why is it—if you will pardon the pun—floundering on a sea of red ink? I feel there are a number of reasons and I would like to go through them. I think there were tremendous expectations which came about because of the extension of the 200-mile limit. The result was overcapitalization in the industry. Another reason was the recession of 1980 which resulted in fewer products being sold and in lower prices to the fishermen. Therefore, there was a decline in sales and a decline in prices. I believe also that part of it was due to a management position to expand even at the beginning of tough times. Perhaps the reason was over-optimism, furthered by the hope of getting Government grants and so on.

The Liberal Government must bear some of the responsibilities for the difficulty in the industry, and the Conservative Government before it, because both the Clark Conservative Government and the present Liberal Government favoured high interest rates and monetarist policies.

Mr. Evans: Come on.

Mr. Waddell: The Hon. Member says, "Come on". I ask him to look at the interest rates in this country in the last three years.

Mr. Evans: Look at the height of the sky also.

Mr. Waddell: These high interest rates brought on by the Liberal Government, and the body which it controls, namely, the Bank of Canada, through its appointment of the Governor of the Bank of Canada, really squeezed out any hope that these fishing companies could make a go of it. So while some fishermen could even double their catch, they were tripling their debts and, as you know, Mr. Speaker, you cannot survive if you do that.

I would like to quote from some remarks which were made in this House by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Nanaimo-Alberni (Mr. Miller), who is the fisheries critic for our Party. I quote as follows from page 28,858 of *Hansard* for November 14, 1983:

> Companies had paid little enough attention to increasing the quality of their catch or improving their marketing strategies. This led to a decline in the ability to sell fish and the ability to support the economics of the industry.

What happened then was that the industry in fact collapsed. We then saw a deal between the present Fisheries Ministry, the Premier of Nova Scotia and the Premier of Newfoundland. That odd couple, Ottawa and Newfoundland, finally got together to deal with the fisheries industry. As I understand the Bill, it provides authority for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) to spend $138 million to restructure the groundfish processing sector in eastern Canada. This restructuring is based, as I said, on two agreements, one with Newfoundland and one with Nova Scotia. This will see the creation of two new super companies, the largest in the world, from the dregs of the five major and a few smaller processors. I do not think my colleague was here at the time, but I said that I find it ironic that this is nationalization of part of the

industry and while the Conservatives and Liberals are scampering not to say that, they are still supporting it.

● (1530)

The federal Government is going to inject $138 million in cash and hold the majority of shares in each company. The provincial Governments and the Bank of Nova Scotia, by converting debt into equity, will hold minority shareholder positions. Not bad for the Bank of Nova Scotia. Perhaps it gets rid of that tremendous debt on its fisheries account. The Nova Scotia agreement is not completely finalized, but in the Newfoundland agreement there is a potential for employee ownership and a seat for the union on the board of directors. Can you believe it? We might even be getting a little bit of progressive legislation. We might be able to get some legislation where employees of the company will start feeling they are really part of the whole process and will become more productive. That of course is the way to productivity, not by beating them over the head as the Conservative-Social Credit Government of British Columbia tends to do.

We in the NDP will be supporting the Bill, as I gather you have surmised, despite some of the shortcomings which I want to go into in a couple of minutes. There is no doubt that some form of intervention was necessary. As I said, many smaller communities in eastern Canada are completely reliant on the continued operation of the plants and related fishing activities. We do not see any viable alternative at this particular time. There is some necessity for getting this restructuring in place very soon, before the next fishing season, because sales contracts and renegotiation of the union contract are pending. I want to again quote our fisheries critic from his opening speech at page 28858 of *Hansard* where he said:

> It is necessary to proceed with this Bill because the future of the next fishing season in Atlantic Canada relies on it. If this Bill is not passed, if there is not a restructuring of the industry and if a board of directors is not appointed to the new companies in Atlantic Canada, there will be a great deal of uncertainty about markets and our ability to sell the product that is harvested over the next year. As well, the matter of negotiations between the fishermen's unions and the company for contracts in Atlantic Canada depends upon this Bill and suppliers must know whether the debts that are owed to them at the moment will be repaid. There are a great many other uncertainties in almost every community in Atlantic Canada and hundreds and hundreds of those communities are dependent upon the fishing industry.

That is all the more reason why the Bill should go to committee.

I gather, in following the debate, that the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) brought up the problem of smaller companies which are not included in this deal. I acknowledge that they need some assurance from the Government that they will not be forced out of business. Even a rampant socialist like myself can say that. There also needs to be some concerns about selling off the companies to foreign owners and so on. I also think we should not be in any hurry. I notice various speakers have talked about this hurry to have the Government bail out the industry, get it going again and then sell it out to private enterprise. If these big companies work, and if the workers in this industry can really feel they are part of the whole thing, that it is not "them and us", it is all "us" in these two large companies, then I would think we would want to continue with these companies. But that is looking into the future and that is difficult to do.

Before I sit down I do want to look into the future at one aspect. We all know Michael Kirby; he is a man who, I suppose, has made as many enemies in Atlantic Canada as he has made deals. But he is to be, if not congratulated, at least we will acknowledge his hard work and sincerity in getting these deals together. It is obviously a lot of hard work because there must be a minefield of competing interests in this area. However, I would like to caution the Government that, when it comes to dealing with the West Coast industry, and the Hon. Member for Nanaimo-Alberni and the Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) are much more expert on that industry than I am, the Government should be very careful in the way it treats the West Coast industry. It is a different kind of industry. If there is to be restructuring there, I ask the Government to do it openly with as much consultation as possible. Put everything on the table, because that is the way to negotiate. I would not want to repeat the spectre of the Crow in the sense of Ottawa taking the position, as viewed from western eyes, that Ottawa knows best and therefore we will force whatever restructuring we think the industry needs. I have my nose to the wind and I understand that there are some things about to happen to the industry on the West Coast, perhaps the purchasing of companies and so on, but I just say to the Government that it should be open and above-board and that there should be much consultation.

I think I have touched on all the areas I wanted to. I think the detail can be done in committee, where I hope the Bill will go soon. As someone who lives a long way from Atlantic Canada but who has a great deal of sympathy with what the people there are trying to do and what they are going through in the fishing industry, I wish them luck. They are going to need it. I wish them a future in a really viable industry. While there are problems, I think the Bill really sets the basis for doing that. It really is quite a unique opportunity for fishermen in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland to take from this dead, bankrupt industry and build something which can be really viable. All Canadians can be proud of a real working industry there.

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I know it is late on a Friday afternoon and perhaps everything that can be said about this Bill on second reading has been said, but I would like to add my comments to what Hon. Members have said in this Chamber.

First of all, there must be an absolutely clear understanding that this Bill must be accepted, perhaps reluctantly, by this House because the Government has put forward nothing else to meet a crisis which has continued now since at least the summer of 1981, and to which the Government has not made any adequate response. This is not to say that this Bill is a perfect Bill. Because the Government waited so long to act, the Bill amounts to a piece of enabling legislation to put into effect one agreement that has been entered into between the federal Government and the Province of Newfoundland and to give

power to implement another agreement which the federal Government hopes to enter into with the Province of Nova Scotia. It also enables the Government to establish a huge national fishing corporation. The bulk of the power to make decisions will rest with the Government, not only because of the structure of that fishing corporation, but because the Government already regulates and controls the resource to which all of the user groups of Atlantic Canada must resort. That is the fishery. The consequence of this is an establishment of immense state power. It is done in response to a crisis. The tragedy is that it is done in response to a crisis for which the Federal Government must take responsibility to a significant extent.

• (1540)

During the summer of 1981 my colleague, the former Minister of Fisheries, the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), was warning the Government that action was required. At that time it was quite clear that the companies were not going to be able to carry on for two reasons. The first reason was the difficulty because of markets. The second reason was over-expansion and the extreme difficulty in carrying the loans as a consequence of high interest rates. Those interest rates continued to go up. Those companies and the banks which had made loans to them were in a position where they could not get sufficient cash flow to get out of the difficulties.

During the 1980 elections the Hon. Member who is now the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) said that he would resign rather than belong to a Government that did not bring interest rates down. Tell that to the people in Atlantic Canada.

Mr. McGrath: They were 14 per cent then.

Mr. Fraser: At that time they were 14 per cent, as my hon. colleague points out.

An Hon. Member: And went up to 24 per cent.

Mr. Fraser: And went up to 24, as another hon. colleague points out. I am sure if I stand here for a few minutes, other rates will come to mind. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the situation in Atlantic Canada was clearly visible in the summer of 1981. All during that autumn, questions were asked in the House repeatedly. There was a special debate. The Minister of Fisheries at the time kept saying that the situation was not too severe. He was trying to get away from the responsibility that the Government of Canada held by saying it was the fault of the companies, they should not have built so many processing plants. In one speech he said that he had warned the corporations and companies, both large and small. While he was giving the warnings, the Department of Economic Expansion was putting up the money and practically forcing the industry to build the processing plants. The Government of Canada is the Government that controls the fishery and regulates its catch and allotments. It intervenes, and not always to good effect, into the fishery. The result of delay between 1981 and now resulted in a frantic attempt to be seen to be doing something.

In January of 1982 I was in St. John's, Newfoundland. I was asked what the Conservative Government would do if it were in power then. I said that the Atlantic fishery needed then an immediate influx, either through guarantees, loans or some other mechanism, of $100 million to stabilize the industry and to save the industry and the private sector in the industry. Mr. Kirby laughed. He said my figures were excessive. The then Minister of Fisheries laughed and said they had nothing like that amount in mind. Mr. Speaker, this Bill starts off with $138 million. It carries on to guarantees of $100 million. That does not even begin to count the money that has been committed to the Atlantic fishery as a consequence of the Kirby Report some months ago.

An Hon. Member: Fleet replacement.

Mr. Fraser: Fleet replacement and other things, as is properly pointed out by my hon. friend. Mr. Speaker, in the first week in January of 1982 we, who had an answer that would have retained a viable private fishing industry, were laughed at. We were told they were not even thinking of $100 million. If the Government had acted then there would have been no need for this particular Bill.

Mr. Pepin: Why didn't you act?

Mr. Fraser: As my hon. friend on the Liberal side of the House knows, in January of 1982 we were not the Government. He represented the Government and sat on the Treasury benches. The question is why he and his colleagues did not act. We could not act. The power in this House lay with the Government.

The Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) yesterday said: "There is no need for such a Bill". He was referring to this particular Bill. I agree there is no need for this particular Bill, but because of the neglect of his own Government there is need for a Bill. As I said at the beginning, we must, with reluctance, accept the passage of this Bill.

My hon. friend, the Liberal Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell) is from a part of Nova Scotia that understands well the difficulties of and also the opportunities for the Atlantic fishery. She said: "Certainly my constituents feel it will affect them, and they want more information . . . The powers the Bill gives to the Minister seem to be unlimited."

It is all very well for my hon. socialist friend, the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), to offer some caveats about the power in this Bill. It is understandable that he does so. While he wants to endorse nationalization, even he understands that the powers in this Bill are quite extraordinary. The Bill, in Clause 4, says the power is:

> To carry out the purpose of this Act, the minister may, on behalf of Her Majesty,
>
> (*a*) acquire, hold or dispose of or otherwise deal with shares, debentures or other securities of, or any security interest in, any fishery enterprise;

This Bill is a Bill to execute and implement one agreement and another that is hoped to be signed by the Government. The Bill does not confine itself just to the subject of the agreements, which are not mentioned in the Bill. It gives power to do these things with other fishery companies which may well not be in financial difficulty at the moment and which we can call the independents. Because of the neglect of the Government over a long period of time something had to be done. The people in Atlantic Canada cannot be thrown out of work completely. Their means of making a living cannot just disintegrate as a consequence of this neglect.

● (1550)

But there is another section of the Atlantic fishery of which other Hon. Members, especially on the Government side, have spoken. That sector views this piece of legislation with concern. They do not want to see fellow fishermen thrown out of work and do not want to see a large part of the Atlantic fishery collapse. They do not want to see it forced to go through a painful process of re-establishment.

They also do not want their viable, effective and competent part of the industry to go under, which is a concern of theirs over the sweeping powers of this Bill. My hon. friend from the NDP commented on this a few minutes ago. The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway said that some form of intervention was necessary. I understand that, because I am aware of the political ideology which lies behind that statement. However, even he recognized the concern of the independents. He said, "They need some assurance that they will not be forced out of business". This matter has not only been raised by my colleagues from the NDP who are the advocates of nationalization and socialization but also by my colleagues on the Government side. While they are perhaps more content with intervention and nationalization than some others in the House, they too have raised the concern of fellow fishermen in Atlantic Canada about the extraordinarily immense power of this particular Bill. They have commented that for all practical purposes there is no accountability. While the Hon. Minister can argue that parliamentary approval is required in order to get additional sums, we know that that is not the kind of accountability that is required. What is required is a constant reporting mechanism to the House.

Hon. Members on the Government side also know that the independents in their part of Atlantic Canada are getting clear signals from the banks and the investment community that there will be a diminution of the necessary funds for them to carry on and plan their business affairs until there is a more clear idea of what kind of power might be exercised under this Act.

Since this alarm has been raised by all Members of the House—I fully compliment my friends on the Liberal side for having the good sense to recognize it for what it is—I hope that those Members from Atlantic Canada on the Government side will come forward at committee stage and assist us in bringing forward some witnesses who will be able to help us perhaps in making amendments which might be necessary to alleviate that concern. I also hope that all Members of the House will address themselves to the question of accountability.

There is another side to this legislation. It is the intention of the Government eventually to reprivatize the capital assets and corporate structure that will be taken over by the Government, at least in the initial stage. It is terribly important that if there is to be any capacity to reprivatize, the independent sector of the Atlantic fishery must not become so frightened or concerned that it ceases to have economic viability to be in a position to help the Government in its stated objectives of reprivatization. Those of us who have put many long days and weeks into the study of the Atlantic fishery and have spoken here on many occasions in support of a viable and effective Atlantic fishery want to be assured that there will be an honest expression of intention made very clear during the committee and further stages of this Bill. We want to be clear that the objective is indeed to withdraw Government intervention as soon as possible.

I think it has been made very clear from the debate so far that all Members of the House, for different reasons, understand that this Bill must now be accepted. I also believe that all Members understand there are some problems with the Bill. For instance, the Hon. Member for Gloucester believes that this Bill should not have been necessary. Although he says it is not necessary now, I believe it is. Perhaps the Bill could be in another form, but something must be done. We do not believe that the situation had to develop to this point but it has, and on behalf of my Party we are saying to all people involved in the Atlantic fishery that we know the Bill must now be accepted and we will do nothing to prevent the Government from doing those things that must be done now to maintain employment and some kind of viability in the Atlantic fishery.

But we must also say to others in Atlantic Canada that we are very conscious indeed that this Bill must be watched carefully. The powers contained in it must be constrained to meet the Government's stated objective eventually to withdraw and allow the Altantic fishery to carry on in a viable and healthy way with as much private initiative as possible.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think there is a disposition that we put the question at the second reading on this Bill. Perhaps subsequent to putting the question, we might call it five o'clock.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has suggested that there may be a disposition that the Chair should see the clock as five o'clock. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Agreed and so ordered. It being five o'clock I do now leave the chair until eleven o'clock Monday morning.

At 4 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 21, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—RESOURCE INDUSTRIES

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River) moved:

That this House regards the Government's failure to take action to encourage the development of Canada's resource industries and ensure their competitiveness in world markets as a betrayal of all Canadians whose standard of living depends upon the resource sector of Canada's economy and calls upon the Government to bring an end to the nationalization of Canadian resource industries which has discouraged investment in Canada; introduce tax incentives to restore competitive advantage and stimulate resource production and further processing in Canada; initiate a program of incentives for research and development; and incentives for marketing activities of Canadian industries.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the House will not be surprised that we should have chosen to put aside a day in the busy life of Parliament to discuss the state of our primary resource sector, and therefore the economy in general. Naturally we would have preferred to discuss issues so vital to the well-being of our entire nation and her people in connection with any Government initiatives.

Despite our strong urgings here in the House and the danger signals which we are receiving from the industry, the unions, and the scientific community associated with it, and from the investment communities that invest in the resource sector, this Government sticks stubbornly to a deliberate policy of indifference and neglect. This Government sees our primary resources such as trees and minerals as artesian fountains of wealth which will flow uninterruptedly to be tapped and sapped at every stage without regard to the health of the resource itself or the industries that are sustained by it. It makes no difference whether we talk of our forests which could be, with reasonable care, renewable, or the minerals which we extract and refine and which are such an important part of our commerce and trade. This Government's only interest is what these industries can be made to contribute to satisfy the monstrous appetite for public revenues to support a spending spree over which no one any longer has any control.

My colleagues will, in the course of this debate, Mr. Speaker, tell you of some of the horror stories which are the result of 15 years of Liberal mismanagement. We will speak of the imminent crisis facing our resource sector. We will also point out the great opportunities that we have missed in the past and will surely miss in the future if we fail to act responsibly and decisively to arrest the disease which has been inflicted on private sector industries in general and the resource sector in our economy in particular.

I share the view of many economists who say that Canada could hardly survive as an important and viable trading nation without its resource wealth, if for no other reason than the fact that the volume and potential for growth of one's industrial production is, in the main, limited by the size of one's markets. All of us want to expand our secondary manufacturing capacities and our markets for such products through trade with foreign countries. But it is in the resource sectors wherein lies our natural strength and advantage. It is our resource industries which provide the foundation for the economic structure which permits us to compete in a significant way in world markets. It is our resource sector which is the source of our economic well-being, our prosperity, and social contentment.

• (1110)

Permit me, in the few minutes that I have to speak on the motion standing in my name, to give a profile of just two of our more important resource industries, mining and forestry. I think I might best be able to describe the importance of those two industries by comparing our total economic structure to the trunk of a tree which supports its branches and its leaves through a network of roots through which flow its life-supporting juices.

There are now more than 350 small and not so small communities throughout our country, from the Great Lakes to the Arctic Ocean, which depend almost entirely on one or the other of these two industries I have mentioned. These communities are at the end of the root structure or network, generating wealth and nourishment which sustains the life at the end of the branch.

Fifteen per cent of our country's entire work force is either directly or indirectly engaged in the forest and mining sectors. In better times these two industries have generated directly close to $40 billion of industrial product, $25 billion of which is earned from trade in foreign markets throughout the world. The mining sector alone accounts for over 50 per cent of all our rail freight volume, with crude minerals making up 44 per cent and fabricated minerals 9 per cent of all the railways' revenue freight handled. Forty-one per cent of all goods shipped through the St. Lawrence Seaway originate from the end of one of the root canals, from a quarry, sandpit, mine smelter or refinery, a sawmill, pulpmill or logging camps some place in mid-Canada or the North.

It is the activities of the miners and the loggers which sustain some form of economic life in over 60 per cent of our

entire geography. The further the roots have been extended, the healthier and stronger our tree has become.

But something has gone terribly wrong. The engine which pumps the vital juices through the trunk is working at only 50 per cent capacity. On the mineral side, half of our mines are shut down or have drastically reduced production. The Government says that it is just another cyclical problem, the result of a world-wide recession in the economy, and is something we will just have to wait out. Of course, that is true to some extent but it would be extremely dangerous to ignore a number of trends and factors which will undoubtedly have a profound effect on the timing and rate or extent to which our mining industry can recover from this deep valley of a cyclical curve.

First, it must be obvious by now to even the most casual observer that there is a fundamental shift of resource-based industrial production toward the developing world. Industrial countries in Europe and Japan, even ourselves and the Americans, are making massive investments in the resource sectors of many developing countries. We see it as our contribution or form of development aid or assistance. But in the case of our industrial competitors from Europe and Japan, it also has the purpose of adding to the supply of raw materials to achieve greater and more diversified access to natural resources and, through it all, to create keener price competition. As well, the World Bank is very active in this field. While all this activity may produce significant benefits to the target countries and the industrial countries which make the investments, it spells bad news for Canada.

A second, equally important factor is the substitution in the manufacturing process of certain base minerals for new materials and a general impact of a new technological revolution of which we are becoming the beneficiaries, or perhaps the victims, at an extremely rapid pace. For instance, the same tonne of coal that it used to take to produce 90 miles of copper wire now turns out 80,000 miles of fibre cable capable of delivering 100 times more impulses. Or an automobile which used to weigh 5,000 pounds ten years ago now weighs only 3,000 pounds. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, it would take unprecedented growth in world markets to generate the kind of demand for our base metals needed to restore our mining sector to its original health.

● (1115)

Finally, there is another factor more of a home made kind which will undoubtedly delay the recovery of our industry and therefore the economy generally. That has to do with the unreasonably heavy and crushing tax burden and economic rent structure which all levels of government have loaded on the shoulders of the resource sectors in recent years, a burden out of all proportion to any return the industry has achieved from its investment.

There have been unconscionable increases of certain so called non-profit taxes, such as property tax, fuel taxes and so on. In some cases these charges have increased by over 100 per cent in one year, diminishing the efforts the industry has been making in cutting costs and increasing productivity.

The Mining Association of Canada in its submission to this year's conference of resource ministers gave a number of examples to illustrate this point. Let me quote:

> In British Columbia and in the period 1980-1982, costs to the industry have increased by $118.5 million in direct payments arising from a very large number of actions by Government, both federal and provincial, on several fronts. This represents a 105 per cent increase in only two years. For 1983 it is anticipated that further substantial increases have occurred. More specifically, we have evidence to show that in the past 12 years, two large mining operations in British Columbia have seen their property, fuel, water, provincial and municipal taxes escalate from $4 million to $35 million.
>
> In Quebec, salary and fringe benefits, which in 1980 represented 32.2 per cent of the average value per tonne of ore, increased in 1982 to 38.8 per cent of this average value, representing a 20.5 per cent increase. On the other hand, the cost of social policies, indirect taxes and electrical power, which in 1980 represented 9.67 per cent of the average value per tonne of ore, reached a percentage of 15.62 in 1982, i.e., an increase of 61 per cent during the period. So together, the cost of all these items measured, on the average value per tonne of ore, went from 41.9 per cent in 1980 to 54.3 per cent in 1982.
>
> In Alberta, over the past five years mining companies have experienced percentage increases of over 100 per cent for fuels, 80 per cent for electric power, 75 per cent for freight costs, 60 per cent for property taxes, 85 per cent for provincial health care premiums, 62 per cent for unemployment insurance, and 41 per cent for pension contributions.

Very similar increases could be documented in every province or territory across Canada where mining is carried on. To add to all that, we keep inventing ever more stringent rules with respect to environmental safeguards, health, safety and standards of social amenities in the mining and logging communities.

Now, Sir, you will find me among the very last to suggest that some of the standards which we have all worked hard to achieve should be sacrificed to assure the future health of the resource sector. But it is now painfully obvious to everyone that the industries alone are no longer able to bear all the costs related to these laudable social objectives. We have simply strapped the industry too tight. We are depriving it of its competitive edge and rendering ourselves extremely vulnerable and unprepared to meet the new challenges and forces which have distorted the conventional rules of trade in market places of the world.

Our new competitors, as you know, Mr. Speaker, may not play by the same rules or by what we would consider conventional rules. They are in the main state-owned enterprises, their prime objective, understandably perhaps, being foreign exchange earnings and jobs. Their plants will be heavily subsidized from funds to which we ourselves are contributing. It is as if we are all too eager to finance our own demise.

Well, Sir, one might ask how is the Government on the other side of the House reacting to these worrisome trends? Surely it must have the same information we have. To some of us it appears as if its answer to our dilemma is to succumb to the rule changes and attempt to compete on an equal basis with the new players in the developing world and the not so new players in the socialist world. It appears as if it sees states ownership, or at least a very advanced form of state control, in our own country's economy as the only way to survive this onslaught.

• (1120)

In a sense we have advanced some way toward that goal. The justification for Petro-Canada, for instance, was to provide us with a window on the world and permit us to trade with countries that refused to deal with the private sector. Our tax laws are designed to permit our companies barely to cover their costs of capital and operation and leave no room for modernization and technological innovation.

"Not to worry," says the Government, "after all have we not given you grants to modernize or subsidies for labour costs when that became your problem?" That may be true, but do you believe, Sir, that this is the kind of climate to which either our own or foreign investors feel attracted? That must be a worry, unless we either believe the Government can create money out of thin air or we assume that after necessary adjustments to our economy have been perfected we might ourselves become eligible some day for loans and gifts from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

What happens if one falls out of favour with the Government on which one has to rely for grants when things get tough, or what happens if it is too late before the bureaucrats in Ottawa get around to a particular problem? The forest industry is a case in point. It is suffering not only from all the pains of the recession and the fact that we have not permitted the industry to build and maintain its own capital resources to ride out the storm, but because we have also neglected to assure that our forests are replenished to provide our mills in the future with the necessary feedstock on the basis of a sustained yield. All of a sudden we have come to realize that we have been mining our forests for the last 200 years instead of farming them and that nature alone is no longer able to replenish itself in sufficient time to meet our demand.

For some mills and towns in mid-Canada, coming to grips with this realization is too late. No matter how many grants the Government might make to bail out a troubled company, we will shortly experience timber shortages in most areas and regions of the country, causing lay-offs and shutdowns not only of mills but of whole towns and regions, because it takes 60 years to grow a tree and sometimes much longer, depending upon the climate and other factors.

I have little doubt that had it been the responsibility of the private sector to manage the resource, either through direct ownership or long-term tenure, we would not find ourselves in this fix today. The United States, where 60 per cent of the forest land is privately owned and managed, provides us with an interesting model for comparison.

To sum up, we see difficult times ahead for our resource industries and therefore for our economic wellbeing. Any prospects for recovery and new growth are admittedly, as I pointed out, influenced by factors and trends over which we have little control. However, much of the pain we must suffer during the recovery period is self-afflicted and can be cured only by ourselves, even though some of the larger corporations and their sector organizations still refuse to speak out in defence of the system from which they have grown, I suppose for fear that the Government might not think kindly of them at their time of need. Some do speak out and, more important, the average Canadian has become weary of the dream of a just society which our centrally-structured and planned economy was to deliver, a dream which for some has turned into a nightmare. Canadians now understand that state planners are not very good in creating new wealth and that Government cannot distribute wealth which has not first been created by someone.

It is true that we have built for ourselves a very sophisticated socio-economic structure, one which is still the envy of most of the world and indeed one which can feed on itself for a short period of time. However, like the maple tree that has been tapped too deeply, it will eventually die, and like any tree that has been cut off from its roots, it will rot and decay.

• (1125)

We draw our confidence for not only bright but exciting future prospects for economic growth and prosperity from the confidence Canadians are expressing in my Party's ability to recapture the promise which inspired earlier generations of Canadians, the promise of a just reward for individual effort and free enterprise. Most assuredly if we should manage once again to set this spirit free, we shall have no trouble meeting and beating whatever our new competition will throw at us in world markets.

I thank the House for giving us this day to state the case and for preparing Canadians for the challenge ahead.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are Hon. Members rising to ask questions or make brief comments on the remarks of the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle)? If not, the Chair will recognize the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to rise today to address what has to be one of the most critical problems facing our country. I thank the Hon. Member for bringing forward this motion which in part reads:

> That this House regards the Government's failure to take action to encourage the development of Canada's resource industries and ensure their competitiveness in world markets as a betrayal of all Canadians whose standard of living depends upon the resource sector of Canada's economy—

While the motion goes on to refer to a number of other interesting and important matters, the essence of the motion is presented in those few words. Indeed, it is a betrayal of many Canadians.

I want to focus my remarks this morning on one of our most critical resource industries, the forest industry of Canada. One could comment, as the previous speaker did, on the mining industry, the fishing industry and all the resource sectors. By and large the critical comments would be appropriate in terms of how not only the federal Government but the provincial Governments, and in many cases industry itself, have failed to live up to the challenges of the present time.

I want to focus my remarks today on the forest industry. This industry has by and large been overlooked by Canadians.

We have now been in session in excess of 600 days, the longest session of Parliament in Canadian history. We have managed as a result of an Opposition initiative to discuss forestry for a single day.

When you consider the importance of the forest industry and the impact which the forest industry has on the balance of payments in this country, Mr. Speaker, there is more economic impact in terms of our country's trade balance than the entire agriculture industry, mining industry, fishing industry and auto industry combined. That is the immensity of this one industry that we are discussing today. It is of incredible importance.

If you look closely at the statistics, you find that 1.3 million Canadians are involved in one way or another with the forest industry in terms of their jobs. In other words, they are employed either in a direct way or in an indirect way with the forest industry. It involves 1,300,000 Canadians. There are 5,000 forest companies spread from one end of the country to the other. Three hundred communities depend 100 per cent on the forest industry. We are talking about an industry of immense proportions.

I believe it is fair to say that the problem associated with the forest industry has not been clearly understood by many Canadians. A number who have watched or who live close to the industry have known for many years that it is in a virtual crisis situation. I would say there is a national emergency in Canada today as it touches on that critical resource industry, the forest industry of Canada.

• (1130)

We can look back, however, to a politician from 1871, none other than John A. Macdonald himself, who at that time said that we are recklessly destroying the timber of Canada and there is scarcely a possibility of replacing it. Here we are, more than 100 years later, Mr. Speaker, and we are saying that same thing today in the House of Commons. We are saying that we are seeing the erosion of the most critical industry in the country in terms of the balance of payments and employability of Canadians, and we are seeing the erosion of that industry in every single Province.

When we consider that last year we harvested approximately 800,000 hectares of forest land, it is interesting to note that we managed to replace 25 per cent of that in terms of reforestation. Only 25 per cent of the most critical resource in the country was replanted, albeit additional hectares were replanted naturally. However, there is nothing to say but that the shortfall in reforestation in the country is absolutely astounding.

I would like to focus on a couple of points that simply indicate the critical nature of the problems facing us today. I suppose it is not surprising that Canadians have not been alert to the nature of this problem. After all, 95 per cent of Canadians are urban dwellers and live in big cities like Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Regina and Hamilton. We do not come into contact with the forests of Canada on a regular basis, so naturally many of us are a little out of tune with the realities out there.

However, Mr. Speaker, if you ask any single individual in the logging sector, the lumber sector, the plywood sector, the pulp and paper sector, the shake sector or any other sector of the forest industry, they will tell you that the industry is in serious trouble today. Every professional organization in the country related to the forest industry will say the same thing. As a matter of fact, I remember a number of presentations in the last three years from professional foresters to Members of Parliament on an individual basis, a caucus basis and a professional basis. Those organizations have said that this industry is in serious trouble and that we must do something about it not next year, not next decade, but immediately.

What do we do, Mr. Speaker? Do we take action? Does the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Caccia) who is responsible for forestry call for special debates in the House of Commons? Does he call for extraordinary steps to be taken? I do not hear a great deal from him, but to give the Minister credit where credit is due, I will say that he has indicated an interest in this area and has recognized some concerns. Perhaps he is having difficulty with some of his Cabinet colleagues when trying to put his money where his mouth is when identifying the problems and their solutions in the forest industry.

I would like to quote from a number of people I feel are representative of respectable forest voices. Jack Walters, the director of the UBC research forest on the West Coast, had this to say recently: "Our forests are in a shambles. It is a tragedy of the first dimension." This is a professional forester speaking out in an attempt to communicate to the powers that be and particularly to the politicians both provincial and federal, that we have a serious problem. Mr. Michael Innes, the manager of forestry for Abitibi Price, the world's largest producer of newsprint, said: "We are gradually running out of wood." He is saying that we are gradually running out of merchantable timber in the country and that we must now transport the product in many cases hundreds and hundreds of miles from the forest to the processing plants. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we are failing to replant those forests which stand right in front of the processing facilities.

The forest industry's advisory committee to the Government, Mr. Speaker, recently made a plea for more financial assistance to this troubled industry. The Science Council of Canada targeted the problem clearly, I believe, when it said that 6,000 square miles of forest land is destroyed or wasted each year. The IWA said that we are running out of merchantable timber, that the industry is virtually at a crossroads and that it will either fail or succeed, depending upon the initiative taken by governments and industry. The Quebec and Ontario furniture manufacturers recently brought to our attention that they are now required to import maple logs from the United States because sufficient supplies of maple do not exist here in Canada for use by the Canadian furniture industry.

I would like to go on and relate to you, Mr. Speaker, two or three of the problems that were brought to our attention as parliamentarians and legislators by the Association of B.C.

Professional Foresters. That association has brought to our attention the fact that more than 800,000 hectares are harvested annually in our country but less than 25 per cent are planted or seeded. In British Columbia, more than a million hectares heed reforestation and British Columbia is adding 20,000 to 50,000 hectares annually to this problem. Yet the B.C. Ministry of Forests recently had budget cuts in this area which will simply exacerbate the problem.

The number of person-years available to research in the Canadian Forestry Service has declined by more than 50 per cent since 1968. We are talking about an industry in which research and development has never been more needed and demanded than today. Yet the professional foresters tell us that money for research and development in the Canadian Forestry Service has declined by more than 50 per cent since 1968. Increased research is required in almost all phases of forestry management.

The association goes on to say that current spending on silviculture by all parties, including industry and provincial and federal Governments alike, amounts to about $240 million a year. This is less than 1 per cent of the total value of the annual forest production in the country; we are reinvesting less than 1 per cent of its total value in that critical resource. We can look at some of our competitors in western Europe. For instance, Sweden spends between $700 million and $1 billion annually as compared to our expenditure of $240 million. That is the kind of husbandry with which our competitors are treating their forests in terms of silviculture, reforestation, spacing, thinning, road building, fire prevention and disease prevention. They are spending up to $1 billion annually compared to our paltry expenditure of $240 million. If that does not spell doom for this industry in the long run, Mr. Speaker, then I do not know what does.

The Canadian Forestry Service is a part of Environment Canada and $69.4 million was allocated to the Canadian Forest Service. Within the same Ministry, $146 million was budgeted for the Atmospheric Environment Service and $275 million was allocated for Parks Canada. The Professional Association of Foresters from British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, goes on to say that it is a national disgrace that the federal Government spends twice as much money monitoring weather as it does on our forest industry. That is not to suggest that any cutbacks should occur in weather and climate monitoring, Mr. Speaker, but I think that when these people put their professional careers before the public for scrutiny by standing up and saying that this is a national disgrace, we as Members of Parliament cannot stand idly by and say: "Well, I suppose that is just more rhetoric about this issue". The people who are most knowledgeable about the state of the forestry industry in Canada are calling the present situation a national disaster.

The association goes on to speak, Mr. Speaker, about a problem in the Province of British Columbia which is, of course, the major forest producer in the country and one of the major areas in terms of available merchantable timber. The association indicates that forestry is the largest economic activity in B.C. It generates more direct and indirect Government revenues and employment than any other sector by far. This wealth comes from forests which are 95 per cent owned by the people of the Province yet less than 1 per cent of the new provincial budget in British Columbia is set aside for reforestation, a significant drop from last year. Can you imagine anything more akin to committing economic hara-kiri, Mr. Speaker, than spending less than ever before on reforestation at a time when the need and the demand is so great?

The association indicates that no money has been allocated this year for improving this resource, and that includes money needed for thinning, refertilization of young forests and particularly for dealing with the 29,000 square kilometers of forest land that sits idle in British Columbia. This is a critical statement, Mr. Speaker. If reforested, these lands could produce more than six million cubic metres of wood annually, and up to 20,000 new permanent jobs in the Province of British Columbia. It further states that more than 40 per cent of the funding was cut for forest protection activities. We have, it is said, more than a million hectares of idle land in the Province of British Columbia which requires treatment to return it to a new forest. At the backlog planting rate of this new plan of the provincial Government, it will take that Government 50 years to reforest these areas. I believe there is no question but that we are at a crossroads with Canada's number one industry.

• (1140)

The situation in which we find ourselves in terms of provincial governments, the federal Government, as well as a good part of the industry, is a crisis situation. Last year the forest companies in Canada lost $500 million, but they were anticipating an improved situation for this year. However, I believe any Hon. Member of Parliament who comes from a forest related area will know that things have not turned around, that the pulp and paper industry is in a very tough situation and that the lumber industry is simply struggling to survive. Most of us with saw mills in our riding will know that they have closed, or shifts have been laid off in the last two or three weeks. That would indicate what is coming down the pipe in the months ahead.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we have an ideal opportunity now as parliamentarians to take a positive step and show that, yes, we are concerned and are prepared to do something about it. We must recognize that we have created an evergreen ghetto in this country. What was once a dynamic, thriving community is now decaying. There is now a sense of despair and a demoralization in the ranks. We are turning our backs on that part of our community. However, the evergreen ghetto can be turned around with some positive leadership and initiatives. We have heard speakers today indicate what some of those actions should be. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would entertain a call for unanimous consent of the House to present a motion asking the Minister of the Environment, who is responsible for forestry, to call a meeting of all provincial ministers of forestry early in the new year, to have as the number one agenda item the formation of a federal ministry of forestry. I have circulated a letter to the House Leaders of both the Conservative and

the Liberal Parties indicating that I would be asking for unanimous consent to present such a motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Would the Hon. Member care to present the Chair with a copy of the motion he has in mind?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, if I may say for clarification, realizing that at this point to present a motion would be presumptuous on my part, I am simply asking for unanimous consent of the House to enable me to present such a motion. The motion would in fact urge the Minister of the Environment to call a meeting of provincial ministers of forestry and the number one item on their agenda would be the formation of a federal ministry of forestry. I am asking for unanimous consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We have a motion before us in the name of the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). It is in order for the Hon. Member to present an amendment to the motion before us. However, the Chair has some reservations as to whether the amendment as indicated would be proper as an amendment to the motion, although the Chair would be prepared to receive such an amendment and consider it. If it were found in order, the Chair would put it to the House. However, if this is not what the Hon. Member has in mind by way of procedure, would he please indicate what he does have in mind?

Mr. Riis: I appreciate your patience on this issue, Mr. Speaker, and also the patience of Hon. Members. Not feeling that a motion to amend the motion before us may be in order, I was, first of all, seeking unanimous consent of the House through you, Mr. Speaker, to allow me to put such a motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has the right to present a motion. However, there are limits in terms of a motion by way of an amendment to the present motion which can be presented. If the Hon. Member cannot present a motion which is within the scope of an amendment permitted at this stage, then he cannot otherwise present such a motion which would not be acceptable within the normal scope of amendments. Would the Hon. Member read the amendment to the present motion which he has in mind?

Mr. Riis: I certainly will, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your patience. It will be a motion asking the Minister of the Environment responsible for forestry in Canada to call a meeting of all provincial ministers of forestry early in the new year and to have as the number one agenda item the formation of a federal ministry of forestry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Hon. Member will present the proposed amendment in writing to the Chair, the Chair will consider the proposed amendment before ruling. Meanwhile the debate will proceed.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I question whether or not such an amendment is in order, first of all; second, if it were in order and were introduced, since this motion is under Standing Order 62(11) which requires no vote, what possible power would it have? I would think another forum, perhaps, would be better. Usually there are discussions between the two sides when a Minister is going to be asked to do something so that the Minister can respond properly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has not accepted the amendment. The Chair has merely asked the Hon. Member to present his amendment in writing so that the Chair may decide whether such an amendment is or is not in order. That is all the Chair can do at this stage. The Chair is the servant of the House. This is a limit which is on the Chair at this point. The Chair at this stage invites the Minister of the Environment to make his remarks.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I quite appreciate that you have already ruled on what the Hon. Member was asking. What I would like is the opportunity to question the previous speaker under the rules.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is perfectly in order. The Hon. Member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail) wishes to put a question to the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap. That is in order at this point.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, on the motion today and the remarks made by the Hon. Member, I wonder, based on the fact that he made a very strong plea and placed a very strong thrust on the subject, whether he has any comments to enlighten the House with respect to any recommendations he would make in light of the difficult situation of the variation in value of money in various countries where we have to sell our products, the question of competitiveness with other countries south of the border, the American pulp and paper industry? Would the Hon. Member tell us exactly what he would put forward, not in terms of the motion brought forward today by his Party, but what firm recommendations can he make with respect to the difficulties with which this particular industry is faced today? Could he tell us something about that?

Mr. Riis: I certainly would like to respond to the Hon. Member, Mr. Speaker. When it comes to suggestions as to what may be done to improve the situation in the forest industry, I would like to focus, perhaps, on one aspect, and that is the whole matter of what might be termed "reforestation". I can recall at least seven presentations which various organizations related to the forest industry have made to Members of Parliament in the past 12 months. They dealt with such recommendations as site preparation; burning or ploughing for reforestation; planting trees or seeding areas, using genetically improved seed or planting stock; choosing the best species for a site; thinning and spacing trees for optimum growth; pruning and fertilization when needed; reducing losses through fire, insect and disease; improved utilization of our present resource during logging; concentrating our efforts on the best reserved forest areas for the time necessary to grow the crop, and so on. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the need to reforest is accepted as a reality by all who are sensitive to the forest industry.

This type of "Government spending" I believe is a misnomer and ought to be called "Government investment". After all, what we are doing is investing in a resource which will presumably pay back to the Government both in terms of royalties and personal and corporate income taxes in the years ahead. Considering that this investment made now will result in returns to the Government in the years ahead, it has to be done now, and it will never be done cheaper. The need for employing people in this particular activity has never been greater. Instantly, once the decision is made to embark on a massive initiative of reforestation in all parts of Canada, it will literally provide tens of thousands of jobs for Canadians in every Province and territory. At a time when the need for job creation in a meaningful sense is so acute, surely a step in this direction has to be one of the most appropriate the federal Government could initiate at this time.

• (1150)

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not disagree with that aspect. I underline as well the importance of reforestation. Indeed, in my home Province of New Brunswick we have to this date accomplished a great deal in reforestation through various companies such as the Irving Group, International Paper and others.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, taking the term used in the Hon. Member's motion with respect to competitiveness, I was asking what concrete proposals does the Hon. Member have regarding the economics of the day, the problems we have with selling these products? We have the problems of competitiveness, variations in the value of the pound and the dollar and other currencies used by countries we trade with. What does the Hon. Member have to tell the House about concrete proposals and recommendations he would make to the Government or industry to try to alleviate this serious problem he has stressed so forcefully in his speech today?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, let me identify three or four things I think would be appropriate, particularly when it comes to the competitiveness of our industry. For too long our marketing procedures have resulted in Canadian exporters going abroad and saying: "This is the product we have; are you interested?" That as opposed to going abroad, identifying the needs for forest products, coming back to Canada and creating those products to meet specific market demands. That would be a major step forward for many producers in our country. In other words, identify the markets more precisely and take advantage of them, and perhaps become more aggressive in seeking out those markets. Also, a great deal can be done through the federal Government to assist our export sector and assure the necessary financial support so we can compete with some of our major competitors.

The Hon. Member mentioned productivity. When you look at countries with which we compete, western European countries and some of the American countries, one of the things they have in place that we do not is what I will refer to as industrial democracy. They have recognized that by involving all employees in their operation, be it large or small, in a meaningful way, their ability to be competitive is that much greater.

As a first step in this direction, and I emphasize only a first step, I suggest that something like the profit-sharing schemes we have seen in certain corporations ought to be looked at in Canada. The United States has over 400,000 profit-sharing schemes; we have approximately 2,000. In other words, we are abysmally behind even the U.S., let alone our western European competitors who are miles ahead of us, not only in profit sharing but in the whole area of involving employees in a responsible way through profit sharing, responsibility sharing and information sharing.

When we begin to democratize the workplace and involve all employees in the productive capacity of our plants, then we will see our competitive advantage increase substantially. However, while we maintain the old-fashioned, neanderthal approach of bosses and workers, we will continue to have difficulties as we act in a mode which was perhaps more appropriate in the 1920s but which has no place whatsoever in the labour management world of the 1980s, let alone the 1990s.

Mr. Greenaway: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Hon. Member having to do with the fact that in British Columbia at the present time much of our forest land is being devastated by insect attacks. In his riding there is a problem with the tussock moth and Douglas fir trees. Can he comment on what is being done about that? I think there was a virus they were going to use and there was a problem getting it licensed. Perhaps he could give us some information on that program.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, indeed, the tussock moth was a major problem in the forests of central British Columbia. The solution was brought to my attention by a number of people involved in entomology who said that the virus was really the only solution. It had some problems but it was the most obvious solution. I brought that to the attention of various officials in Ottawa whose approval was required for its application. I must say they took some extraordinary steps to provide intermediate approval to allow this to proceed, but because of the unavailability in Canada of an adequate source, nothing very much was accomplished.

What that proved to me was that while the bureaucrats were quite conscious of the problem and aware of the solution, they lacked any sort of comprehensive plan and were acting on their own individual initiative. With inadequate funding and a lack of any long-term plan, they were really unable to respond to this mini-crisis in central British Columbia. So rather than politicians planning three or four years in advance, we need to look at it over 40 to 60-year intervals, the time it takes to grow a mature tree.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The time for questions and answers has expired. We can continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Murphy: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I rise on an issue raised by the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) when he asked unanimous consent of this House—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has not yet received the proposed amendment. It is not in order to ask for unanimous consent at this stage of an opposition motion. The Chair has invited the Hon. Member to present his amendment, which will be considered. There has been no amendment presented to the Chair at this point.

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, all I wish to do is to point out that Citation 13 and Citation 14 of Beauchesne say that at any time a Member may ask unanimous consent. That is what the Hon. member did.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has now presented to the Chair an amendment and this will be considered in the normal way. The amendment as proposed by the Hon. Member, after consideration by the Chair, is another motion and is inconsistent with the main motion before us in the judgment of the Chair. The Chair regretfully must make this determination.

If the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap has a point of order he wants to raise, then it is in order for him to do so.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to prolong this, but in light of what you have ruled, and I accept that, that indeed the intent of my amendment was certainly not going against the principle of the motion but was opening up some new areas for consideration, I would now ask for unanimous consent for that motion to be presented.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Hon. Member to present such a motion?

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There does not appear to be unanimous consent.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the motion before us today raises a number of fundamental questions. It is couched in the language that is customary around here and which may come as a surprise to onlookers and watchers on TV, namely the phraseology of Government failure to take action. Of course, I do not agree with that kind of approach and terminology because, as we all know, in particular in relation to the development of resource industries, there has been a lot of government action, a lot of activity and a lot of taxpayers' funds which have been put into the development of our natural resources over the past decade.

• (1200)

I would conclude, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a question of failure here. The Hon. Member in his motion is putting a basic, fundamental issue on the floor for debate today for a critical analysis on the part of all concerned individuals and Members of this House. In that respect he is doing everybody a great service by allowing us to look at this issue in a partisan way, and at the same time I hope in a constructive way.

If there is trouble in our resource industries, I would be inclined to think it is because we have had a slowdown in the economy, some very serious downturns in certain aspects of the economy. There has been a very serious drop in demand which has affected the prices of our natural resources, particularly in mining and the lumber industry. Certainly to attribute the behaviour of economists in the world to inaction by the Government is not just stretching it too far, but is pointing the finger in the wrong direction.

Over the years this Government, as colleagues will subsequently demonstrate, has shown an enormous sense of awareness of and sensitivity to our interests in natural resources. As some of the speakers have already indicated, our natural resources represent a substantial form of income for hundreds of thousands of Canadians. They represent jobs in very large numbers and therefore are a substantial part of our Gross National Product and of the wealth that we all share and benefit from.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I will attempt very briefly to outline our position on the question of forestry which is very close to our minds and hearts. This House has been made familiar, on a number of occasions since the beginning of the life of this particular Parliament, with our concern for forestry. We have given the Canadian Forestry Service higher status by identifying the person at the top of it with the title of an Assistant Deputy Minister, who was also given at the same time the assignment of preparing, in conjunction with my predecessor, a strategy.

My predecessor released the strategy in 1981 which summarized the problems which are facing forestry in Canada, and also outlined a plan for action. The strategy has its foundation in a national forest policy based on co-operation with the provincial Governments. We recognize ownership on the part of the Provinces of this resource and we realize that there must not be a pulling apart or a moving at cross-purposes between the provincial and federal Governments in this particular field of resources. Rather we must work together and we must both work with industry and unions as well.

As a result, this policy which the federal Government is pursuing is one which rests on co-operation with the Provinces. In this regard we have utilized the forum of the Canadian Council of Resources and Environment Ministers as well as held bilateral discussions with provincial Governments. The forest sector strategy pointed out that, in effect, the virgin forests have been mined and little thought has been given in the past to future crops. We must focus our attention therefore on farming and managing properly the forests and on emphasizing intensive forest management and forest renewal.

Not only must we do this, Mr. Speaker, we must also address problems that we recognized, including the need to protect our forests from fire, insects and disease, to encourage the management of private woodlots, to increase the management of the forests on Indian reserves, to fill the need for

professional foresters, and to foster the important area of forest research necessary for all of these objectives.

The role and involvement of the federal Government in forestry is basic to the health of the sector. The federal Government is committed to forestry and will continue to act in its support in concert and co-operation with the Provinces. It has indeed been on this basis that we have been able to achieve a series of accomplishments initiated by my predecessors which I hope to continue and build upon. As the first step we felt it necessary, prior to the implementation to the forest sector strategy, to establish a national system for the collection, analysis and dissemination of forestry data in furtherance of intensive forestry management policies, planning and programs. This work is being conducted as a component of the Petawawa National Forestry Institute. Financial resources approved for this program for the period of 1981-82 to 1983-84 amount to some $5.7 million. It has enabled us to produce the 1981 Canada forest inventory as a basic step.

Responding to the challenges of forest management and renewal, and in the spirit of co-operation, we have committed ourselves to enter into agreement with each of the Provinces in support of programs to meet the reforestation needs of the forest sector. Two agreements have already been signed, one with Nova Scotia of August of 1982 which provides some $30 million of federal funds over five years. A significant program of aid to private woodlot owners is built into this agreement. An agreement with Prince Edward Island was signed in July of this year which allows for federal funds of some $15 million over five years.

In the case of Newfoundland funds have been provided to enhance the existing agreement totalling some $16 million over three years for employment stimulation. I hope that we will soon be able to announce a new agreement with Manitoba. Another agreement is being put into motion with Saskatchewan and with Alberta. Negotiations are well underway with Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and British Columbia. These Provinces are currently under agreements arranged by DREE which expire in March of 1984. I would like particularly to bring to the attention of the NDP critic and the Progressive Conservative Party that the agreements which are now in place total some $400 million over the five past years alone.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Forestry Service also prepared a private woodlot development policy. It provides the basis for private woodlot programs in federal-provincial forest agreements. Earlier this year, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) announced the plan for the development of the Gaspé Bas-St. Laurent region. In the program some $19 million will be devoted to assistance to the *Groupement Forestier* for private woodlot management.

All of these agreements, Mr. Speaker, are based on the Government's policy that is tuned in to and focuses on forest renewal. This policy requires a financial commitment on the part of the federal Government and an even larger amount by the Provinces and by industry. It remains to be seen whether all levels will be able to find these funds in times of fiscal restraint.

• (1210)

Given the high unemployment in the forest sector, we began a job-creation program last year using Section 38 of the Unemployment Insurance Act. The Canadian Forestry Service was provided with $34 million to top up the benefits of unemployment insurance receipts under this program. As I said last Friday, this totalled as a combined amount some $140 million. To date, this has provided 14,000 positions, representing a quarter of a million weeks of employment.

The program was particularly successful in British Columbia where it was known as EBAP, the Employment Bridging Assistance Program. Unfortunately, in June of this year the Province of British Columbia decided to curtail its involvement in this program, sharply reducing its effectiveness. However, the federal Government is continuing this initiative under the new Canada Works Program. We are hopeful that industry and the Provinces will generate sufficient projects to allow us to make a substantial contribution to our forestry renewal objectives with these funds.

The federal Government has historically provided Canada with its basic forestry research and development. This has been done by the Canadian Forestry Service with support from sister organizations such as the Forintek Canada Corporation. The forest sector strategy recognized the situation of underfunding to this institution and is moving in that direction.

The House may recall that Cabinet approved the research and development component for the strategy and provided some $5.5 million to the Canadian Forestry Service for research and development for this fiscal year. The R and D component calls for a substantial increase in funding for subsequent years, including basic support for Forintek to maintain our competitive position for forest products and lead us to forest renewal as called for in the strategy.

In addition to that, however, funds have already been committed to the expansion and upgrading of Canadian Forestry Service research labs across the country, including some $14 million for the expansion of the Pacific Forestry Research Centre in Victoria, some $13 million for an addition to the Great Lakes Forestry Research Centre in the Soo, some $10.5 million for additions to the Laurentian Forestry Research Centre in Ste. Foy and some $22.5 million for a new Maritimes Forestry Research Centre in Fredericton. Also some $17 million has been provided for the expansion of pulp and paper research facilities in Victoria and Pointe Claire.

As part of the Maritime forestry complex in Fredericton, the Government is providing over $10 million for a Maritime forest ranger school. Also in keeping with the spirit of co-operation with the provincial Governments, we have signed a memorandum of understanding with the Provinces on the co-ordination of forestry research.

I am sure that Members of the House are in part familiar with the activities in support of the control of forest fires which have cost Canada as much wood as is harvested in certain years. The CL-215 water bomber program will contribute significantly to our efforts in fighting forest fires. I believe this

has been a major illustration of co-operation with the Provinces in response to a major problem. Through joint arrangements with the Provinces, we are purchasing some 29 water bombers from Canadair, of which 17 will be owned by the federal Government, four to be used exclusively by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for use north of 60. The entire fleet will be co-ordinated by the Interagency Forestry Centre in Winnipeg which is, in itself, a very good example of federal-provincial co-operation in forestry methods.

Let me say a few words on our forestry initiatives on Indian reserves. I agree with the mover of the motion that the forests on Indian lands have been neglected in the past. It is understood that this resource could provide twice the benefits to the Indian people that it currently provides. We have been recently working in close co-operation with my colleague, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro), to develop a comprehensive program of Indian forest land management. A working group of officials from the Canadian Forestry Service and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has been set up for this very purpose. What is significant, however, is that this working group is headed by representatives of the Assembly of First Nations.

The basic objectives and principles of this program are that it will provide for economic, social, cultural, spiritual and environmental benefits for the Indian people through the wise management of forest resources on Indian lands. It will be controlled and administered by the Indian people and implemented at the community or band level. This approach is entirely consistent with the recommendations of the House of Commons Special Committee on Indian Self-Government. Within the context of Indian ownership of India resources and in the control of Indian development, the objectives of the proposed program are: to increase the number of hectares of productive Indian forest land; to increase the sustainable annual harvest on Indian lands; to increase the number of Indian persons productively employed in all aspects of the forestry sector; to increase the number of Indian enterprises actively engaged in direct and indirect viable forestry and forestry-related activities; and finally, to develop the technical, operational and managerial skills of Indian people consistent with the requirements for an economically viable Indian forestry sector.

The financial support for this program will come from several sources and the Canadian Forestry Service will provide the necessary technical and scientific expertise. We are now taking an excellent opportunity for the federal Government to establish a useful and rewarding program in co-operation with the Indian people.

Turning to human resources, it is indeed a potential problem for the future but we have anticipated well what may happen and have taken steps to address it. The human resources development component of the sector strategy addressed this concern and we have been able to provide over $15 million to expand the pool of professional forestry manpower. This money will provide for forestry scholarships, contract research and development and summer student employment to some 300 students per year. Most of this money will go to Canadian universities and particularly to the six forestry schools across the country, the University of British Columbia, the University of Alberta, Lakehead University, the University of Toronto, Université Laval and the University of New Brunswick.

Another area of increased federal activity in response to the forest sector strategy is in international trade. In recent years there has been a successful program of overseas market development of British Columbia forest products under agreement between the federal Government, the Province and the British Columbia Council of Forest Industries. This program will be expanded to other Provinces and negotiations are under way to do so by my colleague, the Minister responsible for DRIE.

An important issue to forestry is the use of pesticides and insecticides. Pesticides are designed to kill organisms that cause environmental disease, insects and weeds. By their very nature, pesticides are toxic and have the potential for adverse effects on non-target life. Management of pesticides requires weighing risks and benefits on the basis of value judgments, including economic and social factors. There is public dissatisfaction with the current management system from both the environmental protection and research development perspectives.

I suggest that two major issues emerge from the analysis of pesticides management. One is the lack of public confidence. Contributing factors to this lack of confidence include confidential information, shifting burden of proof, little public access to the decision points, uncertainty of risk assessments and conflict of interest between environmental protection and resource development.

The second issue is the public concern extending from immediate human health to long-range environmental quality. There are multiple jurisdictions involved, including federal, provincial and municipal, which complicates this issue.

A great deal must be done to improve this situation. For its part, in improving the situation for the forest sector, the Canadian Forestry Service is developing effective and environmentally acceptable materials and methods to respond to the needs of the forest manager and is developing biological and non-chemical methods and means for forest pest management.

● (1220)

I see you are impatient with me, Mr. Speaker, and I will conclude briefly. In summary, much has been accomplished since the preparation of the forest sector strategy for Canada, including increased support to forestry schools, expanded forestry research facilities, the development of a national water bomber fleet, forestry job-creation projects and an expanded overseas trade program. There remain two major priorities: increased research and development and the major task of forest renewal. Research and development is essential to protect our forests from threatening insects, disease and fire.

I see you are looking at the time, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps you could request the House to give unanimous consent so I may continue for a couple more minutes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the Minister to conclude his remarks?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Caccia: As I was saying, research and development is essential to protect our forests from threatening insects, desease and fire, to develop faster growing species, to develop means of managing forest productivity from a shrinking land resource base. The Canadian Forestry Service requires a substantial increase in resources to do its work. A major investment in forest renewal is required by the Provinces, industry and the federal Government to ensure an adequate supply of wood in order to sustain and enhance the forest industry which remains Canada's largest employer.

The evidence is clear: failure to act will jeopardize the 300 or more single industry, forestry-based communities and critically affect our balance of trade. The investments are labour intensive and give employment, particularly to our young people and our native people. However, in times of tight fiscal restraint and low profits for industry, the tendency is for us to postpone these essential tasks. Industry and Provinces must also confirm their resolve to rebuild our forests to ensure that future generations benefit as we are benefiting today.

Can we save Canadian forestry, it has been asked. The plan to do so is there. It has been supported and endorsed by various organizations, including the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers, by the Canadian Forest Advisory Council, the Forestry Industry Advisory Committee, industry associations, professional institutes of foresters and by all Parties of this House. The policies and plans are being implemented and the decisions are also being made.

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister which I think are pertinent to the debate. In the Minister's final comments he admitted what we have suspected all along, namely that there are tendencies by both federal and provincial Governments to postpone what the Minister called the major effort that must be made to save our forests. Since the Minister is approaching a critical deadline this Thursday when there is the annual auction to redistribute money that has not been used, and knowing that the Minister is behind in his commitment to come up with this $130 million for forest renewal, is the forest renewal side, which the Minister thinks to be critical, one of the things he has a tendency to recommend postponement of, or is the Minister confident that on Thursday he will get the necessary funds to meet the commitments he has made to the whole forest community?

Second, knowing of the tragedy, that of the resignation of the Assistant Deputy Minister and knowing of the invaluable contribution Mr. Reed has made in the effort to rebuild against all possible odds a federal forestry service, what is the Government's plan to replace Mr. Reed? Also, what is the next stage of the upgrading of the forest service? Is it to appoint a deputy minister? As the Minister well knows, and I am sure he agrees with me, the environmental side of his portfolio is overshadowing and taking precedence over some of his other responsibilities. I give the Minister credit: his heart is in the right place but he has the responsibility of a dual portfolio. Unfortunately, bureaucrats on the one side are overshadowing his responsibility on the forest side. I would appreciate the Minister responding to these questions.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I will try. Both are very difficult questions. The first relates to a decision to be made next Thursday. I cannot anticipate the answer because I lack the ability of a clairvoyant to know what the outcome will be. If the Hon. Member wants to know from me, as he did last Friday, whether I will put into the cause of forestry all my energy and commitment, my answer is definitely yes. I hope we will eventually find the funds required for the implementation of this policy, keeping in mind, as I mentioned earlier, that this is a joint kind of effort and that the Provinces will also have to indicate that they, too, put forestry at the top of their priorities in the selection of priorities which they have themselves. That it be recognized by the Provinces is extremely important since, after all, they own some 90 per cent of Crown lands.

As to the departure of the Assistant Deputy Minister, it is a great loss but not a tragedy because the departure was the wish of the official himself. He came to Ottawa with the intention of filling the position for three years and his three-year tenure expired at the end of October. It is a position that will be very difficult to fill by someone else with the same commitment and dynamic drive that Les Reed demonstrated during his three years. He has left with us a very important legacy. We are, however, in the process of looking for potential candidates willing to fill the position.

As to the final half of the Hon. Member's second question, I do not see, in all frankness and having been in the Department for only three months, a situation whereby the Canadian Forestry Service is overshadowed by other sections in the Department. I think it has all the scope and its place in the sun, as have other interests in Environment Canada. Certainly as long as I am in this portfolio it will have my ear and fullest attention.

Mr. Darling: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister. In all modesty the Minister has not mentioned his qualifications. I would point out to the House and to the people that the Minister is a professional forester. He is to be commended.

The Minister mentioned in his remarks the very substantial amount of $400 million which was DRIE money. That money will certainly not all be channelled through forestry even over a five-year period, which would amount to $125 million a year because the budget of DRIE in the past has been $600 million or $700 million in total a year.

One other thing. Since he wears the hat of the Minister of the Environment, I must tell him I am concerned and greatly interested in the acid rain problem. We on the committee, and I think the Minister as well, are aware of the possibility of

grave injury to reforestation, to the small seedlings coming up. I hope his Department is giving top priority to that as well.

Mr. Caccia: Dealing with the second point first, Mr. Speaker, the answer is definitely yes. We are devoting all possible attention to the long-term impact of acid rain on forest growth. The scientific data on this continent is very recent and young. However, there is enough evidence in Europe to make a strong case about the serious damage and effect of acid rain not only on seedlings but on grown-up stands. This is the kind of persuasive message which I have to bring to our American friends whenever I meet with them on environmental issues, particularly on acid rain, in Washington, Indianapolis or in New York.

● (1230)

I report with regret to the Hon. Member that the operation of convincing our friends to the south is not an easy one because in some quarters they are still looking for scientific evidence to prove the point the Hon. Member made so eloquently a moment ago. This is very serious because we are talking about long-term damage for which there is already evidence in Scandinavia and Central Europe. While I can assure him that we are paying a lot of attention to the consequences of acid rain on the growth of existing stands, I also report to him the fact that we are still in the phase of trying to convince certain quarters south of the border. My counterpart in Washington, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency, is having an absolutely miserable and difficult time convincing his own administration that this issue deserves attention in order to reduce damage to American forests themselves. It has now reached a point where unless there is clear indication of leadership on the part of the American government, we will be engaging in this debate for a long, long time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly).

Mr. Manly: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order concerning the matter of procedure, with one question on the other side and then a question being allowed from this side. I have an important question for the Minister concerning his statement today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has used its best discretion. Unfortunately the Chair did not see the Hon. Member for Restigouche (Mr. Harquail) seeking the floor. However, he was recognized earlier this morning, and the Chair is now recognizing someone who was not recognized earlier.

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the Minister. First, he pointed out that money had been spent under Section 38 to help with the EBAP program in British Columbia. He went on to say that the program would be continued under the Canada Works Program. Will the Minister admit that there is no specific forestry component in the Canada Works Program and that forestry projects will have to compete with a wide range of very worthy projects for a limited amount of money? There is no specific forestry amount of money. Could he answer that question?

Second, he mentioned something about which many of us are very concerned, that his Department was working to develop biological and non-chemical forms of pest control. Could he provide the House with more information on how much money is being spent on that, at what stage of development it is, and when we can expect some real results from the process?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the Hon. Member an answer to his second question specifically, but I do not have that figure available or at hand. I suggest that he put that question on the Order Paper for a reply in due course.

As to the forestry employment program, my understanding of the creative utilization of funds under Section 38 is that it exists and is available, and that we have renewed with the British Columbia forestry sector at the end of September an agreement that was expiring at that time. I do not see any conflict or restriction in availability of funds. Funds under Section 38 continue to remain available. I hope the forestry sector, through initiatives by public institutions or private institutions, will continue to make extensive use of funds under that Section.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent of the House to extend the question period for a short period of time, as there are Hon. Members on both sides seeking to be recognized?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up with the Minister responsible for forestry the question I asked the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) earlier. It concerns the motion before the House today. Setting aside the negative aspects of it and dealing with the positive side, I want to ask the Minister about a situation which exists in New Brunswick. First, I can tell him that we certainly applaud the forestry school at the University of New Brunswick and all other efforts carried out by DREE and by the federal Government in making available funds to protect this all-important industry which represents billions of dollars annually to the country.

My question relates to a difficulty which the International Paper Company is experiencing in New Brunswick. The Minister mentioned co-operation between the federal and provincial Governments. Could he speak with his counterparts, the Minister of Commerce and Development and the Minister responsible for natural resources in New Brunswick, regarding the high power rates? We know of the moneys that have been made available to Lepreau and nuclear generating stations in New Brunswick, moneys which have been made available for renewal of equipment and plants through DREE. Now we have this difficulty. If one of the pressures on being more competitive is high power rates, would the Minister responsible

for forestry agree to consult with his counterparts in that Province to see if there are any ways or means which can be found to alleviate the pressure and to have the Ministers responsible in that Province through their Premier agree to some alleviation of pressure by reducing power rates for that plant at this time?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly make note of the Hon. Member's intervention and the concern he has expressed. I have an opportunity twice a year to meet with colleagues in charge of forestry and environmental matters and I will certainly raise it with them at the earliest opportunity. I understand the difficulty posed by the fact that high power rates tend to have an effect upon the cost of the final product and that, therefore, it may be disadvantageous to some aspects of the New Brunswick economy. This is the reason the federal Government and the New Brunswick Government entertained an agreement for the construction of a new nuclear plant in order to increase the quantity of power available and thus hopefully reduce rates. Having said that, I will indicate the Hon. Member's concern to my colleagues and discuss that matter with them at the earliest opportunity.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, the Minister stated that forestry did not take a second-rate position in his Department. Pursuant to that, I would like to ask him whether he had frequent and regular meetings with the Assistant Deputy Minister responsible for forestry. Was his telephone open to the Assistant Deputy Minister, or did he have to go through other Deputy Ministers to present forest problems to the Minister? It seems to me the fact that we have no better than an Assistant Deputy Minister for forestry would indicate that it is very badly subordinated, though it is the most important of the trade-generating industries in the nation.

Mr. Caccia: I would like to reassure the Hon. Member that he need not worry about accessibility. On several occasions I indicated to the Assistant Deputy Minister that he should feel free to call me and to approach me on matters related to his responsibility. I invited him to do so on several occasions.

• (1240)

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to speak this morning on the motion brought forward by the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). Normally the only time we get to talk about resources in this House is when the Government comes forward with a new proposal for yet more tax burdens on a resource industry or comes in to nationalize an industry either through the back door or front door.

My intention this morning is not to examine any one resource industry. We were pleased to hear the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River indicating the importance of various industries. However, my intention is to examine the reasons for the failure of this Government's policies in these areas, the philosophy that it maintains and its ideas which have given rise to the failure of forestry, mining and other resource industries.

Before I get into that, I would like to preface my remarks with a couple of observations. The first observation that is apparent to almost every Canadian is that we are the most resource-rich nation in the world, especially when you take relative populations into account.

The whole history of Canada, or a very great part of it, deals with the development, exploitation and utilization of the natural resources of this country. It was in the sixteenth century that fishermen from European ports, Portugal, Spain and other countries, first came over in small vessels to exploit the riches of the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the fur trade blossomed. It was probably the most important industry in New France. The fur trade helped to develop the rest of the hinterland outside of that small area in the St. Lawrence Valley. The fur traders went far afield and penetrated into the vast interior.

I was fortunate to receive just the other day a publication by the Fur Council of Canada entitled "The Fur Industry in Canada". It gives us a description of the proud history of the fur trade. It is sad to relate that at the present time the fur industry is under something of an attack. The trappers have been faced with inequities in taxation and are finding it tough to survive. An even greater threat to that industry are certain people who do not like to see fur-bearing animals taken in Canada. It is incumbent upon this House to protect the trapping industry.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries we got under way with the exploitation of our forest resources and agriculture, especially western Canadian agriculture potential. There was a taking up of agricultural lands in western Canada. The forests of eastern Canada, especially in the time of the continental policies of Napoleon with regard to the timber industry of New Brunswick, first came into being.

In the twentieth century, Canada and Canadian resources have really come into their own. We have had the development of mines. Around the 1940s we had development starting in the oil and gas industry, especially in western Canada. That industry is now finding new worlds to conquer offshore in eastern Canada and in the Arctic. In this century we have developed hydro-electric resources. There is more to come, of that I have no doubt.

It is interesting that we have to take into account that a lot of our natural resources can only be developed and exploited if we have the knowledge available so to do. We must have the capital available to develop them and find people who are skilled in the exploitation of resources. For these reasons, we on this side are most concerned with the continuation of research and development in this country on natural resource issues and the training of personnel.

With all our resources, Canada ought to be the richest nation on the face of the earth. In fact, in the fifties and sixties it looked like we were getting there. We were second only to the United States in standard of living throughout the world.

That brings me to my second undeniable observation, that since the present Government under the Prime Minister (Mr.

Trudeau) took office in 1968, everything has slid downhill. We are now no longer second in standard of living of the world but fourteenth, fifteenth or sixteenth. We have slid downhill. The underlying reason for this is that we have neglected our resource industries and those who work and invest in our resource industries, those whose livelihood depends on the forests, mines, agriculture and fishing. Had we husbanded our resources and adopted policies conducive to their continued development, we would not be fifteenth in the standard of living table in the world. We would be first, where we deserve to be and by rights should be.

Let us look at the over-all policies and the reasons Members opposite have failed to increase the Canadian standard of living but have allowed it to decline, and the reason there has been failure of resource industry policy. The first reason has to be that hon. gentlemen opposite—a bunch of academics, professional politicians, people with an administrative background—have had little experience in the outside world. Gentlemen opposite have not been involved with industrial organizations. They do not come from areas where resource industries are of fundamental importance. They are more interested in philosophical ideas, particularly in changing the way of thinking of people. They love to do that to Canadians. They want everyone to think a certain way. They engage in advertising and everything else in order to get people to think their way rather than concentrate on practical, economic issues.

For example, for two years this House was preoccupied with the constitutional issue. It was a manufactured issue. I did not come across a farmer, miner or logger three or four years ago who had that at the top of his list of priorities. There was nothing wrong with the Constitution we had before, yet we spent two years, to the exclusion of almost everything else, talking about a Constitution when we should have been talking about getting the economy of Canada back on track.

Gentlemen opposite are imbued with these socialist ideas. They think that the state should control and regulate every aspect of the economy and other areas of life throughout Canada. They think that as the Government they can direct everything that goes on in the country. It does not work. Instead of having one huge pyramid with the Prime Minister and the Cabinet at the top, giving direction to and regulating everything that goes on in Canadian life, there should be a series of pyramids. Much of industry should be fairly independent of Government. The Government should give only the most general direction. Industry should be relatively independent. Universities and education facilities should be independent. As well, the artistic community should be independent and we should have these independent societies operating together rather than having everything directed by the Government.

● (1250)

We see that the Government is using its direct influence to get into the resource industries. An example of this, of course, is Petro-Canada. I cannot see one good reason why we need a nationalized oil industry in Canada, without which we were doing far better. What has happened is that the Government has taxed every gallon of gasoline and heating oil that Canadians buy in order to fulfil its socialist ideals.

The situation with Petro-Canada is bad enough. It was only recently that, through the use of closure, the Canagrex Bill was forced through the House of Commons. The Government's intention for Canagrex is clear. It wants to get a stranglehold grip on agriculture in Canada, which is another area that ought to be independent.

Socialist views have come to the forefront with Bill C-48 and its back-in provisions. If someone acquires some land and drills an oil well or a gas well in what the Government calls Canadian lands but what I call territorial lands and risks his own money to find something that looks profitable, along comes the friendly Government of Canada, through Petro-Canada, saying: "Okay, we are going to take over 25 per cent of this venture". I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if this is the way to encourage enterprise in the nation.

The Government has the idea that all resources belong to the state and that anyone who gets into the resource exploitation or development industry is entitled only to what is called an economic rent. That means that the investor takes his risk, spends his money, devotes his time and energy to something, and if it does prove to be successful, somebody from the Government of Canada will come along and say: "We figure that you should get 7 per cent on your investment and that is all you are going to get. We are going to take every other nickel that you make and put it into our coffers because the state owns the resources."

This concept is evident in the progressive incremental royalties that apply to oil and gas exploitation on federal lands under Bill C-48. Unfortunately, this concept is now so pervasive throughout Canadian government, not only the federal Government but provincial Governments as well, that it goes almost unchallenged. I can tell you that the concept of the state owning all of the resources is wrong. Resources should belong to the finders of those resources and the people who have worked to make a go of them.

In the case of minerals and oil and gas, the people who find the ore deposits or the oil and gas on Crown lands should become the owners of those resources and deposits. If a fisherman were to find a new area for fishing, he should be entitled to extraordinary profits from developing that new area. I am ashamed to think of what is happening within the Department of Fisheries in Winnipeg where officials are trying to use the same concept of economic rent on fisheries. A fisherman will be entitled to make so much money a year and no more. If he makes more than that amount of money, the Government will take it all back or tell him to stop fishing because he has been too successful.

In the case of farms and agricultural operations, the concept is not so much one of the resource belonging to the person who finds that resource but rather one of the persons who puts the effort into breaking the sod where it has never been broken before and building up something which will be a part of

Canada becoming the owner of that resource. In exchange for doing that, that farmer or agriculturalist should be entitled to ownership in the resource, which in this case is agricultural land. That is the concept that existed when the western Canadian Prairies were settled. I think we must get back to that way of thinking rather than the concept of the state owning everything and perhaps allowing a little bit of farming, a little bit of mining and a little bit of fishing to take place while saying: "Do not by any means make any profit out of those ventures because, if you do, we will take it all back in the form of taxes and royalties".

We on this side of the House agree that resource exploitation should be subject to taxation. I am not saying that there should be no taxes on mines, farms and oil fields. However, these taxes should not be designed to skim everything off the top and leave nothing. In cases where some people are eminently successful and come up with a greatly profitable venture, those people should be and deserve to be highly rewarded. It is necessary that some people be successful and rewarded in order that their success act as an incentive for others to do the same, to risk money in prospecting ventures and to risk hard work in developing agricultural lands.

Last, Sir, we recognize that Members opposite, especially those on the Treasury benches, are by and large people from the central metropolitan areas of Canada. They do not have a first-hand knowledge of the resource industry and they do not have a feeling for the resource industry. The fact is that enterprise in Canada is by and large to be found in the extremities of the country. The core, Sir, has a tendency to grow soft. Ideas that result in the exploitation of the hinterland of Canada where those resources are located and result in that money and wealth and power being brought into the central area of Canada find favour with the present Government.

In the few moments left before one o'clock, I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the October 13 edition of *The Northern Miner*. That editorial contrasts the $275 million combined grant put up by the federal and Quebec Governments to build a helicopter plant in Montreal, which admittedly is to create some 3,700 jobs over 20 years, with the gold mining developments in the Hemlo area of Ontario. It is expected that as a result of new gold finds in that area, some 5,000 to 8,000 people will move there and the direct number of jobs created will be very much equivalent to those created by the so-called investment of some $275 million of taxpayers' money in Montreal. However, the big difference is that in the Hemlo area, the situation was all brought about by private investment. Not one dollar of taxpayers' money was expended. What will happen is that that privately developed area will be taxed in order to provide funds for the helicopter plant in Montreal.

This is the approach that is taken by the Government. The Government will not allow economic developments to occur naturally according to market conditions in Canada. It insists that it has the responsibility to redirect funds into the areas in which it can mine for votes.

I see that it is rapidly approaching one o'clock, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps you would be kind enough to allow me to call it one o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired. He cannot call it one o'clock unless he has the unanimous consent of the House.

[*Translation*]

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

CONDEMNATION OF IMPACT ON WESTERN FARMERS

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, last week Royal Assent was given to Bill C-155 and the Liberal betrayal of the farmers of western Canada was completed, a betrayal which will have its impact on all of Canada for a long time.

It could have been a glorious day, a day of triumph for the producers of our nation, a fair deal for the grain growers, a chance for the cattlemen, the hog raiser and the processors of the West to realize their great potential. Exports of Canadian grain could have been greatly increased from the present $6 billion, and the economic spin-off in direct employment of at least another 25,000 jobs could have resulted, with the manufacturing industries of central and eastern Canada reaping the benefits of some $3 billion for farm machinery alone. Yes, it could have been a wonderful day had the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and the Liberal Members of Parliament in the House not betrayed western Canada by refusing to legislate Gilson's recommendations.

Instead, it was a black day. Grain farmers in western Canada will have to pay double, and then five times the Crow rate, with an already shrinking income. The cattle industry, the hog industry, and the processers of western Canada have had their hopes dashed to the ground. There is joyous laughter in the board rooms of the railways, but only tears and dismay and disappointment in the homes of western Canada.

The Liberal majority forced the Bill through over the opposition of the Progressive Conservative Party. The only hope for Canada's agriculture now is that, out of the ashes, will come a Progressive Conservative Government which will be fair to all regions of Canada.

S.O. 21

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

QUEBEC INDUSTRIAL PARKS—RECOMMENDATION THAT GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENT CERTAIN MODIFICATIONS

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Government has introduced a new program to help business in Canada. The new Regional Industrial Development Program, also known as RIDP, has received praise from all sectors of the economy. Last Friday, I was able to attend a seminar at Black Lake in Frontenac County, where industrial commissioners, mayors and businessmen expressed their satisfaction with the Government's decision to create a one-stop program for providing assistance to business. However, there is a problem concerning levels of financial aid. For example, since industrial parks in the riding of Lévis are located in a level II area, theoretically they will receive less aid than level III sites on the Quebec City side. In this particular case, industrial parks in Lauzon, Saint-Romuald and Laporte, located several kilometers from the Quebec City Urban Community's industrial park at Saint-Augustin will be at a disadvantage because of the way dividing lines were drawn, which, I feel, should be easy to correct by changing Acts and Regulations accordingly. As things are now, for a million-dollar investment, the mere fact of selecting Saint-Augustin on the Quebec City side, instead of the Laporte industrial park in the riding of Lévis, would mean a difference in funding of $150,000, although these are two areas facing each other on either side of the St. Lawrence. I therefore urge the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lumley) to make appropriate changes for the benefit of a program that has otherwise been well received.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CYPRUS—DISAPPROVAL OF DECLARATION OF TURKISH CYPRIOT REPUBLIC

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed sad to see what has taken place, the Turkish Cypriots' unilateral proclamation of independence in the occupied part of Cyprus. This action has dangerously increased the tension already prevailing in this sensitive part of the world. There is no doubt that mainland Turkey remains internationally exposed because the present situation is exclusively the result of the continuous occupation by its troops of a large part of Cyprus. Turkey must accept full responsibility for this move which has undermined the intercommunal dialogue and the initiatives of the Secretary General of the United Nations to promote an agreed, just, and lasting settlement of the Cyprus problem.

It is encouraging to see, Mr. Speaker, that many countries around the world, including Canada, have protested the deplorable action which has taken place. Commendable as this may be, words alone, after a time, have a way of dissipating into thin air and becoming soon forgotten. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Government not only to restate its strong disapproval of an independent Turkish Cypriot republic in Cyprus, but to underline this by calling on all nations to undertake further diplomatic actions and other deterrents which would reverse the deplorable decision that has been taken in occupied Cyprus.

* * *

[*Translation*]

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGATIONS OF PREMIER OF PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

Mr. Rémi Bujold (Bonaventure-Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, during the past weekend, the Premier of the Province of Quebec, at a meeting held in the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area, expressed his Government's intention to proceed with Bill 38 which prohibits municipalities from accepting money from the federal Government. It is most unfortunate that the Premier of Quebec is claiming that the federal Government refused to sign an agreement with Quebec and was distributing funds without prior planning. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it has never been the Canadian Government's intention to ignore the Constitution and deal directly with the municipalities. We have already had discusisons, and we even signed an agreement with the Government of Quebec for handing over the money to the municipalities, an agreement that was broken by that very same Government. We are still willing to continue negotiations and pursue them so as to reach an agreement with this Government. It is, however, unfortunate that the Ministers responsible within the Quebec Government should cancel, without notice, meetings scheduled with our federal Ministers, and that they do not seem to want to reach an agreement.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the Canadian Government has concluded similar agreements with the nine other Provinces and the two Territories, and I find it difficult to understand why we cannot conclude a similar agreement with the Government of Quebec.

* * *

[*English*]

CROWN CORPORATIONS

SALARIES OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, we in this House have learned that a number of senior executives of Crown corporations, and other Cabinet appointees, may be earning as much $227,900 per year. The fact that Canadians are kept in the dark about the salaries of Jack Horner, Claude Taylor and Pierre Juneau is unacceptable government secrecy.

In the private sector this same attitude prevents us from finding out the salaries and benefits of our corporate elite from

Canadian sources. When I and others have risen to complain about those salaries and benefits in the private sector exceeding $500,000, we have had to quote from American sources. Surely, in the spirit of open Government and freedom of information, we should be entitled to these figures from published Canadian sources.

When public and private sector leaders preach restraint, they should be practising it. When these same leaders are reaping the benefits of a strained economy, they should be subject to scrutiny by the public. When they accept outrageous and immoral salaries and benefits, they rob from the needy in our society. They rob jobs from the jobless, food from those who are hungry, and homes from those who are in need of shelter.

* * *

STATUS OF WOMEN

ORDINATION OF FEMALE CLERGY

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, the Parliament of Canada continues to support the changing role of women in Canadian society. Women must play a full part in all facets of life and we parliamentarians, of both sexes, encourage their participation and hope that opportunities will increasingly open up to ensure that participation. However, in one segment of society progress has been remarkably slow. I refer to the church.

Although some denominations have made real efforts, by and large the established churches have been slow in recognizing the full worth of women and their potential for enhancing things spiritual across the nation. We must be able to look forward to the eventual ordination of female clergy in all churches. One would hope that churches that wish to be heard on a variety of social issues would first make a real effort to improve the status of women within their own organizations.

* * *

● (1410)

UNITED NATIONS

MEDIATION OF CYPRUS DISPUTE—CALL FOR SUPPORT

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, having just returned from a visit to the United Nations General Assembly, I am more convinced than ever that the UN plays a unique and important role in fostering world peace. We, as Canadians, should be aware of the fact that the UN is one of the few forums through which smaller powers can have an impact on world affairs. This is an especially important point to remember in light of the renewed dispute in Cyprus. Canada maintains a contingent of about 500 soldiers in Cyprus as part of the UN peace-keeping force, so now, more than ever, Canadians must place their trust in the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly as a means for resolving the Cyprus dispute.

Clearly, Canadians have a commitment to retain peace-keeping troops in Cyprus at this time. But it is also just as clear that Canadians have been sending soldiers to Cyprus for 19 years and there is still no sign of an imminent resolution to the dispute between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. In fact, the latest developments in Cyprus demonstrate clearly the futility of simply providing peace-keeping troops. Those troops must be viewed only as a mechanism for keeping the peace while a permanent solution is being negotiated. The United Nations plays an instrumental role in both of these functions. Therefore I wish the UN Secretary General well in his effots to mediate the Cyprus dispute. I call upon Canadians to continue to have faith in the United Nations as a mechanism for fostering world peace.

* * *

RAILWAYS

RETENTION OF MANITOBA BRANCH LINES URGED

Mr. Laverne Lewycky (Dauphin-Swan River): Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the Government has moved very quickly on the Crow rate. Of course that affects constituencies such as Dauphin-Swan River. In view of the fact that this decision has been made on the Crow rate, I urge the Minister to examine seriously the impact on farmers surrounding some of the rail lines presently slated for abandonment. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to the line which goes through Amaranth, Manitoba, which is slated for abandonment in August, 1984, and also to the line that goes through Fork River and Winnipegosis, otherwise known as the Winnipegosis subdivision, which is slated for abandonment in 1985.

It is very important that these lines be kept open so that farmers do not have to transport their grain an inordinate distance to market. It is also very important that the Minister review the operations of the western arm of the CTC.

In Manitoba we have had approximately 18 rail line abandonment hearings. It is a shame the way the western arm of the CTC has been operating. Of the 18 hearings held, all have been decided in favour of the railways. Now is the time that decisions should be made to assist the farmers, so I urge the Minister to look very seriously into these matters, reverse the decisions of the CTC and see that these lines are kept open so that farmers can transport their grain.

* * *

SPORTS

ATHLETIC BIAS IN FAVOUR OF TALL PARTICIPANTS

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, competitive sporting events provide major entertainment for those actively participating and those attending as spectators. Yet there has crept into the field of athletics, especially in rowing, basketball, volleyball and swimming, an overwhelming bias in favour

of the tall and the very tall. It is, in a sense, unfair and discriminatory that in so many sporting events height is an essential asset to achieve acclaim and recognition. Indeed, many of the enjoyable sporting events are almost exclusively the preserve of the very tall. Yet many team events could probably be played as spectacularly and expertly by players of shorter stature if the handicap of height could be eliminated.

The merits of existing rules in athletics should be reviewed. Ways must be found to remedy the seriousness of the height bias in competitive sports. This would promote greater participation of the general public in sporting events. In international events, athletes from Asia, Africa and Latin America would stand a greater chance of success when competing in events where height bias now exists. Such changes would be more in keeping with the first charter of the Olympic Games which proclaims "They assembled, the amateurs from all nations, in fair and equal competition."

* * *

NEW EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

EXTENSION OF EMPLOYMENT TIME NECESSARY TO QUALIFY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, not very long ago the federal Government introduced a program called NEED, the purpose of which was to fill a gap so that when people no longer qualified for unemployment insurance benefits they would be able to requalify themselves through ten weeks' participation in this Program creating jobs. This was the Government's intention not very many months ago.

I am saddened to report to the House of Commons that, during the course of this Program, the Government changed the rules. What the Government has done in Peterborough is to say that people in Peterborough now require 16 weeks in order to qualify, rather than ten weeks. It is grossly unfair and discriminatory, and I call upon the Government to reverse its position and go back to the original Program of ten weeks on NEEDs in Peterborough so people can then qualify for UIC, rather than changing the rules, as it so often does, in the middle of existing programs.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

CORPORATE SHAREHOLDING LIMITATION ACT

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Last Friday, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs said that all Liberal members were in favour of Bill S-31. That day, however, the distinguished Member for Saint-Denis showed his fierce opposition to the Bill when he said the following, and I quote:

The Bill is going to die in the Senate any way.

The Member for Saint-Denis, who is an experienced and respected Member of this House, was very definite about this. Considering the disastrous effects the Bill would have on an instrument that is vital to the economic well-being of Quebecers, could the Acting Prime Minister confirm, as was said by the Member for Saint-Denis, that he intends to let Bill S-31 die on the Senate Order Paper?

Mr. David Berger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to remind the Hon. Leader of the Opposition of various comments that were made by the media in Quebec and I shall quote the newspaper *Finance* of November 14, which said that Ottawa's reaction was legitimate: "It would be dangerous to let Minister Parizeau decide how broad sectors of the Canadian economy should develop". Regarding the Hon. Member's question, I may add that I believe that the Members of this House and this Party will have an opportunity to examine in committee all amendments tabled by the Minister and to consider this question in the House, and that our Members will give their answer in the final vote on this Bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Mulroney: I want to hear it from the organ grinder and not the monkey.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacBain: No brains and no manners.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mulroney: The Government is trying to do in a round about way what it would otherwise be afraid to do directly, and we are going to get at the truth behind Bill S-31.

The Member for Saint-Denis—a respected and experienced Member of this House and excellent Cabinet material, more so than some Members who are in Cabinet today—said that Bill S-31 was going to die a natural death. Considering this categorical statement, I would like to ask the Acting Prime Minister whether the Government intends to withdraw Bill S-31, and if so, I would ask the Government to withdraw it today, instead of continuing a debate that has become increasingly useless.

● (1420)

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT TABLE CORRESPONDENCE WITH PROVINCES

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, what kind of no is this? We have no way of knowing!

I am going to get back to the Acting Prime Minister, because this is a Bill that would have disastrous consequences for Quebecers and because the Government is putting up a smoke screen and lacks the courage to say what it wants to do about this legislation—the Member for Saint-Denis knows, however, and he said most definitely that the Bill would not be passed.

An Hon. Member: Question!

Mr. Mulroney: Considering those facts, and also considering the fact that last Friday, the Minister based her argument on the objections of the Provinces, could the Acting Prime Minister inform the House which Provinces objected to the Bill, and could he also table in the House any relevant correspondence?

An Hon. Member: You are a clown!

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that before any Bill can become law it has to pass the two Houses of Parliament. In this particular case the Bill is before the Senate. Before it becomes law it will have to come to the House of Commons and be debated. It seems to me that is the time when we deal with all the questions in which the Hon. Member is interested.

LIMITATION PLACED ON INVESTMENT

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): My question is also for the Acting Prime Minister. Will the Acting Prime Minister confirm that Bill S-31 limits the investment by the Caisse de Dépôt in at least 35 large Canadian transportation companies, and potentially in hundreds of other large federally incorporated companies whose activities include transportation? This Bill forces Quebecers who want to invest in Canada either to look outside Canada or to go back to their Province. This is a separatist Bill. Will the Acting Prime Minister explain to us the logic of forcing Quebecers, who want to invest in this country, to turn their backs on Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. David Berger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead is so concerned about the lack of investment opportunities for the Caisse de dépôt et de placement du Québec, perhaps he could suggest that the Caisse comply with the regulations of the Toronto Stock Exchange, and it would then be allowed to trade on the TSE.

PETRO-CANADA HOLDINGS IN WESTCOAST TRANSMISSION

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I prefer to let the Stock Exchange settle its own affairs. Here in the House, I am concerned about the business of Parliament and about the threat hanging over Quebecers.

If I may, I would like to put a supplementary to the Acting Prime Minister.

[*English*]

If the Government is worried about government agencies operating outside the jurisdiction of the government that sponsors those agencies, will the Acting Prime Minister tell the House what actions the Government of Canada is going to take about the fact that Petro-Canada holds more than 31 per cent of the shares of Westcoast Transmission, a pipeline company operating exclusively within the Province of British Columbia? Why is there one standard for provincial agencies and a different standard for federal agencies?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I want to come back to the point which I made earlier. In Question Period we are having discussion on a Bill which is in the other place and which will come before this House. There will then be plenty of opportunity to debate it. I do not intend to debate, in Question Period, a Bill that will be before the House in the normal way.

Mr. McDermid: You don't even know what it says.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LAY-OFFS IN AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY—INTRODUCTION OF JOB-CREATION PROGRAM

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment. In the months of September and October we lost 48,000 full-time jobs in Canada. On Friday last McDonnell-Douglas laid off 500 people. This is part of lay-offs that are occurring in many parts of the country. Precisely when will the Minister put before the House of Commons the program that the Government has been touting around the country; is there such a program simply waiting to be implemented, to create employment for Canadians who are presently unemployed?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that since last Autumn there have been something like 350,000 new jobs created in the Canadian economy. The answer to the second part of his question is that I am looking forward to the presentation of the Speech from the Throne. Within that context of government policies I hope to be able to present the reinforcement of our present programs, and perhaps some new ones which would focus on the question which concerns him.

Oral Questions

COMPANIES' RESPONSIBILITIES TO CANADIAN WORKERS

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Notwithstanding the Minister's claim that there have been substantial numbers of new jobs created, the overwhelming majority of those jobs are part-time jobs that do not meet the needs of those people who are providing the only source of income for their families. In addition to the 500 that McDonnell-Douglas announced it laid off, it is subcontracting work which could provide for an additional thousand or more manyears of work to other employers, some in Canada but not all. What action does the Minister propose to take to guarantee that those companies in Canada which are currently enjoying higher profit margins than they were a year or a year and one-half ago, and which still have people unemployed, are undertaking their responsibility to this country and its citizens by giving Canadians an opportunity to go to work?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first part of the question, I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that the largest part of those 350,000 jobs are short-term jobs. A very significant number of them are permanent. Moreover, I do not think it is wise to heap scorn on short-term jobs, particularly for young people and those entering the economy for the first time. That first job, even if it is a short-term job, is extraordinarily important in giving them the work experience which enables them to go on and subsequently have more permanent employment in the labour force.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): All across the country we have people who have been laid off. Many of them have reached a point where they are no longer eligible for unemployment insurance. Many of them cannot find employment. Given that one month from now will be Christmas, is it the intention of the Government, since it cannot produce employment for those people, at least to give them an opportunity to have a halfway decent income over this very difficult period by extending unemployment insurance benefits to ensure that those who have run out of benefits will, in fact, receive unemployment insurance benefits up until the time the government programs take effect?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think that the approach that we are taking is the one presented by the Hon. Member's colleague, the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway, speaking on "The Nation's Business" this weekend. I recommend that presentation of the Hon. Member. The Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway recognized that there is a strengthening of the economy taking place. We on this side of the House believe that in that strengthening of the economy jobs are being created for Canadians largely as a result of the policies which have been brought forward by this Government. It is that approach, the creation of jobs in the private sector, which is partially as a result of co-operation with the federal Government, that is leading to the response to the job needs of this country, which we support.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

LEBANON—PRESENCE OF PLO AND SYRIAN FORCES—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. After weeks of meetings and briefings to clarify the Minister's unfortunate statements with respect to the Middle East situation, questions are still unanswered. Two weeks ago, for example, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs asked in this House:

> Why has our Department of External Affairs not moved to condemn the presence of the parasite PLO in Lebanon and the Syrian invaders, and demanded the withdrawal of Syria and the PLO?

Would the Minister now answer that question? Why indeed has our Department of External Affairs not moved to condemn the presence of the parasitic PLO in Lebanon and the Syrian invaders, and ask that they withdraw from Lebanon?

● (1430)

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the question contains an implication which I reject totally, namely, that Canada has not taken a stand on all foreign forces in Lebanon. Our view, which we have stated frequently, is that all foreign forces should withdraw unless specifically requested by the Government of Lebanon. That applies to all forces.

We have made it clear about Israeli forces. We have made it equally clear about Syrian forces and the PLO. Let the Hon. Member be under no misapprehension about the over-all view of the Government of Canada with respect to the occupying groups in the sorely afflicted country of Lebanon.

MINISTER'S STATEMENT IN CAIRO

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Bearing in mind that Israel is Canada's friend and our traditional ally, and if the Minister's last answer is correct, would he indicate why, when he was in Cairo on October 23, he specifically called for the unilateral withdrawal of Israel's troops from Lebanon but made absolutely no mention of the withdrawal of the Soviet-backed Syrian troops from the same country?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, again the Hon. Member should examine the many transcripts of press conferences given in my visit to the Middle East. I made it abundantly clear that, in the view of the Government of Canada, Syrian forces should withdraw from Lebanon. If the

Hon. Member has any doubt about that policy let me repeat it. It is the view of the Government of Canada that Syrian forces should withdraw. That statement was made on a number of occasions—

Mr. Stevens: When?

Mr. MacEachen: —on my visit to the Middle East. It was certainly made to my interlocutors in the various conversations which I had. Let the Hon. Member not try to create a false issue here.

Mr. Stevens: They are your words.

Mr. MacEachen: The matter has been fully dealt with in a number of statements which I have made, including those made in the course of the Middle East visit.

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON SYRIAN POLICIES

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the same Minister. The Minister will know that the impression which was left from his trip, as a result of his comments about the potential role for peace which Syria had to play, was that in fact Canadian policy had shifted toward a pro-Syrian position. Therefore I invite the Minister today to make the record as clear as possible for all Canadians, and particularly for our allies in this case, and simply say that the gravest possible threat posed to peace in the Middle East, to Israel, and to Lebanon, is currently posed by the policies and actions of Syria. I think he probably believes that if he represents Canada's policy, and I invite him to make that statement.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I regarded the visit which I made to Syria as an important one which illustrated to me the influence which Syria presently has in the Middle East. That was confirmed, the influence which Syria does have in the Middle East, either constructively or destructively. It can either be a positive force or a destructive force.

In my discussions with the President of Syria, Mr. al-Assad, I pointed out to him the influence which his country has, and I expressed the strong view that he ought to exercise that influence in a constructive way in order to facilitate the peace process in the Middle East. That is the view of the Government of Canada.

REQUEST FOR CONDEMNATION OF SYRIAN ACTIONS

Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West): Mr. Speaker, in the interest of clarity let me ask the Minister to use his own words and say to Canadians, Israelis and our friends, that what Syria is presently doing is using its influence, its force and its support destructively. Will he make that simple statement?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member must provide me with what particular action conducted by Syria I should condemn. We have condemned the presence of Syrian forces in Lebanon. We have urged them to withdraw as quickly as possible. We have urged Syria to participate in respect of the peace process in the Middle East.

We have made all of these suggestions in the course of the Middle East tour, and the Hon. Member should not attempt to draw in side issues that were not part of my discussions in the Middle East. I know what the Hon. Member is up to, and I do not respect his attitude very much.

I want to tell him that the trip to the Middle East was a success. My visit to Israel was a success, and it was so described in subsequent exchanges by the Prime Minister of Israel who regarded the trip as a confirmation of a longstanding friendship between Canada and Israel.

It was my purpose in going to the Middle East to draw closer Canada and Israel, and to improve bilateral relations between Canada and all countries in the Middle East.

* * *

FORESTRY

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT'S EXPENDITURES ON REFORESTATION

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment who is responsible for the forest industry. He knows full well the importance of new initiatives for reforestation. Last week he indicated that the Government was spending $80 million in reforestation moneys. Considering that the Government of Canada will give to the oil and gas companies of Canada something in excess of $1.5 billion this year, would he tell the House if he still considers $80 million not to be a pitiful amount of money, as I suggested last week?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Hon. Member, in posing the question, is at all interested in finding sources of energy in the North so as to strengthen Canada's independence from foreign imports. When that policy was established under the National Energy Program some years ago, it was natural that the Government would pursue the policy vigorously in order to ensure Canada's self sufficiency.

REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister did not get the gist of my question. It dealt with forestry and the lack of money for reforestation. Considering that his Assistant Deputy Minister recently quit in disgust at the lack of initiative the Government was taking, would the Minister agree to follow the advice of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce who suggested recently that it was time that the Government of Canada set up a Department of Forestry? Would he give some consideration to actually setting up a Ministry of Forestry and, if not, would he at

least follow the advice from his colleague in Cabinet and set up a Department of Forestry to give it the much deserved credit that Canada's number one industry deserves?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Hon. Member will agree that the creation of another Department will not help the growth and strengthening of our forest industry. What is needed is a commitment by industry and the Provinces, which are the owners of 90 per cent of Crown land, and by the federal Government, in co-ordinating a national policy. If he believes that the structural change he suggests would enhance the cause of forestry, he would have to make a case for it.

* * *

CROWN CORPORATIONS

AVAILABILITY OF REPORT ON SALARIES OF SENIOR EXECUTIVES

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the President of the Privy Council my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. On Thursday, November 17, the President of the Privy Council tabled in the House of Commons, very quietly I might add, a 264-page report dealing with special pay for special public sector people who apparently are not covered generously enough by Treasury Board guidelines.

Would the Deputy Prime Minister tell us why there is only one copy of this report in the Library of Parliament, and why there is only one copy down in Sessional Papers, particularly when, the day before the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates sits, those copies are not available to Members who are interested in the report for their work on that committee?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the Hon. Member why there is only one copy in the Library or in the committee branch. The document was tabled in the House of Commons and therefore it is a public document which can be made available in any numbers required. It is the purpose of the Government to make the information available and that is why it was tabled in the House of Commons. I hope the Hon. Member regards the House of Commons as a very public place. All of its documents are available to the public.

CRITERIA GOVERNING NON-CLASSIFIED APPOINTMENTS

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, three Members on this side of the House have attempted to get copies of that document and they are not available to Members of the House of Commons who are interested in operating properly on the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

• (1440)

What are the criteria and guidelines for non-classified appointments? Are the Treasury Board statutes and guidelines obsolete? One can understand the need for special remuneration for the president and the chief executive officers of the Bank of Canada, Air Canada, and maybe the CNR—maybe even PetroCan, but why the Chairman of the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency? What is so special about the President and the Chairman of the Canada Museum Construction Corporation, the Special Adviser to the Minister of Finance and the Chairman of VIA Rail, who, every time he sells a ticket, has to come back to the Consolidated Revenue Fund for $50? Why are these special rates of remuneration spread so widely across the sector?

An Hon. Member: Because they are Liberals.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): The Hon. Member has asked why data on these particular classifications or particular employees are included in this report. As I understand it, it was an effort to make information public with respect to the compensation paid under Order in Council appointments. The Hon. Member will have noticed it is not a range of compensation but an effort to show the very top salary and the lowest salary in that group of persons appointed by the Governor in Council. That was an effort required under the law passed in connection with the six and five program.

* * *

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

PUBLICATION OF BOOK ON PATRIATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. There are 1.4 million unemployed Canadians seeking work. The Government has refused funding for the Farm Credit Corporation, restricting the capacity of our farmers; and the Acting Prime Minister knows that many students are seeking employment. In the context of the lack of availability of funds, why has his Government suddenly, despite all urging toward restraint, unveiled this elitist book, "Constitution 1982", costing over one-quarter of a million dollars? Would the Acting Prime Minister explain why his Government has made it a priority to publish this expensive book, breaking its own commitment to restraint at this time?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised the Hon. Member would raise questions about that particular publication on the Constitution.

Mr. Crosbie: It is a sleazy piece of work.

Mr. MacEachen: It was published to pay particular attention to an historic landmark in the history of our country. I am very surprised that the Hon. Member would take that attitude. I have seen the book which the Hon. Member has in his hand.

I think it is a splendid effort on the part of the Secretary of State, and I think the money was well spent in the interests of Canadian patriotism.

COST TO TREASURY

Mr. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is also for the Acting Prime Minister. In his introduction, the Secretary of State calls this book an exercise in "fostering among Canadians an awareness and understanding of their history and symbols". In the light of the Acting Prime Minister's answer, how many Canadians do he and his Government think are somehow going to get their minds into the Constitution at $20 or $30 a crack? What will be the loss to the federal treasury? Are we going to go on and on with further printings in order to follow through what the Secretary of State says is the purpose of this book?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, maybe the Hon. Member should take a walk into a book store and find out what is paid today for books of much less merit than the particular one he has in his hand.

Mr. Crosbie: It is propaganda.

* * *

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

SCREENING OF "THE DAY AFTER"—REQUEST THAT CANADA BAN CRUISE MISSILE TESTING

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Prime Minister. Last night countless millions of people on this continent saw the all too graphic television movie entitled "The Day After", which outlined the horror a possible nuclear war would bring to this planet. Since an important part of the Prime Minister's peace initiative is a call for expanding the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, why is Canada helping to develop a deadly new nuclear weapon, namely, the Cruise missile? Why not put our money where our mouth is, and ban testing the Cruise missile here in this country?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member began his question by talking about the film which was shown on television last night and which obviously had a dramatic impact in indicating to us the consequences of a nuclear war.

Mr. Crosbie: You watched King Lear, I suppose, to bone up on Trudeau.

Mr. MacEachen: We are all too aware of what the consequences would be, and that is why we have advocated and stated so frequently that we do not believe any nuclear war can be won. That is why we are part of an alliance which is built upon a philosophy of deterrence; in other words, to prevent the possibility of a nuclear war in a number of ways, one of which is the reduction of arms and the bringing about of a better political atmosphere in which that arms reduction could take place. That is why currently the Prime Minister is devoting so much time to this particular effort in realization of the consequences of a nuclear war and the consequences of a continued buildup in hostilities.

REQUEST FOR TOTAL BAN ON NUCLEAR ARMS TESTING

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Minister did not answer the question.

[*Translation*]

But I would like to ask a supplementary, if I may, Mr. Speaker. We in the New Democratic Party are prepared to go along with any peace initiative, but I wonder why the Prime Minister has not included in his present plan a total and immediate ban on nuclear testing and a nuclear freeze, and finally, why he did not include, as well, a proposal for nuclear-free zones? Why has he failed to include important issues like the three I just mentioned?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think that underlying the Prime Minister's efforts is the belief that there are a large number of arms proposals now in play. There have been proposals made at the Geneva negotiations by the United States, and counter proposals by the Soviet Union. Some of these proposals merit attention.

One asks why is it that no progress has been made? It is not because there are not good arms proposals lying around; it is because the political atmosphere is so bad that it is impossible to move ahead with constructive conclusions. The Hon. Member may have very good ideas on arms control. I do not think that is the real block to present efforts to bring about solutions in the world.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In the interests of recognizing as many Hon. Members as possible, the Chair proposes to recognize Members for single questions only at this point. The Hon. Member for Victoria.

Mr. McKinnon: How did I get lucky enough to come in at this stage?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CF-18 AIRCRAFT—FAULTY ENGINE MOUNTS

Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence, who has the country quite confused about the CF-18. He said on November 18, 1983:

—the needed engineering changes will be incorporated within the aircraft which are now entering the production line. There is, as I indicated to the Hon. Member, a fix being put in which will remedy the problem which he has identified.

Canadian Press in an article on November 19, 1983, wrote:

The U.S. Navy has ruled out replacement of the engine mounts as too expensive and no production design changes are planned—

Could the Hon. Minister assure the House that all of our F-18s—and we have some 20—will have their engine mounts replaced? Could he tell us what kind of a contract we have wherein the supplier might not be held responsible for the defective parts? Does it have anything to do with the short term of the warranty, which is 180 days—which is what you would expect on a $7 wrist watch?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. gentleman that the company has accepted the responsibility of performing the changes that are required, as was pointed out in my initial reply. The requirements are being looked at now in terms of incorporating the changes within aircraft No. 53 that is going onto the production line. That is the information with which I have been provided.

In terms of the changes contemplated for the aircraft that have already left the production line and have been delivered, I am advised the repairs are being performed now. In terms of exactly how the repairs will be completed, that is something which has not been identified to the satisfaction of my Department. We are still pursuing, with a great deal of interest, the solution being implemented.

* * *

● (1450)

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

UNEMPLOYED BRITISH COLUMBIA ENGINEERS

Mr. Thomas Siddon (Richmond-South Delta): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of State for Science and Technology. A recent study by a committee of professional engineers in British Columbia has identified that there are over 1,400 professional engineers unemployed in that Province, that 400 graduating engineers next spring have no job offers to which to look forward, and that about 2,500 registered and unregistered professional engineers will be unemployed within coming months.

My question is important because it appears that the lead time between the inception of projects and the spin-off work to contract and other trades personnel is at least a year and a half. What specific initiatives can the Minister offer, other than concrete and asphalt projects, like repaving parking lots in airports, such as the one in my constituency? What type of long-term hope can he offer to professional engineers in Canada, for example, in the area of technology and trades centres which may acquaint young professional engineers with the new opportunities that might present themselves in the years ahead?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, we are very conscious of the necessity of employing as many of these professionals as possible. In fact, many specific initiatives have been undertaken. The Hon. Member has asked for specific initiatives. He said that he did not want to hear about the paving of runways and highways, but I suggest that these in themselves are significant.

Apart from that, for example in British Columbia, as he knows, under the Special Recovery Capital Projects there is the $15 million facility for pulp and paper research in Vancouver. That is a major area of employment, of which I am sure he will be very much in support. We also have, of course, a number of other significant projects, such as the Block 15 Development in Vancouver, which in itself is another $41 million project. In addition to that, there is Canada Place and the tremendous amount of work which will be undertaken with respect to Expo 86, largely as a result of federal Government initiatives. This will clearly provide very substantial employment for engineers. Of course now, with the passage of the Crow Bill and western transportation initiatives, there will be a whole series of spin-offs, not to mention—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Johnston: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, the Hon. Member asked for specific—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps, if further detail is sought, a question could be put on the Order Paper.

* * *

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

REQUEST FOR INCREASE IN CANADIAN COMMITMENT

Hon. George Hees (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. The opinion expressed very strongly by high-ranking officials in the United States—and it is strongly rumoured that the two who expressed the opinion were Cabinet officers who requested anonymity—was that Canada's contribution to NATO is shameful. As this is precisely what Canadian delegates to NATO meetings have been hearing from their American and European counterparts for the past 15 years, does the Government not believe that it is long overdue to increase our NATO force to the full 10,000 fully-equipped men which it pledged when NATO was formed, and maintained until 1968 when the Prime Minister became the Prime Minister of our country and cut the force in half and, by so doing, brought shame and great embarrassment to our country?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has referred to United States Cabinet officers.

All I can tell him is that I have had quite a number of discussions with the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Shultz, in the course of the past year, and at no point has he ever registered with me the view which the Hon. Member has attributed to the United States Cabinet officers.

I have pointed out to Mr. Shultz, on at least one occasion, and maybe more than one occasion, that Canada is committed to 3 per cent real growth in its defence expenditures. We intend to carry that out. We have undertaken modernization of the forces, and the annual nominal increase in our defence expenditures is quite substantial. If the Hon. Member would look at the rate of nominal growth in defence in comparison with other sectors of government expenditures, he would conclude that the amount spent on defence is quite impressive. I have no reason to accept the words of anonymous Cabinet officers as against the conclusions I draw from direct conversations with the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Shultz.

Mr. Hees: If I were allowed a supplementary question, I would murder him.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

INDUSTRY

IMPACT OF MEXICAN INDUSTRIAL ZONE ON CANADIAN INDUSTRIES

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. As the Minister knows, Mexico is developing a 50-mile wide industrial zone immediately south of the United States, bordering on the United States, and is promoting the moving in of both American and Canadian manufacturing industries where the labour rate cost burden is on average 92 cents per hour. I would like to know what our Government, through the Minister's Department, is prepared to do to stem the flow of Canadian manufacturing industries, not just United States branch plants in Canada but Canadian industries, into that industrial zone where labour rates are about 90 cents or 92 cents per hour.

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member should know that what Mexico is doing with respect to trying to encourage industry around the world to develop, by using its cheaper labour rates, is not something which just happened in the last couple of days. That is one of the reasons why we proposed—and it was adopted by all Parties in the House—the IRDP program to enable the Government to be proactive in encouraging small and medium-sized as well as large companies across the country to undertake investment programs to create more industrial jobs. We have the program. Now the question is: do we have the projects from the private sector right across Canada?

CROWN CORPORATIONS

REQUEST FOR FULL DISCLOSURE OF SALARIES PAID SENIOR EXECUTIVES

Mr. John Gamble (York North): Mr. Speaker, a short time ago the acting Prime Minister took some pride in disclosing the list which was published giving upper and lower salary limits for senior quasi-public servants of Crown corporations. I wonder if he would like to take a further step and indicate why it is that the Government cannot indeed publish the salaries paid to chief executive officers, some of which extend to the limit of $228,000 per year, and in that way make full disclosure not only to the House but to the people of Canada?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the information which was tabled was in compliance with the law passed by the Parliament of Canada. Obviously with respect to public servants, we have made public the range of salary. In this particular case, because it is impossible to find anything equivalent to a range, we have shown the maximum salary and the lowest salary. One should not draw the inference that every person in that category is eligible to receive the maximum salary. The Hon. Member may find a good deal of value by referring to a survey which was published this year in the *Financial Times*, showing the salaries of top executives in the private sector which, in many cases, were much more than salaries paid in the public sector for those who, in some cases, were operating much larger and more expensive public corporations.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for St. John's East.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, my question has been preempted by the early departure of the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

* * *

FISHERIES

ALLOCATION OF FISH TO PLANT AT FERMEUSE, NFLD.

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Fisheries of Oceans my question is directed to his parliamentary assistant, who is not yet dry behind the ears. The Government has promised a resource-short plant program to supply fish to inshore plants which do not have offshore vessels, so that they can operate longer in the year. In particular, this was a promise made to the plant at Fermeuse in my district, and to the people there, some three or four months ago. Can the Parliamentary Secretary tell me when that program will commence? When will fish start to be landed at Fermeuse or other inshore plants? Is the Minister prepared to permit foreign trawlers to be used to catch this fish if no satisfactory arrangements as to payment can be made with Canadian trawlers?

Point of Order—Mr. Berger

● (1500)

Mr. Brian Tobin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Hon. Member that this question is very much on the mind of the Minister, his Department, and his advisers. We are dealing with it even today. We would like to give him an answer as quickly as possible. Obviously I cannot do it in this House on short notice today. However, I want to say to the Hon. Member, in all sincerity, that it is much better to be wet behind the ears and trying sincerely, than to have dry sawdust for 15 years in a row between the ears, as one sits in the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

[*Translation*]

POINT OF ORDER

MR. BERGER—REMARKS OF LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. David Berger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention some comments made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I had hoped we would be here to listen to my comments. Unfortunately, he has already left the House. I am referring to some less than praiseworthy comments he made during oral question period. I find those comments rather surprising, especially since the Hon. Leader of the Opposition had said he hoped debate in the House would be more civilized.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to Citation 359(7) of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, which says, and I quote:

(7) A question must adhere to the proprieties of the House, in terms of inferences, imputing motives or casting aspersions upon persons within the House or out of it.

I can assure the Hon. Leader of the Opposition that I am quite capable of examining a Bill, of determining its substance and of making a considered decision. I merely want to ask him to withdraw his remarks.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is disposed to say at this time—and the Chair was listening attentively to the remarks which were made—that with all due respect to the Hon. Member, while the remarks were not complimentary, they were not unparliamentary.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that you would hear a spokesman from this side before making a ruling. I didn't hear—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) realizes the Hon. Member raised the point as to whether certain remarks were parliamentary or unparliamentary. The Chair has ruled that they are not unparliamentary, that they are acceptable within this House. Surely that disposes of the matter.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that in questions of this nature, when the remarks are attributed to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney), that we on this side might be heard before the Chair comes to a ruling. In the meantime, I of course agree wholeheartedly with the ruling of the Chair. It is sometimes very difficult for us on this side to distinguish the monkeys from the donkeys over there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I invite Hon. Members to reflect on whether they are contributing to the dignity of this place.

* * *

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petitions presented by Hon. Members on Friday, November 18, 1983 meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PETITIONS

MR. FRETZ—RIGHT TO LIFE OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of presenting a petition signed by thousands of people in the Province of Ontario. Whereas they believe that abortion clinics are the first step toward an even more relaxed abortion law and abortion on demand and are convinced that human problems must be solved by loving and caring, not by killing more than 65,000 unborn Canadians each year, wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation to guarantee the right to life of all Canadians as yet unborn, while at the same time promoting in every way possible those groups which seek to provide life-saving alternatives to abortion. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

* * * * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions. May I dispense with the reading of the motions?

Mr. Murphy: Mr. Speaker, we in this Party would prefer that you follow proper procedure at this time.

Motions stand.

• (1510)

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 5,037 and 5,315.

[*Text*]

PART-TIME STUDY RELATED EMPLOYMENT

Question No. 5,037—**Mr. Howie:**

Did the Department of Employment and Immigration sponsor a program at the University of Winnipeg and at the University of Manitoba to provide a special initiative for employment stimulus which would involve part-time work for students attending these universities and, if so (a) within what time frame did the program operate (b) is the program still in existence (c) what amount was expended in support of the program at each University (d) is it intended to expand the program to include other universities in Canada?

Mr. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): In the fall of 1982, the Department of Employment and Immigration signed one agreement with the student union of the University of Manitoba and one agreement with the student union of the University of Winnipeg to provide part-time study related employment for students attending those universities. (a) The agreements initially covered the period from November, 1982 to August, 1983. (b) The agreements have now been extended to cover the period from November, 1983 to August, 1984.

(c) University of Manitoba November, 1982 to August, 1983—$375,000 November, 1983 to August, 1984—$500,000

University of Winnipeg November, 1982 to August, 1983—$80,000 November, 1983 to August, 1984—$100,000

(d) There are no proposals for other universities under consideration at this time.

RECIPROCAL SOCIAL SECURITY AGREEMENT

Question No. 5,315—**Mr. Young:**

Did the Prime Minister make a representation to the Prime Minister of Great Britain that the Governments of Canada and Great Britain enter into a reciprocal Social Security Agreement and, if so, did the Prime Minister of Great Britain respond that representation and what was the nature of that response?

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Yes, the Prime Minister did raise the subject with Prime Minister Thatcher and the question of U.K. pensioners in Canada and the possibility of a reciprocal Social Security Agreement was discussed. Prime Minister Thatcher noted that discussions were under way among officials.

[*English*]

Mr. Evans: I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—RESOURCE INDUSTRIES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Oberle:

That this House regards the Government's failure to take action to encourage the development of Canada's resource industries and ensure their competitiveness in world markets as a betrayal of all Canadians whose standard of living depends upon the resource sector of Canada's economy and calls upon the Government to bring an end to the nationalization of Canadian resource industries which has discouraged investment in Canada; introduce tax incentives to restore competitive advantage and stimulate resource production and further processing in Canada; initiate a programme of incentives for research and development; and incentives for marketing activities of Canadian industries.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) had just completed his speech when the House adjourned at one o'clock. The floor is open.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words on the motion put before the House today by the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). I must say that having read the motion I am amazed that such a motion has been put by the Official Opposition in view of the many actions which have been taken by the federal Government, not only this year through the Special Recovery Capital Projects which were announced in May of this year, but as well the many other activities which have been announced during the past few years.

I do not have to look at the national scene to identify many of the initiatives designed to aid and assist the resource industry taken by the federal Government because my own constituency is one which is very heavily dependent upon resource industries. These include the forest products industry, the pulp and paper industry, the mining industry, the agricultural products industry and the steel industry.

As I look back over the past three or four years, I see a number of initiatives which have not only made these resource-producing industries more acceptable in terms of environmental problems but as well have helped them to be able to meet the competition abroad in the years to come. In the pulp and paper industry in the Town of Espanola, which is in my own constituency, we have seen during the past two or three years a modernization program costing some $250 million undertaken by the E.B. Eddy Forest Products company. Its rehabilitation of an old plant that was not operating efficiently has almost

been completed in the last few months. That undertaking required that a massive capital expenditure be made by the company but it was stimulated and assisted by an incentive program of the federal and provincial Governments.

This modernization will result in a much more efficient plant that will be turning out some 30 per cent to 40 per cent more pulp and paper a year. At the same time portions of wood fibre produced by our forests that are more suitable for use as lumber and other wood products are being used effectively in that way. We can see that a relatively modest stimulation grant of $7.5 million which was made by the federal Government a few years ago has resulted in a massive capital expenditure of over $200 million and will give an old mill that once produced some 600 tonnes of pulp and paper per day the capacity to turn out something like 1,000 tonnes of pulp and paper per day.

I went through that plant three or four months ago, Mr. Speaker, and I was impressed when I saw that in one pulp and paper facility which had cost some $20 million, the total work force in that mill was only some four people per shift. We often speak about robotics and modernization. That industry has really modernized to meet the competition abroad. I believe it has done so despite the difficult recession which began in the latter part of 1981 and continued into 1982. The plant was still able to continue to operate, and of course it will be that much more efficient and that much more beneficial in the years to come when the economics of the industry will improve and the demand for products will increase.

In the years to come, the size of that sawmill operation will be increased to an ultimate capacity of something like 130 million board feet of lumber a year. Historically, that is a massive kind of operation. In the past there existed in the Blind River area a very large white pine industry operated by McFadden Lumber. In its best years back in the 1930s and 1940s, that company produced only something like 30 million board feet per year. I understand that when this mill is completed, its capacity will approach 130 million board feet of lumber per year. We can now catch a glimpse of the magnitude of its future operations.

In the next few months, however, I believe it is urgent that the federal Government and the provincial Government of Ontario reach a consensus on a new forest renewal agreement. I understand that negotiations in that regard are now taking place and that the federal Government and the Province of Ontario are looking at a five-year agreement under which they will spend some $250 million to $300 million. Some of that money will be spent building roads into resource areas in the forest, but a great deal of it will be spent on forest renewal. I think it is impossible to underestimate the importance of forest renewal.

Some would argue that the actual care, management, licensing and so on of forest resources is a provincial Government responsibility. Constitutionally there may be some validity to that argument. However, the entire industry is too important to wait for the Provinces to act. I believe it is clear that the federal Government should renew that agreement, which runs out next March, and put in place a new agreement for the forestry resources which will have a great deal of emphasis on forest renewal. As well, there is need for a research component to an agreement between the federal Government and the Province. However, the agreement must stress forest renewal to encourage replanting, silviculture and intensive reforesting.

I was pleased to note that in the announcement made after the budget came out last spring regarding the Special Recovery Capital Projects, a number of research station projects were approved. In the federal forestry domain alone some $13 million has been allocated for the Great Lakes Forest Research Laboratory in Sault Ste. Marie which is in the riding of Algoma. That money has been allocated to increase extensively the size of that facility. As well, the budgets of other forest research stations in western Canada, Quebec and the Maritimes have been augmented. It is to the credit of the federal Government that it has made such a massive commitment. Without the necessary research we will not be able to meet the demands that are being put on the industry.

While mentioning the Special Recovery Capital Projects, I would also like to compliment the Government on the commitment made in the budget for funding under the Special Recovery Capital Projects for the water bomber fleet. That fleet will make a substantial contribution not only to Ontario but to many of the other Provinces as well by providing a mobile airborne firefighting service to assist the industry in the year ahead.

• (1520)

I would like to mention that energy, agriculture, fisheries, forestry and mining are all key sectors in Canada's economic development, sectors which the federal Government has given particular interest to over the past few years. The technological revolution will have a profound effect upon the future development of our resource industries and it is paramount that we take advantage of the opportunities which will be presented to us in these important areas.

One of the chief characteristics of research and development in the resource sector of Canada is the major contribution which the federal Government makes in undertaking the research for this industry. Because of the structure of the resource industry, the relatively small and scattered units of production, the federal Government has traditionally undertaken the role of the research arm for the industry. In agriculture, for example, the Department of Agriculture has had a major research program in place to support the industry ever since Confederation.

In 1983-84, the federal Government will be spending over $3.2 billion on science and technology in Canada. This is an increase of more than 10 per cent over the expenditures of $2.9 billion in 1982-83, and in a time of the six and five restraint program that shows the kind of commitment which the federal Government is placing on science and technological research. Much of this will be in support of the resource sectors such as forestry, mining and agriculture.

Some expenditures of the federal Government for science and technology in 1983-84 in the resource industries are: the energy sector, $385 million; agricultural research, $288.2 million; oceans and fisheries, $94.9 million; and natural resources, $214.2 million. Most of these expenditures are mission-oriented research expenditures within the Departments themselves. The Department of Agriculture, for example, will be spending $211 million on intramural research and development in 1983-84. Fisheries and Oceans will be spending $158 million. Energy, Mines and Resources will be spending $181 million, and the Canadian Forestry Service will be spending $62 million. These latter expenditures do not take into account the incentives which the federal Government provides to universities and industry to encourage them to support science and technology in the resource sectors. Nor do they take into account the approximately $200 million which the federal Government provides through tax incentives to encourage industry to invest in research and development.

Aside from these expenditures which are committed in the Main Estimates for 1983-84, further support to R and D in the resource sector has been provided under the Special Recovery Capital Projects program. This program, highlighted in the technology policy which was announced in the House of Commons on May 3, has allocated $337 million to the accelerated construction or expansion of research and training facilities. These projects are expected to expand substantially research capabilities to serve the forestry, fisheries, agri-food, manufacturing and mining industries. Another $15 million has been allocated to the construction of a fluid-bed minerals research centre in Chatham, New Brunswick. This project is expected to make a major contribution to Canadian mining technology.

Forestry research has received a major boost from this program. For instance, $22 million has been provided for a Maritime forest research centre in Fredericton, New Brunswick; $13 million, as I mentioned previously, has been provided to augment the Great Lakes Forest Research Laboratory in Sault Ste. Marie, and $14 million has been provided to increase the forest research facilities at the Pacific Forest Research Centre in Victoria, British Columbia.

As part of the joint industry-Government plan to spur technological development and innovation to enhance our forests' potential, the program has provided $2 million to expand the Pulp and Paper Research Institute of Canada's facilities at Pointe Claire, Quebec, and $15 million to construct new facilities in Vancouver, British Columbia. In the fisheries sector, $40 million is being provided to construct facilities for oceanographic and other fisheries related research at the Fisheries Research Centre in Mont Joli, Quebec.

In agriculture, $30 million is being provided to fund the construction of facilities for food research at the integrated research centre in St. Hyacinthe, Quebec. The results achieved at this research centre will support the growth and diversification of the food industry throughout the country. Also, $6 million is being provided to expand the NRC's prairie regional laboratory to house the western centre of the national biotechnology program. Research undertaken here will be primarily focused on the application of biotechnology to the agricultural industry. As well, $19 million will be provided as a contribution towards construction of the Atlantic Veterinary College in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. This is a total of $186 million in support of research facilities to improve research and development in the resource sectors. This does not indicate that the resource industries are being ignored by the Government of Canada; rather, it is a strong indication of the importance the federal Government is placing on supporting our resource development industries.

It is easy to fall into the trap of thinking that technology development is only high-tech or microelectronics. One of the objectives of the technology policy is to dispel this myth and to emphasize the importance of technology to all sectors of our economy. The very first objective of the policy is to strengthen the Canadian economy through the development of new technologies for producing goods and services and the widespread adoption of new and existing technologies. Canada has not always had a good record on technology diffusion within our industries. A recent study by the Economic Council suggests that we lag considerably behind other countries in the adoption of new technologies, particularly in the non-central regions of Canada. Not only is R and D critical to keeping our resource industries competitive, but diffusion of the new and available technologies is particularly important to our continuing ability successfully to make the most of our rich resource base.

Because research in the resource sector is so heavily dependent on research undertaken in the federal laboratories, the federal Government is particularly concerned that the research in these labs is both effective and relevant to the industry it serves. With respect to the research and technology development performed or funded by the Government itself, the objectives of the technology policy are: to ensure that all federal programs and policies related to technology development contribute as effectively as possible to the over-all federal objectives for technology and economic development; to ensure that the research undertaken in federal laboratories in support of technology development is relevant to industrial requirements and compatible with the stated economic objectives; and to ensure that Canada develops and maintains a national competence in the research and development necessary for technological development.

The Minister of State for Science and Technology (Mr. Johnston) has recently appointed a task force to review and recommend improvements to federal policies and programs related to technology development. The task force, which will report directly to the Minister, will review the Government's intramural science and technology activities and make recommendations on whether Government research is relevant to industry's needs. It will also study the Government's industry support programs, policies currently in place to enhance our R and D in the business sector, and possible improvements to university-industry co-operation with regard to R and D. The task force, comprised of representatives from industry, univer-

sity and labour, was appointed in early November and has been asked to report within the next six months.

Public awareness of science and technology is also a critical factor in the abilities of our industries, our universities, our labour force and, in fact, our citizens to recognize the opportunities which the new technologies can offer and to avoid the pitfalls which technological change may place before us. This is as important in the resource sector as it is in any other.

● (1530)

As a first step in encouraging awareness of the effects of technological change and to encourage each sector to manage instead of just reacting to technological change, the federal Government sponsored the Canada Tomorrow Conference. This conference drew representatives from each sector in Canada, including agriculture and the forest and mining industries. The conference opened up lines of communication which had previously been unknown or had lately grown lax from disuse. This communication is vital if Canada is to apply successfully its technological potential to its future economic development. It is a first step but one which will be used to build future ties and develop further policies, not only by the federal Government but by the participants from those various industries such as agriculture, high technology, and resource industries including mining and forestry.

I want to conclude by saying that Canada is a country rich in resources. We cannot ignore the advantages we have in this area. The federal Government has long invested in the future of our resource base by investing in research for our resource industries. Almost 40 per cent of the Government's R and D intramural expenditures are spent on our natural resources, and we will continue to provide this kind of support.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there Hon. Members rising to ask questions of the Hon. Member who has just spoken? If not, the Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster) confesses that he is perplexed as to why we put forward this motion. He says he cannot understand it, then by rote he rhymes off item after item of Government money going into NEED programs and the like. This is the first opportunity in some time that I have had to speak of my own riding of Yukon, some 237,000 square miles, if I am still permitted to use that term in this place. That part of Canada this Government has virtually closed down. No amount of NEED programs, no amount of paper jobs and no number of speeches along the lines of the one of which the Hon. Member for Algoma has just divested himself, will cure that ugly fact.

The most recent project which provided some glimmer of hope for the hundreds of unemployed in Yukon was turned down in early November by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro). I speak of the north slope development where there exists a substantial potential for the development of oil and gas, but which requires construction of a port on the north slope of Yukon. I think it is an apt way to start my contribution to the debate by reading this telegram sent by the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce in Yukon to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau):

Dear Mr. Trudeau:

The following resolution was passed at the monthly membership meeting of the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce on November 8th:

"That the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce request that Mr. John Munro be asked to resign and further that a new Department of Northern Development completely separate from Indian Affairs be formed."

The Chamber passed this resolution due to Mr. Munro's announcement on November 7th prohibiting development on Yukon's north coast.

The following points are relevant:

1. The Minister is charged with responsibility for northern development, as well as Indian affairs. The Yukon economy is severely depressed, due to the shutdown of the mining and transportation industries. New development is required to provide jobs for the many native and non native people who have become unemployed over the past two years. For the Minister to turn down potential new jobs and business opportunities under such circumstances is a renunciation of his responsibilities for northern development.
2. The decision is also a powerful psychological blow to Yukon, as the proposed north coast developments offered a glimmer of economic hope to the Territory. Members of the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce have asked themselves in the past whether the federal Government is interested in the existence of a viable private business sector in the north. We see development proposals going through extensive hearings and reviews which give the impression that development, jobs and taxes are not welcome in the north. Most recently, we see federal Government Departments, leaded by the Northern Affairs Department, proposing new regulations for the placer mining industry in Yukon when even the Government's own studies show that the regulations will put 16 per cent of the present operators out of business. If the Government persists in these actions and adds to the rolls of the unemployed, while refusing to let new projects proceed, we cannot expect to solve the unemployment problem in the Territory or expect private business to survive. Under such circumstances we find it very hard to be optimistic and we await with trepidation the Minister's decision regarding implementation of the placer mining regulations.
3. The Minister has responsibility for the way in which development proposals are handled. Each proposal in Yukon is dealt with on an ad hoc basis. Each has to meet rules, regulations and concerns that are expressed by Department employees at the time of application and which may differ from application to application. Nobody is sure of the ground rules or of the possibilities of success when they make an application. We understand that both applicants in the current issue were encouraged by Department of Northern Affairs staff to proceed with their applications and that both had met the various concerns identified by Departmental staff.

I will be reading into the record a departmental document to show the truth of that assertion. It continues:

The refusal of their proposals after a protracted period of discussion lasting many months, and on the basis of issues that had not been identified before, leads to waste of investment money and effort on behalf of the applicants. It also discourages future development proposals, as proponents will not know what the ground rules are, will have no faith in the bureaucrats knowing what the issues are and will face inflated and additional costs with no assurance that they will see any return. In conclusion, I repeat again that Yukon is suffering severe economic problems. Unemployed residents must move south to find work and our young people graduating from school must do the same. Initially this situation was caused by the international economic slowdown. However, the uncertainty in the placer mining industry has been caused by the federal Government and in the north coast case we cannot understand how a Minister of your Government can turn away a potential solution to the economic problems of Yukon by disallowing new industrial expansion in the Yukon by Canadian companies.

We urge you to obtain Mr. Munro's resignation and to establish a new department responsible solely for northern development headed by a new Minister who is aware of the need for northern development.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: It is signed "Sincerely, P. G. Dixon, President, Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce." I have a better solution than that, Mr. Speaker. That is a modest request by the Chamber of Commerce on behalf of Yukoners. A far better solution would be to get rid of the whole damn mess on the Treasury benches, have them move aside so that we can move with some energetic and visionary policies with respect to developing this country. What does the King Point Quarry proposal mean? What would it have meant to Yukoners, to Canadians not just in Yukon, because certainly it has its national aspects in the potential oil and gas fields off the north slope of Yukon? It would have created a harbour facility, an air strip, quarry facilities and a haul road. A camp would have accommodated 300 people, 400 during the construction stages. Over a quarry life of 20 to 25 years it would have meant an average employment of 300 people, most of whom would have been Yukoners. The vast majority of those would be northerners. It would have meant spin-offs of $3.5 million a year in goods and services required at one operation. This is the proposal that the Minister has rejected. Why has he rejected it? He has rejected it on the basis that it might jeopardize the final conclusion of native land claims. What a cop-out, Mr. Speaker. We have had the Government of Canada, the Government of Yukon, and the Council for Yukon Indians studying and negotiating since 1973. Their target, which is still realistic today, was for announcing the final agreement in principle by the end of this month. Yet on November 7 the Minister gives us the excuse of native land claims for not proceeding with this project.

● (1540)

Another vital factor here is that there was a window within which this project had to be approved or lost, a window which was imposed as a result of the need for the project to go ahead on time. Otherwise the proponents would have to look elsewhere for the method and materials to construct the off-island sites for exploration for oil and gas. That window is now gone. I dare say that if the Minister changes his mind, which I hope he still might do, it could very possibly be that the proponent will still go ahead with the project.

Let me quote from the Department's own document, a presentation to the north slope project review group, that is a group that was set up by the Minister himself, by the northern affairs program department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. This is the Department's own document that was presented about five weeks before the Minister made his decision. I am quoting as follows from the third heading, "North Slope Package":

> At the time the Hon. John Munro announced the creation of the Project Review Group, he indicated that he hoped to be able to announce in the Fall a "package" for the North Slope, consisting of land claim settlements, a caribou management board, a National Park, a land use planning mechanism, and limited industrial development. While each of these are being carried forward in another forum, DIAND would like to make you aware of the progress toward each major element of the package in order to assist you in your deliberations.

Here follows the Departments' own assessment, obviously designed to encourage the project review group to bring down a favourable decision to proceed with north slope development. Under "Land Use Planning" the Department says:

> As you are aware, extensive consultation and discussions with the territorial governments and the native organizations (CYI in Yukon, and the Dene, Métis, COPE and TEN in N.W.T.) have resulted in agreement on the implementation of land use planning in Yukon—

Under "Land Claims" the Department says:

> It is hoped that negotiations on the sub-agreements which will constitute the over-all agreement in principle, will be completed in October, subject to subsequent ratification.

Since this document was prepared, the sub-agreement collection has been made public and they are completed with one or two minor exceptions, none of which have any direct bearing on the reconsideration of the Minister's decision on the north slope.

Paragraph 4, "Some DIAND Objectives for the North Slope of the Yukon", reads:

> Finally, we would like to put several major elements of the Department's thinking with respect to the North Slope on the record to assist the Group.

Two paragraphs on the following page are pertinent:

> While the Department is just started on the intensive review of the Kiewit proposal, we have had the Gulf proposal for over a year now. In looking at both, we have wanted to determine if both were good projects, were they serious, viable, needed projects. We have concluded that the Gulf request for a marine support base is such a project, and our scrutiny to date of the Kiewit proposal suggests that it too meets these tests.
>
> We have wanted to determine if negative environmental impacts can be managed, or mitigated, and if what one could call the down side of the project can be controlled. In the case of the Gulf application, we are confident that these tests can be met, and while the review of the Kiewit proposal is very much in progress, nothing seen to date suggests an unmanageable problem.

And on the next page:

> These projects especially entail a high degree of industrial and employment benefit for the people of the Yukon.
>
> If we look to the future, a site on the Yukon North Slope has a significant set of advantages, not the least of which is enhancing the economic future of the Yukon, a goal shared with the Government of the Yukon. If tied in with a quarry, it opens the chance for Canadians to earn potentially hundreds of millions of dollars in the foreign trade market, and to have available if needed a technique for building hydrocarbon production facilities with a very high Canadian content. If properly located, such a port opens the door to valuable business opportunities for all Canadians and especially Northerners, for marine support activities aimed at the American Beaufort. And, if properly sited, it will of course have a substantial similar role if and when hydrocarbon development takes place in the Canadian Beaufort.

The Member for Algoma went through a lengthy list of moneys that were being expended on these "make aid" programs financed by billions of Canadian taxpayers' dollars to make work for unemployed people whom they themselves have put out of work. Now the private sector and private industry come along wanting to make an investment in Canada's future. What does this Government say to it? It says, "We do not want your dollars. We do not want your jobs."

The chances are that the technology that will be required to be used now in order to proceed with that port facility is not available in this country and those jobs and dollars will be exported to Japan or to some other offshore location. I find it totally incomprehensible that the Government goes to such lengths to turn a cold shoulder to the private sector in this country which wants to invest in its own future and wants to

create jobs. The Government says, "No, because we do not want to prejudice native claims that are now on the verge of completion." I think I can safely stand here and say, with one or two i's and t's to be dotted and crossed, that a total agreement in principle will be out by the end of this month.

It is a sham for the Minister to say that the project is not proceeding because of native claims. I find it difficult to try to figure out why, unless it is because he wants to use the time for announcing the Yukon agreement in principle and the time for announcing the COPE agreement in principle to tie in somehow with his own personal ambitions for what he expects to be a leadership convention of the Liberal Party. That is the only possible reason I can think of why he would reject this project. I understand negotiations are underway through which the CYI might be provided with a loan of $80 million by the Canadian Government so that it can take an equity position in the Kiewit project, in the King Point project. If that loan is made, over a period of 20 to 25 years the Government will certainly recover its $80 million loan to the native organizations there. At the same time the native organizations will ensure that their own people are employed in the project.

● (1550)

I would find it quite acceptable if the Government wanted to follow that kind of course. It would be a sound investment. However, if that is the case, and I understand the case is that these negotiations are ongoing, I urge the Government to make that kind of loan so as to ensure that the project goes ahead because it will certainly see its money returned in very short order.

I wanted to say something about northern Canada Power Commission and how tragic that National Energy Board report is and how tragic it is that the Government is not proceeding with the unanimous Penner report in that regard. I wanted to say something about the suffocation that is occurring with respect to the placer mining industry in the Yukon, which is virtually being shut down by the Government's action. I wanted to say something about the taxation of northern benefits, which we have enjoyed in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories and indeed throughout northern Canada for so many years now. Again, the Government is acting in a way that shows a total and complete insensitivity to the problems of northern Canada and particularly to my part of the country.

These and other measures surely have to be reviewed and they must be reviewed by a Minister who is sensitive to northern concerns and the concerns of northern people. They must be reviewed in a fashion which totally separates the Minister from his two hats, one where he is obliged to care for the general welfare of our Canadian native population and the other where he has an obligation to ensure reasonable development in northern areas.

I might say that the Yukon Government is totally supportive of the Keiwit proposal and if we had the decision to make, I can tell you that a Conservative Government would be totally supportive of this kind of development. It is totally incomprehensible why the Minister and his Government would refuse the only succour that is on the horizon for a part of Canada that has been virtually frozen by the policies of the Government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions, comments and answers. Debate.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Maltais (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to apologize for the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro). The Minister was notified only fifteen minutes before three o'clock that the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) would be speaking to the motion before the House today.

There are two important aspects to this debate. It is clear that Canada's North must be developed, but always within the context of native rights. I think that is essential, and the Member for Yukon is well aware of this. As the Member for Manicouagan, I realize the implications, since the Fort Chimo area is part of my riding, and we are very aware of the fact that, in both cases, Canada's North and the issue of native land claims cannot be seen separately from one another.

That being said, I would first like to point out to the Member for Yukon that asking for the resignation of the Minister of Indian affairs and Northern Development is not the way to settle the issue. I was in Fort Chimo only ten days ago, and their position was the exact opposite. They wanted the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to stay for a long time, and people were saying that he was one of the few Ministers who had done as much for Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I feel that the report tabled by a House Committee not long ago proves beyond a doubt that the present Minister is very sensitive to native rights and land claims and also to the need for development of the North.

Mr. Speaker, to answer the Member for Yukon, I would like to point out that the present Minister has certainly not dismissed the Keiwit proposal. The minister wanted to examine other suggestions as well, because, as the Member for Yukon pointed out earlier, all kinds of studies have been made concerning the Yukon North Slope project.

Very shortly, in a matter of weeks, a definitive report will be submitted to the Minister on the issue of native land claims. At that point, the Minister intends to consider several other proposals aimed at creating maximum employment and especially at bringing about a balanced development process in the Yukon area, not only for industry but for the native peoples as well. I imagine both sides of the House will agree that development of the North must be achieved in co-operation with the first inhabitants of this area as well as with the various companies involved.

Where the Member for Yukon commented that through nationalization, the Canadian Government was preventing the

development of the private sector in Canada's North, I would like to make it clear to the Hon. Member that in my riding, the industrial sector includes both a number of private enterprises and Government-owned corporations. As far as iron ore is concerned, I don't think the federal Government, the present Government, brought about the present situation which, as far as I can see, is a matter of economics.

In Canada's North, we are often faced with the same situation. There is oil, which is in demand today, but there are also minerals, Mr. Speaker, which are there for us to mine and market. However, my colleagues on this side of the House as well as those opposite will realize that it would be entirely premature at this stage to issue licences to various companies or to approve various industrial proposals at a time when we are about to sign agreements on native land claims. I think it is a matter of responsibility, and it is also absolutely vital to any negotiations that we should know how the land will be apportioned and what are the costs involved.

The Member for Yukon also raised the fact that Keiwit was anxious to proceed immediately. Perhaps I may point out, for the benefit of the House, that negotiations are still taking place between the Department and the company in question, and that it was never the Department's intention to set aside the Keiwit proposal. The important thing now is to ensure that the Keiwit proposal, as so many other proposals and suggestions, is analyzed in the light of native land claims. I think that is extremely important. I think it is unrealistic of the Whitehorse Chamber of Commerce to ask for the creation of separate Departments of Northern Development and Indian Affairs. Anyone who knows the history of Canada's North, and I am sure my friends opposite do, knows perfectly well that all these issues are related. Anyone who decided to work only on the business aspects without considering the other issues would soon realize that not only is this a useless exercise, but it only makes the problem worse.

I think Members opposite who are as experienced as Members of this side of the House will agree that proceeding today with issuing licences and agreeing to large scale projects in the Yukon territory, while within a few weeks we can expect to have definitive proposals signed by various parties, would be premature and irresponsible on the part of the Department. I think we should realize that during the past four years, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development has done tremendous work in bringing all parties towards an agreement that will be binding on the signatory parties. I think that is important. Of course it would be nice to be able to act quickly and get into the North and develop it, but doing so without having a formal agreement with the groups in the North would, in my view, be an abuse of authority. I think the Department is right in wanting to examine this aspect more specifically, before giving the go ahead for any project whatsoever.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House, that a number of suggestions were submitted to the Department, not only the Keiwit project, but many others. When I hear the Member for Yukon asking for the Minister's resignation, I must say his request seems rather out of touch with reality, since that is not going to solve the problem. On the contrary, there may be a case for asking for additional time, although I agree these delays are a nuisance, but it does take time for people to understand each other. It takes time, if we are to avoid pitched battles, to reach a carefully considered agreement that will be acceptable to the two or three parties involved, because we have to consider the Yukon Territory as such, and the native people's issue and the position of the federal Government. It is a complex matter involving several parties. Once an agreement is concluded, I think we will be able to proceed quickly, while respecting the rights of all concerned. That is very important, and that is how this country should develop. I think this question can not be properly debated if we ignore these basic issues.

● (1600)

Where it says in today's motion, and I quote:

That this House regards the Government's failure to take action to encourage the development of Canada's resource industries and ensure their competitiveness in world markets as a betrayal of all Canadians—

I think that is a misrepresentation of facts and a verbal abuse of the present situation.

Anyone who has visited Canada's North, Mr. Speaker, will acknowledge that a great deal has been done about developing the North. The main problem in this country is our domestic markets. That is often the problem with which we are faced when dealing with the issue of developing these areas, and we must not forget another major problem, which is the high cost of access to these areas and the cost of the projects themselves, considering the constraints of our northern climate and the distances to be travelled. All this is, of course, related to the availability of transportation. Therefore, taking a very harsh stand against the Government and using censorious language is not going to solve the problem.

The development of the North will always be a tremendous challenge for Canadians. People tend to refer to it as a problem. It is a fact that developing the North takes a lot of imagination, a lot of financial resources and a lot of know-how. But taken as a whole, those projects amount to quite a challenge. Several companies are now operating very far up north, including Crown corporations—I might point out that Crown corporations have made their presence felt in the Beaufort Sea and everywhere in the Arctic—and lots of research is being done to develop the North.

The way the motion reads, Mr. Speaker, it is suggested that we have not done everything possible and that it remains—

—a betrayal of all Canadians whose standard of living depends upon the resource sector of Canada's economy and calls upon the Government to bring an end to the nationalization of Canadian resource industries which has discouraged investment in Canada;

—but I think it does not reflect reality. Again the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) made every effort in the last budget to make it easier for companies to drill and come up with concrete projects to diversify the economy in Canada's Arctic lands, but all that cannot be done overnight.

Perhaps I should urge Hon. Members of the Progressive Conservative Party to ask their leader just how much energy and effort is required to develop the North. Schefferville is only in the mid-north of Quebec, a far cry from the Far North. For those who are aware of the situation in Schefferville, Gagnon and Fermont, I will get back to the Schefferville issue some other day when the Leader of the Opposition is in the House, and I will talk about the development of Schefferville and Sept-Îles and about mining. It is important to know the full story of mining development in that region. In any case, just to keep the debate on an objective basis, let us ask the former Iron Ore Company president what it means to develop those places. It is a giant task. Even at that, no matter how governments or private enterprise might plan ahead, see what happened and what is happening now on the North Shore. None of the public or private sector experts had expected the collapse of the iron ore market, everybody was taken by surprise. So much so that, in 1974, the Iron Ore Company poured $350 million to install a concentrator at Sept-Îles, but it was never put into operation, not because the Sept-Îles workers had not done the job properly, but simply because the demand for iron ore pellets went flat between 1974 and 1979. After reading the motion under consideration, I realize that it is meaningless, although I understand why some Members may be impatient. I understand, but those remarks do not justify that impatience.

Mr. Speaker, it is much more rewarding to try to find formulas which are a bonanza for everybody rather than to impose development. When development is imposed without the agreement of all parties concerned, solutions which are worse than the problem are arrived at and, in the case of the development of the Yukon, I think it is imperative to settle the issue of the native peoples' territorial rights. All Members know that it has always been one of the key factors in the development of the North. The town of Schefferville was developed right next to an Indian reserve, and the company held lengthy negotiations with the Indians before reaching agreements.

I should point out again, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to agreements, we experience difficulties, not only with the federal Government or private companies, but also with a provincial Government, that of Newfoundland. Here again it boils down to tradition, because the North Shore Montagnais and the Naskapis are not allowed to hunt, fish or trap in the Labrador territory of Newfoundland. They will soon seek to meet with Mr. Peckford to find a solution. If someone wants to resort to force, the police will be called in. It is a very simple case, but people have to live with it every day and it is taking ever more significance.

I am saying that only to show that if it is difficult to convince the Newfoundland Government that the traditions of the North Shore Montagnais ought to be respected, it is just as difficult to launch major industrial projects unless all parties concerned have first agreed to a joint or common plan.

Within a few weeks, the report will be completed, agreements will have to be made, and I think that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development will do his utmost to give every consideration to the suggestions made to him by various interests about the project on the north slope of Yukon.

Mr. Speaker, there is a last point I should like to make, since my time is rapidly running out. It is that we must ensure, once the native land claims are settled, that the various companies and Government levels act quickly to meet with departmental officials so that the different projects can go forward. It often happens that a project is reviewed long before a decision is made, but the Department hopes that once the land claims are settled, we can do as the Hon. Member for Yukon and other Members for northern and southern Canada have suggested and act quickly. I simply want to emphasize that provincial governments as well as private companies and Crown corporations should meet quickly with departmental officials in an effort to speed up the implementation of these projects.

The Minister was telling me earlier, Mr. Speaker, that his major objective as far as Yukon development is concerned was to create the maximum number of jobs and develop as many aspects of the Yukon economy as possible, because of the tremendous potential of the area and we would not want this development to be delayed by anyone. We want to make sure that will take into account the people who live in these regions and the companies working there will reap the benefits of that development. This is very important. I believe that Members of a Central Government must be aware of all the problems encountered in such negotiations. If by chance someone had wanted to undertake certain projects before all the agreements were in place, what would have happened? Everyone knows what would have happened, namely injunctions, court appearances and longer legal delays than those caused by the negotiations, especially now that these negotiations are coming to an end. I believe that the Minister had the responsibility to negotiate with the various parties involved so that once an agreement was reached the various projects would not be further delayed by legal proceedings. We really want to go forward and make progress once these agreements are reached.

Mr. Speaker, I shall close simply by saying that the suggestion of the Hon. Member for Yukon that the Minister should resign, is abusive and irrelevant. On the contrary, I would ask for everyone's forebearance in view of the fact that the Minister will have the pleasure of announcing projects for the Yukon in the very near future.

• (1610)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions, comments, answers? On debate, the Hon. Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling).

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in the debate on the motion of the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). It is another indication of how badly things have turned out

under the leadership of the present Government. I rise today to speak on the crucial issue of forestry and to commend the Hon. Member for his motion.

I would like to begin by providing a brief outline. The Trudeau years have not been good for forestry. Since 1968, the forestry service staff has been cut in half, as has research money. In 1978, for example, a decision to cut funding by shutting down the Petawawa Forestry Research Station met strong resistance. Fortunately, the decision was reversed and this important research centre continues to work on the problem of reforestation.

Just last August, the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts), as Minister of the Environment, announced a forest renewal cost-sharing agreement. This agreement would see the two levels of government and private industry pouring $300 million immediately into reforestation, rising to a total of $650 million by 1987. Today, the sad fact is that the Government has not gone far on this agreement. It is too easy to argue that the federal Government is helpless in this regard, being actual landlord to a mere 1 per cent of Canada's huge tracts of forest. Taxes and export benefits are so vital to the federal Government that the lack of attention forestry has received in recent years is both ludicrous and tragic.

Today, more than a dozen significant interest groups from the Woodworkers Union to the Science Council of Canada have called attention to the dismal neglect of our forests. I also rise as a Member of the Progressive Conservative Party representing the riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka, which is very concerned and dependent upon our immediate environment for our livelihood.

My concern with this vital issue of forestry is that forests are an integral part of the acid rain dilemma. The riding of Parry Sound-Muskoka is slowly being eroded and is dependent on a clean environment, as is our major industry of tourism. Tourism, in turn, is dependent upon good forests.

To understand the Canadian forest scene, one must look at land ownership. Unlike the United States where 60 per cent of the land is privately owned, Canada is almost entirely publicly owned. The federal Government owns about 40 per cent of the nation's almost four million square miles, the Provinces own about 50 per cent, and private owners own only 10 per cent. Within provincial boundaries the Provinces own 91 per cent of forest lands, with the federal share reduced to only 1 per cent and private land accounting for about 8 per cent.

Just what do these figures prove? They demonstrate that the use of our natural resources is unavoidably an immediate political issue. They also suggest that co-operation is absolutely necessary for effective national forestry and underlie the possibility of overlapping authority, wasteful repetition and internal dispute. All of these have arisen from time to time and are still present.

Curiously enough, Canadians are generally in the dark in this our largest industrial sector, perhaps because forestry has been an industry of the country for so long, nearly 400 years, and because the forests seem so abundant that we take it for granted. For decades this indifference was of little consequence since there were always good supplies over the next hill. However, today, when decisions must be made which will have serious effects on every Canadian, the reduction in forestry has become a problem. The sheer size of the industry will surprise and enlighten most Canadians. There are more than 300,000 Canadians who work in jobs directly related to forestry. An additional 700,000 jobs are indirectly supported by the industry. Of these, many are manufacturing jobs; one out of every seven manufacturing dollars is forestry related.

In addition, the industry represents a vital component of some provincial economies. In the cases of New Brunswick and British Columbia, it amounts to almost half the value of all provincial manufacturing activity. The political importance of the industry is further heightened by the fact that it is frequently located in communities which are almost entirely dependent upon it for employment. At least 300 communities across Canada are one-industry forestry towns without viable options; that is why it is so important.

Forestry is Canada's major contributor to our balance of trade, outstripping the combined net contribution of mining, agriculture, fisheries and petroleum fuels. Sales of forest products, domestic and foreign, mean close to $25 billion in trade for Canada annually. Forestry also stimulates other industries. It is the largest purchaser of manufactured goods in most of Canada's Provinces, the second largest purchaser in Quebec and the fourth largest in Ontario. The industry generates more than $1 billion annually in taxes for the federal Government, and it produces another $1 billion or more in taxes for the various provincial Governments. This does not take into consideration the millions of dollars paid out in municipal taxes. By recent estimate, just 1 per cent of the forest land base may contribute up to 3,000 jobs and $20 million in provincial tax revenue. In light of these figures it is surprising that warnings about potential threats to the industry have been ignored by the Government.

By the 1970s, a number of structural weaknesses in the industry became evident. New pulp and paper products, particularly in the southern United States, began to compete effectively in traditional Canadian export markets. Their access to lower labour, production and resource costs, plus a wood supply that regenerates itself more quickly, meant that these producers had a considerable price advantage. Also during the 1970s studies suggested that Canada's economically exploitable forest resources were much less plentiful than expected. A lack of long-term planning had resulted in insufficient forest protection and poor use of some timber species. In addition, poor harvesting techniques and rudimentary silviculture practices meant that more potential usable timber was wasted and that reforestation did not keep pace with harvesting.

In eastern Canada these problems were compounded by outdated capital equipment in the pulp and paper sector which wasted energy, caused pollution and required labour intensive production techniques. Also, low profit margins and low

energy and wood supply costs gave little incentive to producers to re-equip. Thus, by the mid-1970s, a significant investment backlog had developed. Producers faced rising energy costs, tighter pollution control regulations, and machinery which was rapidly reaching the end of its productive life. The need for public action is obvious; today even more action is called for.

In its March 1983 report, the Science Council of Canada warned that the forests are essential to our social and economic wellbeing, yet we have allowed them to degenerate to a dangerous point. We have been felling, selling and shipping timber for so long and at such a rate that today a $23 billion industry is facing economic stagnation.

The comments of the Council and its report were welcomed. Concerned citizens, politicians from all sides of the House and spokesmen for industry have been warning the Government for many years that careless exploitation of the forest resource would mean its destruction. Today, despite improved utilization of the forest in the mills and efforts toward replacing the forest, the warnings have become more frequent. The real problem as I see it is that none of the forests we see around our urban areas are marketable.

● (1620)

Why are our forests disappearing? The first big attack on them is logging. We cut about 2.6 million acres each normal year. Of this, at least one-third is not sufficiently restocked. Each year, 400,000 acres are added to the National Science Research inventory. About 12 per cent of our forest land is now in this category. If we had this to cut again, we could sustain our present harvest for about 30 years on this land alone.

The forests are also diminished by pest and disease. At its height, the spruce budworm epidemic had defoliated more than 150 million acres of forest land, about two-third the size of Ontario. Annually we lose about $1 billion in potential forest trade because of insects. Something can be done about this. Fire is another major factor in forest loss. In the last few years we have lost up to six times the annual harvest to fires. Acid rain is becoming a great concern as far as it affects growth in our forests. On this matter, the Europeans are now bringing evidence of their concern. To all these factors we must add the withdrawal of the forest base for parks, reserves, roads, hydro lines, urban expansion and agricultural expansion. Finally, better co-ordination between the forestry organizations and Government Departments would help on this account.

What then is to be done? This morning we heard the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Caccia) outline what the Government has done and is doing and laud his accomplishments. Without sounding disrespectful, I commend the Minister. However, this is not enough. It is only a beginning. As he pointed out, there are still many priorities that remain. They are, more research and development which is essential for protection and a further increase of funds for the Canadian Forestry Service. To this list may the Official Opposition add a few of its own concerns or areas that the Minister can consider when he approaches his colleagues for additional funds.

The Minister should enhance forestry to a higher prominence as a distinct federal ministry, eliminate areas of federal-provincial overlap and, where desirable, develop further joint management jurisdictions. In conjunction with the Provinces, he should encourage improved management and protection of the forest resource with the intention of increasing productivity by at least 50 per cent by the year 2000.

The Minister should consider accepting a share of forest-related costs consistent with the benefits received by Governments from the forest sector, linking federal funding to a set percentage of the federal revenue, averaged over five years, taken from that sector. Through tax measures, he should encourage industry involvement in more intensive forest management, regeneration and product research and, finally, manage more effectively the large federal lands currently being neglected.

It is rather a coincidence that in the Sunday *Star* the lead editorial was headed "Our Threatened Forests". I quote the editorial:

> The forest industry is Canada's largest. One out of every seven of our manufactured goods is a forest product. And the industry is responsible, directly or indirectly for about a million jobs.
>
> Obviously, it would be an unbelievable catastrophe to lose this resource through waste, mismanagement or neglect. Yet apparently we're doing just that.
>
> Our forests are threatened. As Patricia Orwen reported in The Saturday Star recently, large areas of once-lush land already are barren. Canada's trees are being lost while much of the public believes that the supply is endless and that Government and industry are taking measures to protect that supply.
>
> These beliefs are mistaken. The evidence says we're harvesting our trees faster than we replace them.
>
> According to the Science Council of Canada, one-eighth of the country's productive forest area has become useless and will remain so for the next 60 to 80 years. And a 1981 federal discussion paper says Ontario's timber industry faces widespread shortages this decade, unless we do a better job of managing our forests. And we dare not wait.
>
> Basing its calculation on the Ministry of Natural Resources' own figures, a New Democratic Party task force says we're writing off 37 acres of forest an hour. In 1980 and 1981, almost 30 per cent of what was cut—about 270 square miles—was laid to waste and not replanted. That's an area larger than metropolitan Toronto. Some forest will regenerate itself. Some of the waste land, it's true, is not suitable for replanting.
>
> But the conclusion seems unescapable that, overall, a much greater effort is needed to replenish what has been cut throughout the Province.
>
> Clearly, a new effort is needed. Ontario has made a start by entering into new forest management agreements with a number of large lumber companies. These agreements provide the companies with provincial money and require them to replant in areas they harvest.
>
> Such agreements are good, and there should be more of them. But agreements alone are not enough. We need to treat forestry like farming. Trees are crops that must be tended and nurtured before we move down the road to look for more.
>
> And we need to spend more money. The Science Council says we should more than double our funding for reforestation and research. Ottawa, Queen's Park and the timber industry may quibble about who should pay more for what, but there is no doubt more should be spent.
>
> Otherwise we may squander the future of a $23 billion industry.

As a member of the Special Committee on Forestry, a few years ago I visited the forestry station at Pembroke. At Kemptville we saw the new hybrid poplar which is being

developed there. It grows much quicker and will provide the necessary raw product for our paper mills. There are currently about 3,000 acres, with a total of 5,000 well established acres. These plantations are increasing by 1,100 per year. There are 600 acres cared for by the Ministry and 500 acres privately run.

The emphasis of this program is on technology transfer. The companies involved, and I give them full credit, include Domtar and Granville Christian College as it purchases fuel for each. Other projects are by Ontario Paper, Malette Waterford and the Eddy Match Company. The Government is financing with a fifty-fifty split between the two levels of Government, and the 1980-84 term has provided $500,000. In addition, the National Research Council is involved.

It is interesting to note that it takes 60 years for a hardwood tree to reach maturity. Pulpwood trees require about 40 years. The hybrid poplar can be harvested within seven years. It will have a diameter of about seven inches. That is amazing.

As I pointed out earlier, we are in tough competition with Georgia, where vegetation and growth is much superior. Our friends in Sweden spend $1 billion a year on silviculture, protecting their forests, reforestation and protection against acid rain. We in this country spend probably no more than 25 per cent of that amount.

● (1630)

As a member of the Subcommittee on Acid Rain, Mr. Speaker, I am vitally interested in the subject and am interested in the fact that acid rain is doing considerable harm to our forests, not only to the seedlings but also to the mature trees. People have pointed out to me that during certain periods of time after a severe rain, one can actually see what has happened to the leaves of the trees from acid rain.

I know there are other Members who are interested in the subject of acid rain and I know how important this subject is. I hope the Government will give serious consideration to this, the most important industry in the entire Dominion of Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions, comments, answers? Debate.

Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin-St. George's): Mr. Speaker, once again I welcome the opportunity to say a few words about Canada's resource sector and what the Government has been doing to encourage and develop this sector over the past few years, particularly since the Government obtained its latest mandate in February, 1980. I am very proud to be a supporter of the Government at a time when economic fortunes have not been as promising as we would have liked.

The Government has been able to stabilize and preserve the welfare program at a time when other voices have been saying that it ought to cut back. The Government has been able to hold its own in terms of the balance of trade and in terms of exports to other countries. However, it is in the achievements of the Government in the resource sector over the past four years in particular that supporters of the Government can take greatest pride. I say that having in mind particularly what the Government has done in the energy sector.

The Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle), when wording his resolution, must have had in mind the speech made by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) which was delivered in Calgary a few days ago. I am sure Hon. Members of the Opposition will remember that speech. They want very much to forget it but it is on the record. It will be difficult for them to forget that speech. We on this side will not let them forget that speech for a couple of reasons. The first reason we will not let them forget that speech is that it is the closest the gentleman from Central Nova has come to putting himself on the record in so far as any policy position is concerned. We will remember it for that reason. However, Mr. Speaker, it is a landmark speech for another reason. What the Leader of the Opposition put on the record one day, he tried to disown the following day and the day after that. He will have difficulty disowning that particular speech, but that is another subject, Mr. Speaker.

I was saying that the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River must have had that particular speech in mind when he worded his resolution because, in some respects, it seems to me that the Hon. Member cribbed some of the wording and perhaps some of the ideas from the very first speech made by the Leader of the Opposition on the subject of energy policy. At that time, the Leader of the Opposition suggested that he would change some of the energy measures and would abolish others, but in the end he really did not tell us what energy policy he would follow as the Leader of the Government. A few days after that speech, no one is really sure what it is that the Leader of the Opposition wants to change. I am anxious to know and I believe all Canadians are anxious to know what he wants to change. It is a pity that we may never know.

In the meantime, Hon. Members of the Opposition continue to ramble on condemning policies without ever telling the Government what they would put in place of those policies. For example, the Leader of the Official Opposition accused the Government of over-taxing the oil industry. The question to be asked is, would a Tory Government tax the industry less? Are Tory Members telling us that they would tax it less? The oil industry now receives 50 per cent of energy revenues; that is right, 50 per cent of revenues as compared, for example, to the 46 per cent it received just five years ago in 1978. The current share of 50 per cent is much higher, for example, than it was three or four years ago. What was the share in 1979 when the Tories were in power? It was 41 per cent; that is right, 41 per cent under the Tory régime. The industry now receives an additional 9 per cent, totalling 50 per cent of revenues in 1983. In terms of revenue shares, Mr. Speaker, the Government feels that the industry is being treated fairly.

In terms of dollars, the industry revenue position has increased dramatically from $4.5 billion under the Tory Government in 1979 to $11.7 billion today. Industry revenues are now two and a half times what they were when the Tories were in power four years ago. Tory Members who were in power

four years ago are those same Tories who are now somehow implying that the industry is not being treated fairly. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the industry is being treated more fairly now than it was four years ago under the Tories. It is receiving $11.7 billion this year compared to the $4.5 billion it received four and a half years ago under the Tory Government.

I am not suggesting that that kind of money, although it is a monumental amount, is too much. The Hon. Member for Nanaimo-Alberni (Mr. Miller) believes that it may be too much, but of course his socialist views are well known to the House and to the country. I do not agree with his views, but I respect his right to hold them. He and I share many of the same views on the fishery issue and I congratulate him on his enlightenment in at least some areas of the economy.

I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that $11.7 billion is too large a sum for the industry to receive. The Government thinks that it is a fair share. Indeed, I think that the provincial Governments and the industry would say the same of the current federal share of 20 per cent. The provincial Governments and the industry would say that that is fair as well, and they have told us exactly that. However, Opposition Members continue to blame federal taxes for any negative energy event. Why are they not honest with themselves and with Canadians? Would they settle for a lower federal share? Would they increase the deficit through tax concessions? Is that what they are trying to tell us?

Another common Tory argument is that the effect of our policies has been to discourage investment. Again, Tory Members should check the facts and listen to the authorities on this subject. Just a few weeks ago, for example, *Oilweek* magazine, a respected Canadian magazine published in Calgary, reported its assessment of oil industry activity. *Oilweek* magazine estimates that there will be considerable increases in oil and gas industry investment. It expects petroleum exploration and development expenditures in Canada to total $5.6 billion this year, a record level.

While *Oilweek* magazine is confirming what the Minister of Energy (Mr. Chrétien) has been saying for some time, which is that we are headed for record levels of investment to the tune of $5.6 billion this year, and while that is the reality and everyone in the oil patch has been saying that that is the reality, what have the Tory Members been saying? They have been saying that it is not enough to have record investment projections at a time when the economy has been fairly slow, and I hope they know that it has been slow. The fact has been with us for some time. Yet they persist in maintaining the fantasy that things are as bad as they wish them to be. Things are not as bad but are much better then the Tories would wish them to be. *Oilweek* magazine says so and others say so.

From our own perspective, the amount mentioned of $5.6 billion in investment is over 70 per cent more than the industry invested only four short years ago. Who was in power at the time, Mr. Speaker? That is right, the good old Tory Members who now say: "Not enough, too little, too late". In four years, since the Canadian electorate kicked the Tories out of office, this Government, in collaboration with the provincial Governments and the oil industry, has managed an increase in investment of more than 70 per cent—

• (1640)

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Debts. A lot of debt.

Mr. Simmons: —to $5.6 billion this year.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Debt.

Mr. Simmons: The Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) should really watch his blood pressure. I would not want him to get overly exercised by what I am saying.

Mr. Blenkarn: Then be careful of what you are saying, Roger.

Mr. Simmons: I am merely telling the truth. I know he does not like the truth.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Why do you not try the truth for a change?

Mr. Simmons: And I invite him, if he has some documentation, to contradict the figures I just gave him. And I will give those figures again: a 70 per cent increase in investment since the Tories were booted out of office by a smart Canadian electorate; an investment this year of $5.6 billion—

Mr. Stewart: Added to the deficit. Right on top of the deficit.

Mr. Simmons: Is the Hon. Member saying that that is not true? If so, he is contradicting the respected *Oilweek* magazine in Calgary. But he has been known to contradict respected sources before. He is known to have had egg all over his face before. However, if he wants to contradict, I invite him to contradict.

Mr. Taylor: I don't know how you get that report.

Mr. Simmons: The gentleman from Bow River wonders as he often does. I can stand before him because I have the facts straight out of one of the most respected oil magazines in western Canada. I suggest he read it some time. He might learn something. It seems to me I have hit a nerve somewhere.

An Hon. Member: Oh, no, no.

Mr. Simmons: In this latest Tory motion they condemn once again our decision to expand the role of Petro-Canada. Where have we heard that tune before? It seems to me we heard it just before the last election. Remember the great Tory plan, the great Tory promise? I do not mean the one to move the embassy, but that is another one we can talk about. I mean the plan to dismantle PetroCan. Do you remember, Mr. Speaker, how they were going to bring in a new regime? They were going to privatize PetroCan.

Mr. Taylor: And make it less than 18 cents.

Mr. Simmons: Does the Hon. Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) deny that? Does he say he never made that promise?

Mr. Taylor: To make it less than 18 cents.

Mr. Simmons: He made the promise. He would like to forget it now.

Mr. Blenkarn: Eighteen cents a litre, Roger.

Mr. Simmons: The people of Canada are not going to forget it.

Mr. Taylor: Now it is 76 cents.

Mr. Simmons: The Conservatives made a promise to dismantle PetroCan, to "privatize it" in their words.

Mr. Taylor: How about the 76 cents? You should remember your promise.

Mr. Simmons: Then the Conservatives got in power and soon, when they had access to the facts instead of the fantasy—

Mr. Taylor: It was 76 cents after you got in power.

Mr. Simmons: —they learned the people of Canada wanted PetroCan. They learned that the people of Canada still want PetroCan, and that is why we have expanded the role of PetroCan. What would they do now with PetroCan, Mr. Speaker? We heard the Hon. Member for Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney) tell the people in Calgary what he would do. I think he has weasled a bit since and changed his mind a few times. However, that is typical of the Tory stance on PetroCan. They have had a different policy for most days of the week.

Mr. Taylor: How about your 76 cents when you said it would be less than 18 cents? It was a different policy once you were in power. Your face should be red.

Mr. Simmons: Someone was telling me earlier today Mr. Speaker, that I was wearing my "Tory" suit. It is not a blue suit, but it is a Tory suit, nevertheless. It has a pocket inside on this side and another pocket here. It is a very convenient type of suit. It is called a Tory suit because in one pocket you can have a policy about any issue—

Mr. Taylor: I could buy a suit, too, if I did not pay my taxes.

Mr. Simmons: —and if the public does not like that policy, you can always pull the other one out of the other pocket. The Tories have a policy in every pocket depending on the audience they have on that particular day.

Mr. Taylor: I could buy ten new suits if I did not pay my taxes.

Mr. Simmons: Why does the Hon. Member for Bow River not learn that it is not how loud he shouts which makes the point, but how well he does his homework?

Mr. Taylor: You had better practice what you preach.

Mr. Simmons: No, Mr. Speaker, we will not privatize Petro-Canada because Petro-Canada—

Mr. Taylor: You set an example and we will follow it.

Mr. Simmons: —and the Hon. Member for Brant (Mr. Blackburn) agrees with this—has done great things for this country. He agrees with that. Most sensible people in this country agree with that. We have been known to take good ideas and make them available to the people of Canada. We have never denied taking good ideas from whatever source.

An Hon. Member: Pensions, medicare.

Mr. Simmons: Even if the Tories give us a good idea, we will take that idea.

Mr. Taylor: That is the only place you get them.

Mr. Simmons: We should get ideas from the people of Canada, Mr. Speaker. The reason this Government and the Liberal Party have been able to be in power so long, have been asked for so long by the people of Canada to provide good Government, is that we have listened to the people of Canada in terms of the kinds of programs they want, how they want the economy stimulated, what kind of welfare programs they want. We have listened to those people and we have then, using their tax dollars as is proper under law, given them the programs which allow this country to move forward.

Mr. Taylor: What about the 18 cents?

Mr. Simmons: If the Hon. Member wants to talk about the 18 cents, he should put that in context also. What the Tories said in their December, 1979 budget is that no matter what the price of energy was, they would add another 18 cents on top of everything else. That is what they said. And you will remember the people's answer to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Taylor: Why don't you tell the truth?

Mr. Simmons: PetroCan represents an achievement—

Mr. Taylor: You have gone to 76 cents. What is the matter with you? Go down to the gas pumps.

Mr. Simmons: —an achievement for Canadians. The Tories condemn our policy to expand Petro-Canada, but condemnations aside, we will continue to allow PetroCan to play a good role, an expanded role in this country, because it is serving Canadians very well indeed. Most of the progress to date in expanding the role of Canadians in the energy industry has been achieved through private sector initiatives.

Mr. Blenkarn: Right on.

Mr. Simmons: The Tories condemn even this because we help Canadian companies through our PIP program. The Leader of the Opposition said he would change the PIP program. He would stop the progress. He would apply his Schefferville formula. He would close it down. That is what he would do.

Mr. Reid (St. Catharines): He would get a letter from the former Minister of Mines thanking him for it.

Mr. Simmons: He is not going to get the chance to apply his Schefferville formula to the PIP program to the energy industry. The people of Canada will not give him a chance to shut it down.

Mr. Taylor: He would not close down half of the industry in Canada.

Mr. Simmons: He would do whatever Cleveland told him to do, such as he did in Schefferville. Do not tell me what he would do. He talks about monkeys and organ-grinders. He knows all about organ-grinders. The organ-grinder was in Cleveland that day. Do you want to know where the monkey was?

Mr. Blenkarn: We know where the monkey is right now. We are watching the monkey, Roger.

Mr. Simmons: There is no doubt in my mind who would call the shots on the energy industry if the Tories were in power. The multinationals have always called the shots for the Tories.

Mr. Taylor: The people will.

Mr. Simmons: The multinationals in Cleveland and Chicago. The Hon. Member is agreeing with me. The people in Chicago and Cleveland. That is what I have been trying to tell him.

Mr. Taylor: No, the people of Canada.

Mr. Simmons: Finally he has the point. The people in Cleveland and Chicago—that is in the United States, you understand that.

Mr. Taylor: Well, it will not be a handful of Liberals telling them what to do.

Mr. Simmons: We do not settle for an organ-grinder who lives in Cleveland. That is the difference between my Party and the Party of the Hon. Member for Bow River. We recognize organ-grinders and we will tell you where the organ-grinders are. The organ-grinders for us are the people of Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Order. I suggest that the reporters are having some difficulty getting all these interjections. Would you interject a little slower, please?

Mr. Taylor: If the Hon. Member talks directly to me, I have the right to talk back. He is not talking to the Chair.

Mr. Simmons: Of course, the Hon. Member for Bow River has the right to talk back. The only requirement is that he should say something when he talks back.

Mr. Taylor: I know what I am talking about. You have been on your feet for 15 minutes and all you have said is slander.

Mr. Simmons: How does the gentleman from Bow River know what I said? He has not been listening. If he will listen for a minute, I will tell him some good things about the PIP program.

Mr. Taylor: All right, I will listen for a minute. Let us hear what you have to say. One minute only.

Mr. Simmons: Instead of recognizing our PIP program as a positive instrument, which it is, and a program which is needed to help Canadians play a greater role in the energy investments, the Tories, of course, are screaming discrimination. They choose to ignore the fact that there is room for Canadian investment and foreign investment. We have delivered this message—not only in speeches but by working out deals, such as for example, a proposed $600 million heavy oil upgrader in Saskatchewan; two projects to extract oil from the tar sands in Alberta; a production plant at Wolf Lake costing $200 million, and another expansion at Cold Lake costing $300 million. Are these the facts or are they not?

• (1650)

Mr. Taylor: Tell us how many you have closed down.

Mr. Simmons: The gentleman is confused again. The one that was closed down is at Schefferville, and we did not close that one down.

Mr. Taylor: You closed down scores of them in Alberta.

Mr. Simmons: We have two new ones at Cold Lake and Wolf Lake, and one in Saskatchewan. Those are just three of the many projects made possible by a very exciting, aggressive energy policy of the good Liberal Government of Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): The Hon. Member's time has expired. Are there any questions? The Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington).

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say—

Mr. Manly: Mr. Speaker, I believe that in the natural rotation of speakers the NDP gets a speaker for every third speaker from the Conservative Party. I was on my feet at the same time as the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) and I believe I should have been recognized.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The way the debate proceeds, whether it be on a Government motion or an Opposition motion, there is a first round of speakers, one from each Party. That occurred this morning. Depending on which side presents the motion, in this case the Official Opposition, the ratio is four Conservatives to three Liberals to one NDP. The Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) will be the fourth Conservative, following which the Hon. Member will be recognized.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say it is a pleasure to follow the Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's

(Mr. Simmons). I have always had some sadness that I was a Cabinet Minister for only nine months. I truly hoped that it would have been a lot longer than that. But ten days is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. Blenkarn: Where did he go anyway? Roger left.

Mr. Huntington: The issue in the motion today, Mr. Speaker, is a very serious one. It cuts right to the heart of political debate in Canada. This country is controlled by that political ideology and those people who believe that interventionism is the right way to rule the people. On the other hand, I come from a Party which has a tendency to believe that behaviourism is the right way. If you define your laws and the sense of behaviour properly, and allow people to work in widely different activities within those laws and patterns of behaviour, then you will bring out the magic of the human powers of innovation and development, the incentives which encourage people to work and create wealth, and you will not have the dilemma we are facing in this country today.

The motion is a very serious one, Sir. As I was wandering through the Lambert Royal Commission Report on Financial Management and Control, I was reminded of an excerpt from a speech by Prime Minister James Callaghan to a Labour Party conference on September 28, 1976. I would like to read that into the record because I think it goes right to the heart of the reason for the wording of this motion today. It says:

> When we reject unemployment, as we all do . . . then we must ask ourselves unflinchingly—what is the cause of high unemployment? Quite simply and unequivocally it is caused by paying ourselves more than the value of what we produce . . . It is an absolute fact of life which no government, be it left or right, can alter . . . We used to think that you could just spend your way out of a recession and increase employment by cutting taxes and boosting government spending. I tell you in all candour that that option no longer exists and that insofar as it ever did exist, it worked by injecting inflation into the economy. And each time that happened the average level of unemployment has risen . . . And each time we did this the twin evils of unemployment and inflation have hit hardest those least able to stand them—our own people, the poor, the old and the sick.

What we are dealing with here is that even leaders of opposing ideology share the view that modern day parliamentary democracies so far have been unable to bring their spendthrift and wasteful habits under control, each apparently aware that not to do so will aggravate the economic and social tragedy facing us. That is the political dilemma we are in. It does not matter whether you are of the interventionist ideology or the behaviourilist ideology, here is a British Prime Minister addressing the Labour Conference in Britain in 1976 and laying out the dilemma. It is a Catch-22 situation. We stand in this House and yell and shout at each other, a perfect example of which was the performance of the previous speaker, the Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's, who fancies himself an absolute and perfect politician; that is what politics is all about. But I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I am not here for that type of behaviour, that type of debate or that type of comment. I have learned a little bit about history, and the other day I saw an article in Richard J. Needham's "A Writer's Notebook" which I thought was very applicable to the dilemma we are in today. He points out that:

> In countries like Malaysia and Sri Lanka, the industrial revolution is just beginning; but in Britain, where it originated some 150 years ago, the industrial revolution is drawing to its end.

Then he points out some very interesting data from a *Washington Post* editorial:

> In the past 10 years employment in British manufacturing has dropped 30 per cent. British steel production, declining steadily, is now about half of the 1973 level. Automobile production is about half of the 1973 level. Ten years ago just over one-fourth of the cars sold in Britain we imported; currently well over half of them are.

Does it sound familiar, Mr. Speaker? We are always just a little bit behind the British Fabian socialist movement, but we have imported the mistakes they made which they are now trying to correct. It goes on:

> Increasingly, Britain buys its manufactured goods from other countries.

That is the dilemma the mother country of the industrial revolution faces today. So where do they go? What are they going to do? There are some 55 million in that country and some three million are now unemployed. It is pointed out that there is nothing to prevent that figure from going to four, five or six million. This raises the question that was asked some weeks ago in Newark, New Jersey:

> —what do you do, what can you do, with a huge surplus population unwilling or unable to support itself?

He points out that that was the problem that destroyed Rome. What we are dealing with is an element of human nature which seems to just cycle in and out of societies as time goes along. II think we are at a point where we had better wake up. We had better get our anticipation levels down. We had better understand the reason for this Opposition motion today put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). We had better get rid of the political rhetoric and address the Catch-22 situation that we are in to see if we cannot put the nation on an emergency basis of some kind and start to become competitive in the world once again. It points out too in this article of Needham that Ben Franklin said in 1789:

● (1700)

> Though we may set out in the beginning with moderate salaries (for politicians) we shall find that such will not be of long continuance. Reasons will never be wanting for proposed augmentations, and there will always be a party for giving more to the rulers, that the rulers may be able in return to give more to them. Hence, as all history informs us, there has been in every state and kingdom a constant kind of warfare between the governing and the governed: the one striving to obtain more for its support, and the other to pay less. And this has alone occasioned great convulsions, actual civil wars, ending either in dethroning of the princes or enslaving of the people. Generally, indeed, the ruling power carries its point, and we see the revenues of princes constantly increasing, and we see that they are never satisfied, but always in want of more. The more the people are discontented with the oppression of taxes, the greater need the prince has of money to distribute among his partisans, and pay the troops that are to suppress all resistance and enable him to plunder at pleasure. There is scarce a king in a hundred who would not, if he could follow the example of Pharaoh—get first of all the people's money, then all their lands, and then make them and their children servants forever.

These words apply today, Mr. Speaker. We have just heard the Member for Burin-St. George's talk about the National

Energy Program under which the Government gathers and collects it all up and then delivers it out only to those people who will do as the rulers and the princes want them to do. It is called suasion. The other thing we have today is a Government that puts priority on information. It shovels and bulldozes unbelievable quantities of money into advocacy, information, propaganda and advertising. This is the stage we are at. This is the ultimate stage of the interventionists and it is bringing the nation down to the point where it can no longer produce the wealth to carry the social programs that we have all been so proud of.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) and others that there is recovery coming and everything is going to be all right. We should keep our eye on the ball. If you look at the Royal Bank trendicator you will find that the balloon coming up has now levelled off and is flattening. There is not really going to be a recovery in this country that means much more than a temporary aberration of some 20 or 30 months until we start to see the products of our resources, our mining, our harvesting, our refining, moving out once again to world markets.

Is it not interesting that we have moved so much of our foreign assistance and our know-how and engineering into the creation of competitive plants in Third World countries? It is very generous of us indeed. But our at-home resource production has to compete with very modern plants that we have put into Third World and other emerging countries. We have a lot of pressure on any recovery. I do not see, and economists that I talk to do not see, the raw products of our resources really moving back in a stable fashion in the world markets for nine to 11 years. I think that not until we see those products from our natural resources moving out again into world markets, or moving into Canadian plants that are capable of giving "value-add" to them, are we going to see the movement of capital goods. It is "value-add" that creates more jobs. Until you see the movement of capital goods you are not really going to address the increasingly serious unemployment factor in Canada. You get bulges from railroad infrastructure building and from housing, and you get bulges from infrastructures like northeast coal. It is these infrastructures that are so important to us in hard times. That is where we should have enough money in the bank to be able to spend money. We have put well over a billion dollars into northeast coal and all we have done is to make available two sources of supply of metallurgical coal on the same coast of Canada to the Japanese and to world markets which they can bid one against the other. We do not seem to be able to plan, use and market what we have wisely. We therefore aggravate and increase the dilemma that we have.

Mr. Speaker, we have a Government with a Minister of Revenue who absolutely attacks and destroys all the junior mining exploration in western Canada. That is where all the risk money is. You have to attract real gamblers into the game of staking claims, diamond drilling, trenching and bringing about something that has the potential of being harvested as a mine or put into a mine and something that can come through to various classes of refineries. They attack those types of investors before they actually get their hands on their winnings. They tax them with capital gains when they exercise their options into other paper certificates. It is just throwing cold water on the whole industry and all that type of activity in our part of the world. It is deliberate. It is the interventionist mindset that destroys the opportunity of all the frustrated talent that exists throughout the country in creating the wealth and paying the taxes that we need to support our system. Mr. Speaker, we have truly lost our sense of excellence.

I was in the B.C. Research Council the other day. That is a very frustrated organization. It is a group of men and women who have tremendous talents and abilities. They have developed and broken through and are the world leaders in the biological reduction of ores to deliver pure metal. They have even done something that the biologists said could not be done. In the microbiological leaching of ores and the delivery of pure metal out of these leaching piles they have been able to stop the process at elemental sulphur. Now we do not have to worry about disposing of sulphuric acid or the contamination it causes. Can they get a nickel from the federal Government to assist them with this work? No. All of this leaching and all of this technology has to be sold in Mexico and Sweden and other markets in order to get the pennies that these brilliant people need for their research.

While I was on that tour I saw absolute breakthroughs in the formulation of roe and caviar. It is sitting there unused, probably to be picked up by the Japanese. It is Canadian minds that create these things. We do not allow the cost of marketing and research to be a deductible item with the incentive to take a risk so that people who understand these words in the market can act on them. No, it has to be somebody in a white coat in a government lab, or somebody at a desk in Ottawa who will say, "Yes, you may have these dollars to do this and that." As a result, we stifle and smother the country.

We have the national energy policy with all its Crown corporations. We have Canagrex which was politically forced by tobacco growing areas. We now find a key executive from the tobacco industry as its chief executive officer. We have a fishery takeover in the Atlantic region, where the problem has probably been lack of capital for processing and getting a high quality product to market. Mr. Speaker, the other night the Minister said, "Do not worry Ron, it is going to come out in the Pacific. We are going to spend $200 million out there next year. We are going to take over a major processing plant". There are two different fisheries in Canada. There is the Atlantic fishery and the Pacific fishery. We sell every single thing we produce in the Pacific fishery. Some of our smaller operators have been caught as a result of the botulism scare on an Alaska pack. But we are peanuts compared to Alaska. At least we have been able to sell and produce a high quality pack.

• (1710)

Some of our small packers get into trouble and require a special agency to help them with good harvests so that they can finance inventories over a hurdle. Perhaps that is an endorsement which some commission must give to the bank in order to subsidize them over these inventory hurdles when they get into trouble. I assume that is much of the problem that exists on the Atlantic coast.

The Department of Fisheries is moving into and taking over the Pacific fishery with a massive Crown corporation that will eventually eliminate everyone else. It will all be state-controlled because that Department has a sense of possessiveness over that resource. It keeps using the argument that the resource has to be protected and that it is reducing at 2 per cent compound per annum. However, that is totally misleading, and if the Minister keeps saying that, he will be challenged for misleading the House and the people of Canada, because I have in my hand the annual report of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission. This commission works with approximately $31 million a year. It is poverty stricken, receiving $15 million from Canada and $15 million from the United States. This 1983 report shows that the $30 million a year has created an upward curve on the return of fish to spawning grounds. It has created an upward curve on pinks and sockeye in terms of harvest on all the fish sources and fish runs for which it is responsible. If these dedicated scientists in the international salmon commission can achieve this with $30 million, there must be something wrong with our Department of Fisheries and Oceans which needs over $1.5 billion to run its operation. It has recently asked for another $484 million. Perhaps the trouble with most of the delivery of the federal services is that they are all too fat. Perhaps if we returned to thinner budgets and thinner operating expenses, these services could be delivered more effectively. For instance, the Fisheries Department disallowed patrol personnel on the fishery patrol vessels to clear streams any longer, such as clearing a fish stream of a fallen tree. That is now disallowed. I have seen university students who were hired on crews working their way up a stream to clear it when they suddenly received a call from their office saying that there is no more money and they should return from the bush.

The behaviour in the federal service in terms of the delivery of quality input into the preservation of that resource is unbelievable.

The reason given by the Government for getting into marketing in the Pacific is that the fish resource on the Pacific Coast is reducing 2 per cent compound per annum. In 1977 I was assured by the Department of Fisheries, when I was asking questions in committee, that it did not need any more resource to protect or conserve the species on the West Coast. Suddenly, it admits that the resource is going down 2 per cent compound per year, when I can show that, as stated in the annual report of a small organization like the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission with $30 million, it has an upward curve of performance taking place. If we took another $30 million from the $1.5 billion which we seem to spend on fisheries and oceans and gave it to them, they could open up new tributaries for the Fraser River fishery and perform miracles out there. That international commission is absolutely frustrated by the lack of support it is receiving from the Government.

I thank you for your tolerance, Mr. Speaker, but the motion is important. The motion is bogged down in a Catch-22 situation, which is the struggle between the interventionists, who are represented by the Liberal Government and the NDP, and those of us who believe that laws defining behaviour and tax incentives allowing the magic of man's inventiveness to explode are the political issue. It is this Catch-22 that causes motions like this in Canada today.

This House will remain irrelevant until we can make a breakthrough and address the Catch-22 situation. It is obvious from the history of Great Britain that the interventionist mentality will destroy a country in terms of creating enough wealth to sustain its social services. I believe that both the people of Britain and Canada sense that we are running out of time and we must begin to become more relevant. The reason the House is irrelevant is that we hear these nasty political speeches such as we heard from the Member for Burin-St. George's today instead of fundamental debate in addressing and resolving the Catch-22 situation that we have in Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions, comments and answers? Debate.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) for bringing this motion forward. I and my Party are in substantial agreement with it except for the unfortunate phrase calling for an end to nationalization of Canadian resource industries which has discouraged investment in Canada.

This phrase essentially reflects the Tory tendency to let the right wing ideology interfere with a very legitimate concern they have about Canada's mismanaged resource economy. Do Conservatives really oppose all programs of nationalization, even when they are needed to save an industry, to save a community such as Ocean Falls or to save thousands of jobs? We know that former Conservatives did not oppose nationalization when it was needed to save some investors who had put their money into some bankrupt railway schemes. They were not afraid to nationalize then in order to protect the Bank of Commerce. Now they say they are opposed to all nationalization. We saw the same kind of right-wing ideology intrude into legitimate business when the Liberal, Conservative and Socred coalition in British Columbia brought in its restraint legislation. There is no doubt that the Socreds won a mandate for restraint in the May 5 election, but they did not have the kind of mandate to put an end to the Human Rights Commission. They did not have a mandate to do away with the rentalsman or to destroy unions. The NDP Opposition in the B.C. legislature and Solidarity on the streets and on the picket lines have forced the Government to modify that legislation slightly.

The Tories should consider carefully the consequences of this ideology getting in the way of common sense. It is something with which Canadians are becoming concerned with respect to the Tories.

As I said, we are concerned, as is the Member for Prince George-Peace River, about the serious nature of the resource industry crisis that is facing Canada right now. The crisis that Canada faces in terms of its economy is based on the fact that our whole economy since the Second World War has looked to Canadian prosperity on the basis of branch plant manufacturing on the one hand and the exploitation and export of resources on the other. The whole Liberal welfare scheme that we have come to depend on is based upon those two factors. When we are now in the situation in which branch plants have been closed down or are running at half capacity and our export resource industries are in trouble, we find that the Liberal Government and the Conservative Opposition are talking about cutbacks in basic standards of welfare. We have seen cutbacks in the established programs of financing and we have seen capping on pensions. We have heard talk about questioning the whole principle of universality for family allowance by the Liberal Government. A few years ago we saw the implementation of a block funding system for medicare that really caps the federal contribution there.

The fact is that our Canadian economy grew after the Second World War but did not really develop. It was something like a force-fed turkey that was fed until it grew large but it never really developed its own muscles so it could be an independent bird. It was just force-fed until it could be brought to someone's table and carved up. However, now we are in a situation where our branch plants are shut down. At the same time the best of our resources have been creamed and we are in a situation where other resources are harder to reach, harder to develop and we face increased competition from other areas of the world. At the present time and for the last several years, Canada has run deficits for manufactured goods of $20 billion a year. This means we have to export more and more of our resources in raw and semi-processed states in order to keep our balance of payments in line. We have seen developments take place that often ride roughshod over the needs of aboriginal people.

• (1720)

I was interested to hear the House Leader for the Conservative Party, the Hon. Member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) saying that they should go ahead with the developments on the north slope without real regard for the land claims process under way. In our Party we recognize that Canadian prosperity depends now upon a proper development of our resources and a proper export policy for these resources. Canadian prosperity will depend on these for a long time. We cannot have Canadian prosperity by a sell-out of our resources. Perhaps the best example of a sell-out is the prebuilt pipeline that was pushed through by the Liberal Government and supported by the Conservatives a few years ago. This was the building of the prebuilt pipeline to export natural gas into the mid-west United States at a time when there were supposed to be ironclad guarantees that once the lower part of the line had been built and once the gas was flowing into the United States the Americans would then finish the rest of the line so that Alaskan gas could flow through Canada. Any gas that was sold from Alberta would be replenished by Alaskan gas. There were supposed to be thousands of jobs for Canada. Where are those jobs now? Where are the spin-offs from this project? All we see is the export of our resources and a piece of paper that was supposed to be an ironclad guarantee. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien) cannot give a date for the beginning of the pipeline and the Tories are strangely silent on this whole issue.

Another example where we see a neglect of our resources is in the area of fisheries. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Salmonid Enhancement Program that was originally designed to invest $150 million in federal money over five years in phase one was stretched to include seven years so that money was stretched over a longer period of time instead of being spent when it was most needed. At the same time, when money should have been spent, some $21 million was estimated to be needed to plan for phase two, only $5 million of planning money was spent planning for phase two on the Salmonid Enhancement Program. Now we are in a kind of interim period. No one is sure what the long-range plans are for SEP. On the Pacific Coast, and I am sure the East Coast as well, we are all aware of the Government's failure to protect fish habitat. There is a continuing shrugging of shoulders in the Fisheries Department in the face of expanding log booming in our estuaries. There is a lack of any activity at all to protest the leaching of toxic chemicals and sewage into fish habitat. There is inadequate protection of spawning channels. We see the turning of a blind eye to steep slope logging that destroys streams. But perhaps the prime example with which we are concerned today in terms of the federal Government's neglect of Canada's resources is in the forest industry. As speaker after speaker has pointed out, it is Canada's number one industry.

The attitude of waste and prodigality that we have adopted with respect to this resource in the past is something that we are beginning to pay for now. I can remember as a child, when we moved to our farm on Vancouver Island, walking through the bush and finding log after log that had been cut 10 or 15 years previously. These were logs that were three feet through and 40 feet long. They were just left because they did not meet the exacting demands of the mills at that time. They had some kind of a pitch seam in them, and so they were left to rot or to be cut up by farmers for firewood. If we had those logs today, they would be number one prime. We wasted this resource because it was cheap and we thought it was inexhaustible. We treated it with contempt.

As Canadians we are very much aware of our northern tree line, a line that stretches roughly diagonally from the Yukon into southeastern Canada. North of this line we know that climatic conditions prohibit the growth of trees. Perhaps we should also be aware of a second tree line in southern Canada. Here we find that wasteful logging practices, growing urbani-

zation, hydroelectric projects, transportation corridors and the need for agricultural land are slowly but surely eroding the total forest land base in Canada. In addition, there are additional pressures from environmental fisheries and parks interests.

It has been estimated that for every 130 hectares of average productive forest land in British Columbia that is lost we also lose one permanent sustained job. Yet we are in a situation where over one million hectares of forest land in British Columbia needs reforestation. We are still falling behind some 20 to 50 hectares a year.

In 1981, commercial forest land had declined in B.C. over the last decade between 16 per cent and 20 per cent. It is estimated that over the next 20 years there will be a further reduction in the forest land base in British Columbia of about 25 per cent, amounting to some 2.3 million hectares. This amounts to the loss of thousands of jobs, simply because we are not concerned about maintaining our forest base. The situation in other Provinces is similar. Perhaps some of these factors can be checked by better land management. We still face a declining forest base.

This morning I listened with interest as the Minister responsible for the Canadian forest industry talked about the federal-provincial forest agreements. It was rather sad to reflect that only two agreements with Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island have been signed and to note that a renewal has been signed in Newfoundland. Nothing yet has been signed with the four Provinces which produce the most in terms of Canadian forestry, namely, British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick. Knowing the present Government of British Columbia, I have to admit that not all the failure can lie on the federal side. In British Columbia, as I mentioned earlier, we have a phoney program of restraint. This has resulted in some very severe cutbacks in forestry.

I was talking with a forestry official this past week. He told me they were faced with a crisis where there might not be enough seedlings for planting in 1984 because the provincial Government decided that in the name of restraint it is going to cut back on its nursery programs. This is false economy of the most blatant kind, Mr. Speaker. If trees are not planted in the year in which the ground is ready, then all kinds of weeds and weed species come up, and the whole task of site preparation becomes very expensive if there is to be a proper seeding at some later time.

● (1730)

Our provincial Government is being most foolish in this so-called restraint. While we can condemn the provincial Government, we also have to ask how vigorously the federal Government has pursued these federal-provincial agreements when only two Provinces have signed them. We in our Party certainly regret the low status of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Caccia) in the Cabinet pecking order. There is now a very real fear that the money allocated to forestry programs will be redistributed to other Ministers, unless the Minister of the Environment is able to hold on to that money later this week.

What is the matter? Perhaps the Minister should have been more forthcoming in his speech. Perhaps he should have told the House why the Provinces are not signing the agreements. What is the hold-up? Is the problem the false mythology or ideology of restraint, or is there some real problem with the federal-provincial agreements which he is trying to get them to sign? He did not really answer the question as to why his Assistant Deputy Minister in charge of forestry quit. We on this side of the House were very encouraged by some of the initiative he had shown in trying to get some federal activity in this whole area. However, there is a well-grounded suspicion that the Assistant Deputy Minister quit out of frustration with the low priority the Government gave to the entire forestry situation.

The crisis in our forest industry is now. We need action now. People want answers now from the federal Minister responsible. Why is something not happening? Now is the time when people are looking for work. We have unemployed foresters. We have young people who would love to be involved in forestry projects. Now is the time for the provincial Governments, the federal Government and forestry companies to be putting more money into forestry programs. Certainly, private corporations have not done their share. British Columbia Forest Products, one of the more progressive forestry firms in British Columbia, has cut back on its forestry component. Of course, part of the reason was that BCFP, like many other big companies, a couple of years ago became involved in cannibalizing other countries. BCFP has had to face a $8 million per year interest charge for taking part in the cannibalization of the western forest industry.

During the Remembrance Day week recess, I had an opportunity to visit one of the EBAP programs in my riding. It was very interesting to see some of these young people at work pruning and thinning, doing jobs which the forests badly required. I agree with critics that this kind of program should be paid for by British Columbia Forest Products on whose land this is taking place. However, it is still a good program. There are problems with it. Although it has a five-month extension, it is more or less on an ad hoc basis. It is involved in topping up the unemployment insurance of young people. I talked with three young people whose UIC would expire in two or three days. As soon as their UIC benefits were finished, they lost their jobs at the same time. Somehow it seemed to be a very twisted and perverse way of creating jobs. At the very time when young people had been trained in what needed to be done and were of most value to the project, they were laid off because their UIC benefits expired. Certainly we in Canada can do better for our young people and our forests by providing something other than a stop-gap program to top up UIC benefits which lays them off at the time their benefits expire.

Last week, Kenneth Greaves, President of the Ontario Forest Industry Association, pointed to the need for a massive increase, a quadruple increase, in the amount of money the federal and provincial Governments have to spend on forestry.

If we want to maintain our position as the world leading exporter of forest products, we have to spend $1 billion a year on forestry. The Association of British Columbia Professional Foresters presented a very significant brief to the Macdonald Commission on the Economy. It pointed out that the number of personyears available to the Canadian Forest Service had declined by more than 50 per cent since 1968. Before the Tories cry too much over this, they should be reminded that these cuts were the result of their favourite program of privatization.

In conclusion I say that we would like to see the federal Government take real initiatives on this. It should give a higher priority to the signing of these federal-provincial agreements. We want to see a higher priority on programs to develop non-chemical control of disease or insects and pests. There has been much more research conducted in this area. Canadians are afraid of the sprays which are still being used. Those fears are justified. New Brunswick is now hooked on the whole business of spraying. When I asked the Minister about this matter this morning, he was not able to provide any specifics. He had many statistics on other programs but was unable to give any on this particular program. That suggested to me that the whole business of non-chemical ways of controlling insects and pests is really incidental and peripheral to his other concerns. As Minister of the Environment and as Minister responsible for the forest industry, this is one area in which the two concerns should come together. I would like to see it receive a higher priority in the Ministry.

Finally, I would like to see some federal Government help in the area of community co-operative initiatives for forestry. If the people of Honeymoon Bay or Mesachie Lake had controlled their forest areas, would they have allowed them to become depleted in a matter of 30 years or 40 years so that they are now ghost towns? I believe the people in the community can plan for a wise and rational use of forestry resources in their area. Would the people of Chemainus have allowed their mill to become run down so that they could invest money in Alabama as MacMillan Bloedel did, or would they maintain a modern, up to date mill which would still be running today if they were involved in the management of it?

I would like to see some federal Government money being put into community co-operatives in the whole business of forestry. Finally, we want some kind of industrial strategy which will provide the maximum number of jobs per tree. We should be manufacturing forestry equipment in Canada. There should be no export of raw logs. In conclusion, we want to see a higher priority on Canada's number one industry.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions, comments, answers? Debate.

Hon. Alvin Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to participate in a debate on our resources. For the usual reasons, when we get on to this subject, there is in all Parties a tendency to speak constructively; we instinctively realize that we are a developing nation when we are a resource nation. Also we realize that some day we will move into a more sophisticated match between our resources and our industrial value-added industries.

My remarks today will be on matters which I do not think have been covered by other speakers. I will refer mainly to perhaps one of the most hard-pressed industries in the Canadian resource field. Of course, I am referring to mining. We have had good mining tax laws in the country for most of our mining history. This is why Canadians set an example for the whole world on how to develop mines at minimum cost and maximum productivity. Of course, we have lost this for several reasons.

• (1740)

Let me go back. Until 1971, through the federal Government three-year tax holiday on capital intensified mines, which included all of them, our mining industry was the most efficient and best in the world. Under the regime of the 50-year period, our mining industry prospered. Along came the Carter Commission. It recommended that all risks should be treated equally and that the tax incentives that had been given to the mining industry be removed.

Before the federal Government moved, the provincial Governments took advantage of the rising prices of mining products in the world markets. They doubled, tripled and in some cases quadrupled their tax levels. The federal Government grew very angry with this and under the Turner budget of 1974 made all provincial taxes and royalties non-deductible. This meant that in effect there was double taxation on the mines of Canada. It hit all mines desperately hard, but none so hard as the low-grade mines of British Columbia. This unfortunate doubling and tripling of the tax rate at the provincial level and the making of the provincial taxes non-deductible has brought our mining industry, in so far as the base metal industries and low quality minerals are concerned, to a dead halt.

Since that time, two Provinces, British Columbia and Alberta, have reduced their taxes somewhat. However, the whole discussion of getting this back to normal broke down with the introduction of the national energy policy, which interfered from 1974 on under the Petroleum Administration Act and later the national energy policy, in the right of the Provinces to own these resources and to have full advantage of them for provincial purposes.

All this is history. When this matter was raised in the House in 1973 and 1974, the Minister of the new Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Hon. Donald Macdonald, and the then Minister of Finance, the Hon. John Turner, agreed with the quantitative analysis that I presented to the House. As a result of that, they set up a committee, supported by all the Provinces, centred at Queen's University. That report came down two years ago. I have never heard a single Member on the Government side mention that report. They know about it and I know the Minister knew about it.

It struck me as passing strange for two responsible Ministers on the Government side to admit that there was no future for the mining industry and then set up a committee to look into

it, and you can get a copy of the report in the library, entitled "The Effects of Taxation on Base Metal Mining in Canada" supported financially by the two main levels of Government.

The report says in effect that there will never be another mine developed in Canada as long as the present tax regime exists. This document was supported financially by the Government, yet no one has raised this as a subject of discussion. Until we read the reports presented to this Parliament and prepare policies to meet them, all the rhetoric in this House is useless. We must read, study and do something about it. What I want to do today is to outline three or four points that should be in the policy of any Government. I certainly know they will be in the policy of the new Conservative Government after next year.

Let me say at the outset that, unknown to most Members of the House, something has been done in the last two or three years. I refer in particular to the 1981 budget of the present Government. It brought in a whole series of measures in the so-called MacEachen budget that roused this country to furious opposition. It led to the promotion of the Minister to higher places. It led to a complete demoralization of almost every aspect of our industrial set-up. In that uproar we forgot that hidden in all these proposals was one that brought some justice to the mining industry. If I may use general words, it allowed to those who invested in the mining industry, the junior mines, the same right of flow-through of shares that corporations have always had in relation to the oil and gas industry. The former Minister responsible for Mines, now the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola), did make one speech on it and did send out a press release. If I had been a supporter of resources on the Government side, I would have trumpeted that policy all across the country. It has been in effect for over two years and, outside of that one case, I know of no other.

The brokerage firms have not taken advantage of this and have not made it known to their customers. This is where a person can invest in a mining company directly into the Treasury, get a tax deduction for his investment and get the right to shares. When he pays his taxes, he pays them on the basis of the capital gains on the shares that he purchased. This is one good step.

In 1983, the same Government gave recognition to depletion which in effect equalled what you got in oil and gas, and what was available to corporations is now available to individuals. I could add that that research is now available to industry, but I have never seen that in a clear press statement. Maybe I missed it, but I know it is available.

What then are my proposals? First, I go back to the basic beginning of all mining discoveries, the old-fashioned prospector. He still has the track record of being the most successful of any type of operation, including all the high technology and electronic techniques for finding mines. Of all the biologists and the rest of them, he still has the best track record. The prospectors used a canoe or jeep. They now use helicopters.

If the prospector found a successful mine, we have always awarded him by giving him a $50,000 deduction off his five, ten, twenty or thirty years work. With the high cost of helicopters, the risks and one thing and another, we have to improve that deduction. I am not the final authority on what it is worth, but I would certainly suggest between $250,000 and $500,000 for that man who spent years of his life hunting, either on foot or by helicopter, for those things that can only be found by a hands-on operation.

Second, I have divided this investment proposal into several parts: *a*) the flow-through pattern that I have enunciated should apply to any form of mining and any form of energy production. If you think that through, you see that all of a sudden these heavy oils of Alberta and Saskatchewan become economic. All these oil sands projects which are stalled in northern Alberta and which can only be put forward by tremendous sums of money advanced by Governments' would become roughly economic. You are drawing equity in the form of a 100 per cent deduction which is prepared to wait for five, ten or fifteen years for any return. It cuts out the heavy front-end loading charges. We must also consider all the geothermal energy that exists in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and a little bit in Manitoba. All through that whole area that runs from Michigan to almost Hamilton, through the Gaspé area and the Cumberland Basin there are hot water and hot rocks underneath the ground. We have so much fun whenever there is an earthquake or a volcano erupts. They can be making money for us. Let us milk that hot water, harvest it and put it to use.

• (1750)

I would like to suggest, in quantitative figures, that on the basis of the information from scientists in Ottawa who have done a tremendous amount of work on this subject and from information from the oil and gas industry mainly, there is now 360 times more Btu's of energy in the hot water underneath the Prairies than there is in all of the gas we will ever discover. When we realize that we have already located, on a potential basis, some 440 trillion Btu's of gas, we can then multiply that huge figure by 360, which gives us the amount of Btu's available through geothermal energy. The advantage of hot water energy is that it is renewable. You can use it and then send it back down to get reheated again.

In effect, this would mean that we would offer tax incentives not only to oil and gas and to mines, although the people who handle the shares of those mining companies have not told the people about it, but would offer them to all of these other forms of energy including heavy oils, oil sands, geothermal energy, low grade energy, energy from the ground, the air, and particularly from the waste. I do not want to take any more time discussing that last item because it is ten times more powerful than all of the others.

The second proposal under the investment approach is to do something that has become a sickness throughout North America for hundreds of years. The concept of financing that Governments have is that the minute one starts to develop a resource, the Government immediately loads on him all of the charges possible. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that in western

Canada, as in Texas, when one wants to look at a place to explore, the Government charges a huge fee? One must bid simply to get into the poker game. If you went to a poker game where they charged you $50,000 to sit down, Mr. Speaker, you would not join many poker games. That is why only 400 companies, with huge backlogs of financing and self-earned earnings, are able to afford that poker game.

I could go on and list all of the things that have been done in the House over the last 25 years. I shall suggest a policy that I originally proposed in 1957. That proposal was accepted by all of the oil companies, both American and Canadian, in 1961. It was finally accepted in the House of Commons by the present Government in 1976 under the Hon. Judd Buchanan. That proposal is to go back to the commonsense way of financing for these great risk enterprises in which the biggest cost is interest on the money that must be borrowed in order to go forward with these enterprises and to give to these capital intensive enterprises with their high interest load a contractual arrangement that was put forward in the Liberal Government's regulations of 1976. That was accepted by all Parties in the House, but instead of that, we now have the so-called National Energy Program of 1977.

The contractual arrangement that I refer to has been discussed in the House. It has been discussed in committees of the House. The Hon. Don Macdonald, in committee, accepted the proposal. When I asked him what he thought would be a fair break after all of the debts were paid off, he gave me some figures, and I am willing to accept those figures.

The Hon. John Turner, standing up in the House, said that my figures were correct but that, unfortunately, businesses did not operate that way because most of the business in Canada, not in the mining sector but in the oil and gas sector particularly, follow a financial practice that has been copied from the Americans. The Americans have never been able to get rid of that type of financing.

When the great oil play started in the North Sea, the British Government accepted this type of regulation very quickly, as did Norway, Denmark and The Netherlands. Today, with all of the debts paid back, the British Government receives nearly 50 per cent of the gross value of the oil and gas from that field. The companies are well rewarded with about 30 per cent which pays all of their costs. They get all of their money back and they get an amount of money in addition that gives them a 25 per cent profit on all of the money that was invested and has now been returned. As well, Venezuela has copied that system in part.

I suggest that we return to the fundamental way of handling these problems, which is to return to common sense financing. If we look at the costs of the oil industry and the gas industry in western Canada from 1922 until 1957, we see that 75 per cent of those costs were interest payments. I do not have the figures from the last 30 years, but I am sure they would be as high. When one spends 75 per cent of one's costs on interest, one goes broke. This happened to all of our corporations in 1982. If one looks at the figures, approximately 70 per cent of the costs to all big corporations in Canada was interest payments. That is why so many corporations went down the tubes.

Without stressing that point any longer, the final point I make is that we must consider the infrastructure in an isolated mining area. I would simply apply the same rules as are applied to a mining company or an oil and gas company to the infrastructure costs so that the people who live in those areas may share in the investment and the returns as these costs are part of the total costs. The last point I have to make, which I will not discuss, is simply what we must do in the international market.

I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that the House, in this moment of constructive discussion of resource policy, will give honest consideration to moving immediately toward some form of mining tax improvement to put the mining industry back in the position it was in some ten years ago.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I will pursue the matter of whether or not there are questions and answers.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): May I deal now with the adjournment motion. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for York North (Mr. Gamble)—National Security—Expulsion of Soviet embassy official. (b) Staffing of Soviet Embassy; the Hon. Member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain)—Trade—United States potato import hearings—Request for Canadian representation; the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn)—Finance—Capital gains tax amendments. (b) Treatment of stock purchasers. (c) Application of tax to speculators.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—RESOURCE INDUSTRIES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Oberle:

That this House regards the Government's failure to take action to encourage the development of Canada's resource industries and ensure their competitiveness in world markets as a betrayal of all Canadians whose standard of living depends upon the resource sector of Canada's economy and calls upon the

Government to bring an end to the nationalization of Canadian resource industries which has discouraged investment in Canada; introduce tax incentives to restore competitive advantage and stimulate resource production and further processing in Canada; initiate a programme of incentives for research and development, and incentives for marketing activities of Canadian industries.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It being six o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that pursuant to Section 11 of Standing Order 62, proceedings on the motion have expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL SECURITY—EXPULSION OF SOVIET EMBASSY OFFICIAL. (B) STAFFING OF SOVIET EMBASSY

Mr. John Gamble (York North): Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1982, I asked the then Secretary of State for External Affairs whether, in light of the expulsion from Canada of a certain Mikhail Abramov, Soviet diplomat, for unlawfully attempting to obtain high technology materials, it would not then appear appropriate to reduce the size of the Soviet diplomatic mission in Canada and thereby reduce the risk of further spying by the Soviet Union in our country. The Minister's reply was typically evasive and might well have been appropriate for another question. However, it certainly was in no way relevant to the question which I had asked.

Permit me to review the conduct of Soviets in our country in recent years and to tie in the significance of that question which I asked 18 months ago to circumstances as they apply in Canada today. The House will recall that in 1945, at the conclusion of the Second World War, a certain Igor Gouzenko defected to Canada and disclosed the existence of a Soviet espionage ring operated by the Soviet Union in our country, the act of a hardly friendly former ally. In 1978, 13 Soviet diplomats were expelled from our country for spying. In 1980, three staff members of the Soviet embassy were expelled for endeavouring to obtain classified materials. In 1982, Mikhail Abramov, the Soviet agent to whom I referred on April 2, was expelled, and then, more recently, on September 12 of 1983, two further Soviet agents were expelled for endeavouring once again to purchase high technology materials contrary to the laws of our country.

● (1800)

The most recent expulsions in September proved the point which I had endeavoured to make in April of 1982. The Soviets have absolutely nothing to lose in unleashing upon our nation their professional KGB agents to conduct the activities for which they are well trained. There appears to be, certainly in the minds of most reasonable Canadians, a need for some

kind of penalty which could be imposed upon a Government which specifically instructs its agents to break the laws of Canada. In the event that we are serious about curtailing the activities of the Soviet Union, and its agents in spying and conducting espionage activities or otherwise conducting themselves in an illegal fashion, principally endeavouring to obtain information which is otherwise unavailable to them, it is incumbent upon this Government to establish some stringent guidelines which would guide the Soviet Government in the conduct of its affairs and the affairs of its agents while in Canada.

On a number of occasions I have mentioned those specific remedial actions which should be taken. On one occasion I suggested it would be appropriate to advise the Soviet Union that, in the event it persisted in instructing its agents to behave illegally in this country, its staff should be reduced by one half. Its staff, of course, being those who are associated with both its embassy here in Ottawa and its consulate mission in Montreal.

There is little likelihood that my recommendation will be adopted by this Government. The incident in 1978 probably gives rise to the best kind of response which we could expect from the Government of the current Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he said, after being confronted with the knowledge of the activities of the 13 Soviet agents, that their activities would naturally be disturbing to the friendship between our two countries. I should have thought that his reaction, rather than being one of amazement, would have been one of anger, coupled with a dedication to the adoption of policies which would preclude that kind of conduct from occurring again. Yet the statement of the Prime Minister in 1978 was to the effect that he well expected that kind of activity to continue in the future. Of course, he has done nothing to discourage the Soviet Union from conducting illegal activities in our country since that date.

As a result of a question which I placed on the Order Paper, the House now knows that there are 44 Canadian citizens on the embassy staff of our country in Moscow. There are 45 Soviet citizens on the staff of the Soviet embassy in Ottawa and 16 Soviet citizens who work at the consulate in Montreal. Very clearly, as an initial step, Mr. Speaker, the 17 excessive Soviet representatives in this country should be eliminated in terms of establishing some parity between Canadian representation in the Soviet Union and Soviet representation in this country. I would urge the Government, in the interests of precluding the kind of activity which we find reprehensible, to take some steps to reduce the staff of the Soviet embassy in our country as a penalty for future espionage activities in Canada.

● (1805)

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member's question and his subsequent comments tonight are typically extreme. He ignores the fact that the vast amount of daily business between the two countries is profitable and necessary for both sides.

Instead, he zeros in on extreme behaviour and therefore loses a chance to stress those positive things which help to normalize relations between the East and the West.

In the past two years Canada has declared three Soviet officials *personae non gratae* because they were conducting themselves in a manner unacceptable to this country. In April, 1982, on the basis of evidence at its disposal, the Government took the decision to expel one official, Mikhail Abramov. In September, 1983, after assessing the information available very carefully, the Government asked Victor Tselekovskiy to leave Canada and prohibited a second official, Anatolity Solousov, who was out of the country on holiday, from returning. The Government has no wish to comment on the alleged activities of other officials in the Soviet embassy. Of course, we encourage greater Government to Government dialogue through official contact. In that sense, Soviet diplomats are representatives of an important and powerful country and their work is essential. The record clearly shows however, that we have not hesitated to act promptly and resolutely when Canadian security interests are threatened by the conduct of officials who behave in an inappropriate manner.

It would be a mistake to underestimate the disruptive effect on the Soviets of these expulsions. The Government has pointed out strongly to the Soviet embassy that activities such as those for which these three officials were expelled will not be tolerated, nor will we hesitate to take appropriate action to ensure that Canadian interests and security are protected. At the same time we have no intention of interfering with the normal working and commercial activities between the two countries, and we have no intention of interfering with opportunities to open avenues of dialogue between the two countries.

TRADE—UNITED STATES POTATO IMPORT HEARINGS—REQUEST FOR CANADIAN REPRESENTATION

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I have asked questions in this House with respect to the recent ruling of the U.S. Department of Commerce that there should be a duty surcharge imposed on the export of Canadian potatoes to that market. I want to give you some background on the trade between Canada and the U.S., and some figures to back it up. I asked for some documentation on this subject matter from the Library of Parliament, and they gave it to me with respect to tomatoes, onions, carrots, cabbage and many other items. In their closing paragraph they say that Canada's horticultural trade is an important component of Canada's agricultural exports. Horticultural producers can be found in virtually every part of Canada. Canada imports substantially more horticultural products than it exports, primarily from the U.S. Canada also represents a major market for U.S. horticultural products.

Let us take a look at how important our market is to the U.S. Without going into the detail about cabbages, carrots, etc., I want to point out that in Canadian imports of fruit and nuts, the U.S. generates a net balance of trade of $714 million. To broaden that a little further and include vegetables along with the fruit and nuts, again the U.S. generates a trade surplus with Canada of $382 million for a total of well over $1 billion in trade surplus in fruits, nuts and vegetables.

Our trade with the U.S., particularly as it relates to potatoes, is somewhat minuscule on a relative basis. For instance, between the years 1971 and 1981, which is as far as Statistics Canada has prepared these figures, the import of potatoes from the U.S. fluctuated from a low of 7.1 per cent of Canada's consumption in 1971, to a high of 17.2 per cent in 1977.

● (1810)

In the reverse trade, on a relative basis again, we supplied to the United States a low of 0.2 per cent to a high of 1.3 per cent of their requirement for potatoes in 1982. Under those terms and conditions, who is hurting whom? If they supply to Canada up to 17.2 per cent of our requirement and a low of 7.1 per cent while we reach in one year only an export which is equivalent to 1.3 per cent of their requirement, who is damaging whom? Yet on that basis it has been decreed in the rulings to date that there should be a surcharge of duty on potatoes exported to the United States from eastern Canada. This raises an element of very serious concerns if, in a field in which there is over $1 billion of U.S. trade surplus, we begin to find ourselves in difficulty with individual items which constitute that billion. It does not bode very much good for us. I submit that we should have taken a very serious look at the structure at a much earlier stage.

The probable responder tonight is from Ontario. I want to say to that gentleman from Ontario, through you, Mr. Speaker, that every single potato grower east of the most westerly Ontario destination, North Bay, and I think it would be proper to say east of Thunder Bay, will receive a lower price for his product if we do not successfully either fight or negotiate our way out of the surcharge on potatoes. Mr. Speaker, if those potatoes do not leave the country and go down to the natural market on the East Coast, they then must find a market somewhere east of Thunder Bay. That has a very major consequence on the return of potato growers throughout all of eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the market and the price for potatoes is a continental price. I hope that our Government officials will extend that knowledge to the American officials. If the total continental supply, that is those potatoes grown in Canada and the United States, exceeds what is a reasonable consumptive capacity of the consumers of this continent, we will in fact get a low price. This will not only apply along the East Coast and in the so-called northeast region which has applied for surcharge of duty, but in virtually all of the North American continent with a few isolated situations which are protected by geography against transportation costs and therefore against price fluctuations as they relate to supply. Those will only be isolated instances. It is, therefore, very pertinent that the Government of Canada should make the strongest possible representations to the Government of the United States before the final answer from the United States Department of Commerce is passed down on December 19.

• (1815)

In view of the major resources of agricultural organizations, I want to make an appeal now to all Members on the Government side that the Horticulture Council be given the sincerest possible congratulations for the way it has defended Canada's needs in this industry. Those congratulations should be extended to potato organizations and the Governments of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick and there should be a special grant to the Canadian Horticulture Council which has exhausted its reserves and will end up seriously in debt in the protection of trade for Canada as a whole. I believe this should be the responsibility of the federal Treasury from some Department, under the leadership of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan).

I hope that I will not be answered with a prepared text but in a businesslike discussion on the subject matter of the question and the remarks I have made tonight.

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has pointed out that I come from Ontario, and of course he comes from New Brunswick. He could have gone on to say that I am a Member of the Government and he is a Member of the Opposition. Despite those differences, I would like to extend my personal congratulations to him for the concern he has shown over this issue and the activity he has undertaken. He has stated his case well. I understand that he personally has travelled to Washington—

Mr. McCain: Only to Portland.

Mr. Fisher: He has travelled to Portland, he says, and I appreciate the chance now to give him an updated report on the Government's activities.

Ministers have, on a number of occasions, expressed to their American counterparts the Government's concerns about continuing American actions aimed at limiting potato imports from the maritime Provinces and about the consequences for Canada of the current anti-dumping investigation.

The United States Commerce Department issued an affirmative anti-dumping determination of November 4 which cited higher anti-dumping margins than those in the Department's preliminary determination of July 26. The interdepartmental team that has been working on this case for Canada since its conception, met with the Canadian Horticultural Council and with the New Brunswick, and P.E.I. Ministers and Deputy Ministers of Agriculture. We expressed our collective concern over the final anti-dumping determination and agreed that we now need to focus our energies on the injury case.

The Government sent a team comprising officials of the Departments of External Affairs, Agriculture and Finance to the U.S. International Trade Commission's injury hearing in Portland, Maine, on November 18. Indeed, as I mentioned, the Hon. Member himself also attended the hearing. The reports on this important hearing are encouraging. Mr. Ince, our Washington counsel, made a strong and persuasive intervention. The Government remains convinced that a good case will continue to be made that Canadian exports of the type of potato under investigation are not injuring the U.S.A. industry. The U.S. Department of Commerce must make a final determination of injury by December 19. If its decision is negative, the investigation will be terminated.

May I again compliment the Hon. Member for his obvious concern for his constituents and for the industry generally.

FINANCE—CAPITAL GAINS TAX AMENDMENTS. (B) TREATMENT OF STOCK PURCHASERS. (C) APPLICATION OF TAX TO SPECULATORS

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, on October 3 last, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) tabled in the House detailed ways and means motions with respect to the indexed investment security plan. You will recall that I raised this matter in the House on a number of occasions. I was rather disturbed by the text of the ways and means motion which was tabled. That is why I raised the matter in the House with the Minister on October 6.

Briefly, the indexed investment security plan is one in which a person decides to make his stockmarket investment behind a plan administered by his broker. The capital gains tax is only paid on the actual real capital gain, inflation aside. Losses are deductible on a formula in the plan.

It is a detailed ways and means motion that explictly sets out for the House the terms of the proposed change to the Income Tax Act. The problem is that we are not really dealing with investments in the way the ways and means motions sets out the case. We are dealing with such things as stock options. Imagine a put or a call or an option agreement being treated somehow as an investment? On a matter of that nature, there is no investment whatsoever. What a person does is to pay a fee or an option price to take an option on some stock. If the stock goes up in value, a profit is made. If it goes down, there is a put, you can also make a profit. You are speculating on the market.

• (1820)

Until now that has always been deemed as an adventure in the nature of trade. It is a business activity. It has nothing to do with investment at all. Not one nickel goes into the till of the company. Not one nickel is put up to create jobs in Canada. Not one nickel is put up to improve the investment picture, the capital of a corporation in the country. It is merely a method whereby this Government enables those people who are speculators in the market to escape not only income tax on their trading activities, but capital gains tax as well, except to the extent that there is a real gain in terms of a real gain after inflation being taken into account.

It is abominable that under the guise of trying to increase equity investment as set out by the Minister, the Minister should allow this class of activity to be buried under the indexed investment security plan.

If we really wanted to get to the problem of increasing equity investment, what we would do is to get rid of capital gains completely. Capital gains have not turned out to be a great source of federal revenue. In 1979, the total revenue derived by both the Provinces and the federal Government was but $650 million. If you add some indexing and add some possibilities to that, perhaps there is a billion dollars of revenue in it. But the damage to the economy is so much greater that we would be far better off as a nation to get rid of capital gains tax completely. This proposal gets rid of capital gains tax for those people who are able to trade in listed investments on the market. It is a practical matter. They will pay tax on their real gains but they will be able to write off all of their losses. It is only a tax on real gains and then only at capital gains tax rates. Probably, in fact, after it is all washed out, some people will pay tax, a lot of people will have losses, and the net result will be that the Government will not get any revenue. Maybe it is equitable that some should pay and some should not. But the real purpose of an Income Tax Act is to raise revenue. This amendment does not.

You are indicating to me that my time is up, Mr. Speaker, but I want to say that this is no way to increase equity investment in Canada. What we ought to do is to treat all investment as being free of tax, free of capital gains tax. What we ought to do is to put some sizzle into the market. What we ought to do is to encourage people to invest. What we ought to do is to tax those who are just traders. This amendment lets the traders off the hook and puts the ordinary real investor on the hook for an unfair capital gains tax.

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member often rises in this House to attack the existence of capital gains tax. We have had lively debates on this topic in the past. Tonight he has announced a new wrinkle in the theory, namely, that a billion dollars is not significant revenue for the Government. I think that is an important policy statement from the Progressive Conservative Party and it is one that I am sure we will hear more of in the future. But I ask the Hon. Member, what about the people who have to bankroll his taxation theories? What about the people who have to pay for all the guys who get a free ride under his theory? Of course these are the people who have payroll income but no capital gains income. These are the people who work in factories and teach in schools. These are the people who have their own small stores or small businesses which pay them a salary but no real capital gain. The Hon. Member is recommending that these people finance the high rollers he is supposedly attacking.

• (1825)

Turning to the indexed security investment plan, individuals who speculate or deal with shares, options or other properties as a business venture are taxed on the profit generated from their activities at regular business tax rates, not at the lower capital gains rates. Those people pay the full rates. Speculators do not receive the benefits that ISIP offers to "true" investors.

The option trading which the Hon. Member attacked this evening is an integral part of Canadian equity markets. Our position in the ISIP is something which was recommended and supported by the Investment Dealers Association and the Toronto Stock Exchange. ISIP, along with other measures announced in the April 19 budget, are positive steps in encouraging new equity investment in Canadian corporations. I repeat, just in case my colleague across the way does not understand my position on this, that the capital gains tax is a fair tax. It is a productive tax and it is one that treats income equitably for all Canadians. It does not create a special class of income or a special category of people who get a free ride from other taxpayers. The tax policy must treat all income fairly. The capital gains tax is one part of the entire spectrum of tax which avoids unfairness and gives the Government satisfactory revenues.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at eleven o'clock. May I extend best wishes to the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fisher) and the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn); have a good evening.

At 6.28 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 22, 1983

The House met at 11.00 a.m.

• (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I should indicate to the House at this time that the Chair is in a position to arrive at a decision in the choice of the motions on the Order Paper which are now before the House. If Hon. Members wish to make a comment at this time, the Chair is prepared to hear them out.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, could the Chair indicate what it might be disposed to do without argument, because we might save the time of the House by doing that? I am prepared to make argument but it will take some time. Normally we get an indication from the Chair with respect to these matters before calling for submissions.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I think that is a reasonable request. I would also like to hear from the Chair what its predisposition might be without actually making a ruling, because I am equally prepared to argue the point.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Chair should indicate at this time to Hon. Members that it is disposed to call the motion standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis). The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 62, which in essence provides for three supply periods and 25 allotted days during those periods, is an innovation in the rules. The Standing Order provides that those days are available for the moving of motions by the Opposition. In each of the three semesters, not more than two of those motions will have votes attached. In the supply period ending December 10 are five such allotted days. In the spring semester there are seven and in the summer semester there are 13.

• (1110)

I point out the rules provide that these allotted days are intended for the Opposition. While there are two Parties on the Opposition side of the House, there is one Opposition and that is Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, sometimes called since the days of Mackenzie King the Official Opposition. But the right to those allotted days is the right of the Opposition, not the Opposition Parties but the Opposition.

Since the invocation of the Standing Order providing for this supply process, it has been the practice of the Opposition to divide the allotted days in a fair way with the New Democratic Party, with the other Party that sits on this side of the House. In all cases, in arriving at that decision there have been several factors taken into account, but the chief one is that the allotment has been determined on the basis of numerical representation on this side of the House. That criteria would be applied and I have so assured the Hon. Member from Hamilton Mountain in this instance.

The total of 25 allotted days, the global number of allotted days available and provided to Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, the Opposition, the Official Opposition—whatever you want to call it—following the unwritten interpretation on which we have always proceeded as being fair, should be divided by 30 per cent and 60 per cent, or as close thereto as we could come to it. In my view, if you want to look at the rigid and strict interpretation of the Standing Orders, we need not apply any allotted days to the New Democratic Party. The same thing applies to the votes. On some occasions though, having given an allotted day to the NDP, we have withheld a vote until well on into the final supply period.

When we first came back to this interminable session of Parliament we started into the spring semester where there were still some allotted days that had not been allotted in the supply period that had to be disposed of. I take it from where the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain comes that by using a calendar year he may be advancing the argument to you, Mr. Speaker, as he has to me, that in this calendar year we have not yet reached that one-third position. If you take the calendar year he is, of course, correct. But if you take the supply cycle which commenced when we returned, then he is not correct.

I have examined the history of the allotted days, commencing with the period ending December 10, 1980, through to the period ending June 30, 1983. Of course, in this semester we are in now, this will be the fourth allotted day. In the event that this historical work has not been done for you, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to make this examination available for your perusal. In all cases Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, the Official Opposition, has allotted days to the New Democratic Party in keeping with that fair approach over the period from February, 1980, which was the hangover period, through to June 30.

● (1115)

I submit that the Chair should not instruct the Official Opposition on how it must deal with the division of the allotted days to which the Official Opposition is entitled during supply periods. I suggest to the Chair that the discretion of the number and the discretion of the timing are discretion lying within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Official Opposition in the House.

The Chair is confronted with not only two but three motions on the Order Paper with respect to allotted days. One is in the name of the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty). I will cite them in chronological order with respect to the time they were accepted for filing by the Chair. As I said, the first is in the name of the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe, the second is in the name of the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands and the third, which was tabled yesterday, is in the name of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap. As I understand it, after having failed to obtain unanimous consent to put the motion yesterday, it was then filed with the Table. In any event, the motion was filed subsequent to the motion filed by myself on behalf of the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands.

There are some numbers which should be taken into account in exercising your discretion, Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 62(4)(c). Based on the fact that New Democratic Party Members in the House constitute approximately 23 per cent of the Opposition, according to practice they would be entitled, in our view, to roughly six of the 25 Opposition days in any given year. We agree with the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain that this would be their normal entitlement. However, he is wrong in the manner in which he has chosen to calculate these days. He will be making his own argument in that respect, as he has in a letter to me which requested the allotment of one of these five days. The letter was delivered to me by hand after I had already filed the motion of the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands.

I want to emphasize that the first supply period in this session was an extended period ending December 10, 1980. Therefore, the calculation of the annual allotment of supply days should begin in the fall trimester; that is when it should begin, not on January 1. On this basis it can be seen that last year Members of the NDP received six Opposition days out of a total of 25, which is their fair allotment.

We are now about to commence the fourth day in the fall trimester, the first trimester of supply for the purpose of our calculations. Although the first four supply days have been taken by the Official Opposition, there is no obstacle which prevents the NDP from receiving a share of the remaining 21 days, accepting my submission that we start in the fall trimester. I have indicated to the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain that we are prepared to give those days to the New Democratic Party, as we always have in the past. Indeed, just before coming in here I gave him that undertaking. However, this is done at the initiative of the Official Opposition, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, or the Opposition, however you want to call it.

● (1120)

If we operate on any other principle, there not being any specific divisions set forth in the Standing Orders, then what we would be doing would be negating the idea that there is an Official Opposition in this House with some exclusive rights by virtue of being that Opposition. What we would do if we depart from the practice of allowing that discretion to remain with the Opposition would be to give a minority Party in the House the right to decide at any time when it will elect to have an allotted day.

I might point out that while there are three motions on the Order Paper attempting to use the fourth allotted day, the NDP, in making the submission that they are now entitled to have their motion considered before two others filed in priority, are making a presumption with respect to the disposition of the final day in this trimester. That argument happens to be academic, because not even the Chair knows what disposition is going to be made with respect to that day coming up on November 28.

Mr. Malone: Nor does the House Leader.

Mr. Nielsen: Nor does the House Leader at the moment, as my colleague points out. There is nothing in our Standing Orders that requires the Opposition—and I submit that the majority on this side are the Official Opposition—to make any division.

Second, we have functioned in the past on the basis of fairness but without any requirement technically in the Standing Orders to divide those Opposition days on the basis of numerical representation in the House. We have done that on a global basis. We have allotted a little less than one-third out of the 25, not out of the five in the fall trimester, the seven in the spring trimester and the 13 in the final trimester. We have not approached it that way. In the past we have operated on the basis of the 25 days being divided. Nor is there any obligation, with respect to the two votes in each of those semesters, as to when those votes are going to be allotted.

The strongest argument I make to you, Mr. Speaker, is the right of the Official Opposition to exercise that discretion. It has not been abused in the past. Even though there is no technical requirement for allotting any days, we have been fair throughout. Even the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain will agree with that. They have never been dealt short on a fair division of the days, but that discretion rests with us and, with great respect, with no one else.

● (1125)

Even if that argument does not find favour with the Chair, there is the argument that if any discretion is to be exercised under Standing Order 62(4)(c), then that discretion should be exercised on the basis of the time of filing of the motion. There are two motions that were received by the Table prior to the motion of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, the one filed by the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe which we prefer not to have called today, and the one filed by myself on behalf of the Hon. Member for Kingston and the

Islands. I did not note the time that it reached the Table, but it did reach the Table, I believe, prior to the commencement of yesterday's debate. Perhaps I am a few minutes out on that one way or the other, but it certainly reached the Table before the motion of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap.

On that basis, Sir, with great respect, I suggest to the Chair that it allow the practice to continue whereby the Official Opposition has the discretion to determine when the New Democratic Party will obtain its allotted days of the total of 25, having operated on the basis of the semesters as they come up rather than on a calendar year. We are following practices that have not been abused in the past. I can assure you, Sir, that as long as I have any power to make recommendations for my caucus with respect to the allotment of those days, that practice will not suffer any abuse in the future. I can assure you, Sir, that the New Democratic Party will, as it has in the past, obtain its full allotment both of days of a total of 25 and of votes.

I would strongly suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you exercise your discretion in favour of calling the motion of the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands even if it is only on the basis of its having been filed in priority.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I ask only for fairness and I concede that we have had no reason to complain up until now. In fact, I can recall at least one occasion and perhaps two occasions where, at the request of the Official Opposition and in order to facilitate its own particular requirements of the time, we took an Opposition day. I can recall that on two occasions there were other events occurring outside of the House that Hon. Members of the Official Opposition were desirous of attending. On those occasions we accepted the day although, quite frankly, it would not have been a day of our choosing if we had had any choice at all.

I would like to deal with some of the arguments raised by the Hon. Member. To begin with, if one were to accept the argument put forward by the Hon. House Leader of the Official Opposition that the time of filing should be a predetermining factor, then of course we could today file half a dozen motions that would then sit on the Notice Paper throughout the entire period of supply. That would give our motions priority if one were to accept that argument. Of course, that argument cannot be accepted. The time of filing does in no way interfere with the right of the Speaker to determine the business to be called at this point in time.

I put to you, Mr. Speaker, that contrary to what has been said by the Hon. House Leader for the Official Opposition, it is not solely the responsibility of the Official Opposition to determine which Party will in fact be allocated the day for the purpose of supply debate. Quite clearly, the Standing Orders give that right to the Chair in cases of doubt and in cases of dispute. It is therefore incumbent upon the Chair to make a decision in circumstances such as these and is not incumbent upon the Official Opposition to dictate to anyone how that decision ought to be made.

• (1130)

I am operating on the basis of the provisional Standing Orders which are in place for a calendar year. If so, I can only assume that one must argue about the right of individuals to be recognized, the right of certain processes to be followed, within the calendar year. There will be a new calendar year starting in January next, hopefully with the continuation of the provisional Standing Orders, and we would anticipate that we would get our share of the allotted days during the calendar year 1984.

One argument made by the House Leader of the Official Opposition is that the Chair does not know who will be granted the fifth allotted day. As the House Leader for the Official Opposition would no doubt affirm, I want to make it clear that I raised that matter with him before we filed the motion. I raised it last week, in fact, and asked whether or not we would be receiving one of the three days designated by the Government House Leader. The response was an unequivocal no. I then assumed, I think quite rightly so, that it was the intention of the Official Opposition to utilize each of those days for their own use. That would mean that out of the five allotted days during this period, we would not receive any. Not only would we not get a voting day, which I am not going to argue about at the moment, but we would not even get a day at all.

I waited to see whether the Official Opposition had in fact filed the motions, which they did to take up each of the days, before I filed on behalf of my colleague, the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap. I was hoping that perhaps as a result of communications I sent to the Official Opposition House Leader, they would see the fairness of giving us one of the five days. I say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the five days would be less than one might reasonably expect given the numerical breakdown of the Opposition, but we understand that you can only break it down according to an even division. You cannot get part of a day. So we are prepared to accept less than what we expect we might be entitled to as a result of the numerical breakdown in the Opposition.

If, however, we were not given the day today, it would mean, since we now know the Official Opposition intends to take the final day also for themselves, that out of the 25 days in this calendar year we would have received five. That is clearly less than we would be entitled to and it would mean we would be denied the opportunity of putting forward a motion which we frankly feel is of some considerable importance.

On the basis of fairness, we are asking for no more than we should reasonably expect to get. Having waited, hoping the Official Opposition might change its mind, I think we dealt with it in a reasonable way. We waited until the motions were clearly there for both days before we decided to file, in the hope that maybe the Official Opposition might change its mind.

I would argue very strongly that it would be a bad precedent for the Speaker to determine that the Chair has no jurisdiction in determining which of the two Opposition motions—three in this case but two that we are arguing over—should be be

called for debate today. The Chair would be derelict in its duty if it accepted the argument of the Official Opposition House Leader that, by virtue of being the Official Opposition, they and they alone should have the jurisdiction and discretion.

Quite clearly, the Standing Orders, and I need not cite them now, give the Chair the obligation of making such a decision. Nowhere in the Standing Orders or in Beauchesne or anywhere else that I can find is there any reference to there being some discretion to be exercised solely by the Official Opposition in the determination of the allocation of Opposition days. The only reference to allotted days is in the following way, where it is said that although technically the business under discussion is Government business, motions given precedence on these allotted days may be moved only by Members in opposition to the Government. It makes no reference to whether they sit in the Official Opposition or whether they sit, as my colleagues do, in a third Party in the House of Commons.

I concede that we have not been shortchanged over the course of the last two or three years, but I appeal to the Official Opposition House Leader to consider in the interests of fairness that we would be receiving considerably less during this calendar year than we would be entitled to. That is no guarantee we would be given an appropriate number, although the House Leader says that he will make every effort to persuade his colleagues that we should. We are not asking for more than we would reasonably be entitled to, given the numbers in the House as broken down by the Parties represented here. We are not asking for a voting day, although we might feel it would have been appropriate to have allocated one for this Party during this particular point in time. By granting the day to the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap's motion, we would be receiving what would be fair during this period consistent with what has gone on in the past.

I would ask that the Chair continue with the preliminary ruling the Chair has given, recognizing that allotted days are not only for the Official Opposition. The decision we are asking for is not in any way an attempt by us to abuse the Standing Orders. Though we may in fact be a minority in the House of Commons, we are surely entitled as Members of the Opposition to receive consideration on matters such as this. I point out that it is not precedent-setting. Quite clearly, the Standing Orders give the Chair the discretion to allow for a matter such as this to be resolved by the Chair. I ask the Chair to uphold the preliminary ruling the Chair indicated it was about to make, and give the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap the opportunity to discuss during this important session a question of vital importance to many people in western Canada, in fact many people across the country.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I have called for and now obtained precise times for filing which I think should be taken into account in your consideration in this matter. There is something I am going to have to raise on another occasion with respect to the parliamentary documents here, parliamentary publications. The Order Paper lists all three motions which have been filed, one in the name of the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe, one in the name of the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands and one in the name of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, in that order. While I realize that the Projected Order of Business is not an official parliamentary publication, nonetheless we find only two of them listed. The first one under No. 112 is the motion filed under the name of the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands, and No. 113—and I point that order out to you, Mr. Speaker—in the name of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap. Our motion, the one in the name of the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands, Mr. Speaker, was filed at 2.50 yesterday afternoon and was witnessed by the deputy principal clerk of *Journals*. So clearly that has priority.

• (1140)

I would point out, Sir, that we are embarking on pretty dangerous ground when the Chair, if it does, exercises discretion under Standing Order 62(4)(c)—and I say this with great respect—in ordering, really, what are the internal affairs of one side of this House. I might also point out to my hon. friend, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, that last year his Party received two voting days, which is 33 per cent of the voting day entitlement, notwithstanding the fact that his Party by numbers is entitled to only 25 per cent. One-quarter is the entitlement.

On the basis of that timing, Mr. Speaker, since the motion of the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands had been filed at 2.50 p.m. yesterday, well before the motion of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, plus the fact that the Projected Order of Business lists it as No. 112 as opposed to listing the motion of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap as No. 113—obviously, the Table gave it priority—plus the fact that on the Order Paper our motion appears as No. 2, whereas the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap's motion appears as No. 3, once again, I would strongly suggest that the Chair allow the Opposition to proceed with the motion of the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands.

Mr. Deans: Briefly, Mr. Speaker, and dealing only with the point the Hon. Member has raised, I cannot for the life of me understand how the argument can be made both ways. You cannot on the one hand claim that he or she who files first should be given precedence, while at the same time claim that the Official Opposition has the right to decide. You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. Nielsen: It is not both ways.

Mr. Deans: It would seem to me that if the Chair were to take the position that the person who files first will receive priority, then we could quite legitimately file at the beginning of each period in advance of the Official Opposition and keep them from getting any precedence. That would be ridiculous.

Miss MacDonald: That sounds like you.

Mr. Deans: The Official Opposition likewise could file and make the argument that, since it filed first, it was entitled therefore to have all of the days. I do not see how anyone can make that kind of argument. The reason the Official Opposi-

tion was able to file first was that we were not prepared to file until we were sure that it did not have in mind to give us one of the two days.

Mr. Nielsen: Nonsense!

Mr. Deans: We were awaiting some indication that perhaps the Official Opposition would change its mind and that we would be able to have one of the days. We had to wait until we were sure that both today and Monday next were going to be taken up by the Official Opposition, that it had that intent. Otherwise, the House Leader for the Official Opposition could then legitimately claim that we had no knowledge of what was going to happen on the subsequent day of Monday next, and we therefore were moving without justification to ask for something which those Members themselves might otherwise be prepared to see us have. Therefore, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the time of filing is irrelevant.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): There being no further comments, I will now proceed with my ruling on the matter.

I should point out initially though that the Chair is again faced with a situation whereby Hon. Members—if I may put it in these terms—agree to disagree among themselves. As the Hon. Member for Yukon so rightly pointed out, it is not for the Chair to meddle in those affairs, and the Chair respects that entirely. However, there are three motions standing on the Order Paper under today's supply proceedings; two motions are sponsored by Hon. Members of the Official Opposition and one motion is sponsored by the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap.

The Chair finds itself in the unenviable position of having to exercise its power of selection under Standing Order 62(4)(c). However, the Standing Order places a clear duty on the Chair to make a choice under such circumstances. It is a clear duty imposed on the Chair by the Standing Orders. The Standing Order is very clear and explicit about the Speaker's power of selection in this situation, and I will read Standing Order 62(4)(c):

> When notice has been given of two or more motions by Members in opposition to the government for consideration on an allotted day, the Speaker shall have power to select which of the proposed motions shall have precedence in that sitting.

I draw the attention of the Hon. Members to the words "by Members in opposition". The Chair is clearly in the presence of a situation where Parties disagree among themselves. The argument that the Chair should take into account the time of filing may be an argument which the Chair certainly would want to look at, and has looked at, but it does not appear to be the paramount factor in the case this morning. Past practice indicates that Parties in opposition to the Government, other than the Official Opposition, have received their share of allotted days in any supply period. Since this is the fourth day of a five-day period, and taking into account that three of the days have been used by Hon. Members of the Official Opposition, it is my intention to put to the House the motion standing in the name of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap.

This ruling is consistent with the duty of the Chair to give special attention to the protection of minorities. Should debate terminate before the ordinary hour of adjournment later today, this does not prevent the House from moving on to one of the other motions now standing on the Order Paper.

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—FORESTRY

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap) moved:

> That the Government respond to the emergency in the forestry sector by:
>
> 1. creating a new Forestry Ministry with the mandate to advance the Canadian forestry industry; and
>
> 2. convening a conference at the earliest opportunity of responsible Federal and Provincial Ministers to address the challenges presently facing the forestry sector,

He said: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that, apart from the very eloquent argument put forward by my House Leader, the reason that we in the New Democratic Party felt it was so important—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Hon. Member was recognized to make remarks on the motion now before the House. I do not believe he should reflect in any way upon arguments advanced previous to the ruling, or the ruling itself.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those comments. I would like to say that we were very anxious to have this motion before the House today for three substantive reasons. One reason, of course, is that we are talking about such a major industry in our country, a major industry which certainly deserves more attention than it has received in the past.

Just to take a moment or two to present in some context the importance of the forest industry, I would like to remind Hon. Members that it is an industry which results in a $23 billion income to this country on an annual basis. In terms of our balance of payments, it plays a more significant role than all of the exports from mining, combined with all the exports from agriculture, combined with all the exports from fishing, and then combined, Mr. Speaker, with all the exports from the automobile industry. That is some idea of the size of the exports from the forest industry of this fine country.

It is an immense industry, Mr. Speaker, which employs somewhere in the neighbourhood of 5,000 different companies from one end of Canada to the other. It employs 300,000 Canadians directly in the forest industry and at least a million other Canadians in related industries which service the forest industry in one form or another. It is an incredible sector of our economy.

● (1150)

As well as the forest industry itself, which includes the sawmills, logging operations, pulp and paper mills, plywood mills, shingle mills, shake mills and other aspects of the forest industry that are directly related, one must not lose sight of the fact that we are talking about forests today and the importance of Canadian forests. We have to remind ourselves

that we are also talking about the tourist industry, recreation industry, hospitality industry, and indirectly the fisheries industry, and of course the very important area of wildlife preservation. We are not only talking about the forest industry in the traditional sense, but of an industry that touches the lives of every single Canadian in one form or another. It is an industry that stretches through every Province in this country and is involved in every territory. It is of immense proportions.

The reason we wanted to get this topic before the House today, in light of its immensity, is that the Minister responsible for forestry, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Caccia), is going before his Cabinet colleagues this week asking for additional funds. He has promised the Canadian Forestry Service the sum of $130 million to assist in federal-provincial agreements for this year. We all recognize that that is an inadequate amount of money, but nevertheless it is an increase. We want to highlight the importance of this industry. We want to give the Minister of the Environment responsible for the Canadian Forestry Service every encouragement to go into that Cabinet meeting and to fight for these additional funds.

Perhaps the most important reason that we have decided that this topic ought to take precedence in the House today is the fact that the only other day in the past 600 days that this House has sat when forestry was on the Order Paper for discussion was May 30, 1983. We have set aside only one day out of the last 600 days in this House to discuss Canada's number one industry. If it was just to discuss an industry that was healthy and wealthy and going well, that would be one thing. But this is an industry that has dire problems today. It is experiencing serious difficulty and challenges. These challenges are something that we cannot wait around to address a year from now, a decade from now, or later on in the century. These are problems that must be addressed today virtually in an emergency situation.

Individuals who are knowledgeable of the forest industry, and I suspect the Minister himself, who is a professional forester, and any individual who is involved directly in the forest industry, whether that person is a faller, a scaler, an employee in a logging camp, a sawmill or pulp and paper mill, will know full well that this industry is in serious trouble today. There is no getting away from that fact, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to take a moment or two to support the statement that this industry is in serious difficulty today. The other day Kenneth Greaves, the president of the Ontario Forest Industries Association, said that we must quadruple our investments in this industry if it is to survive and meet the challenges of the nineties. The country of Sweden is one of the most progressive nations when it comes to dealing with the forest industry. While we struggle to set aside two or three hundred million dollars a year for reforestation and research and development, Sweden is prepared to set aside a billion dollars a year to support and husband that industry.

The Swedes have provided us with a lesson that we certainly must follow to get away from the mining of our forests. We must take this industry much more seriously. Sweden is a major competitor in world markets and at the moment is generally outdoing us on the world markets. In the years to come there is certainly no question that the country of Sweden and a number of our other major competitors will be marching past us in terms of lumber and newsprint sales. This is something, Mr. Speaker, that we must work against and address immediately.

Jack Walters, the director of the U.B.C. forestry research centre in British Columbia, has said that our forests are in an absolute shambles, that it is a tragedy of the first dimension. He is a professional forester who understands the seriousness of the problem only too well. Michael Innis is a spokesman for the largest producer of newsprint in the world, Abitibi-Price. Mr. Innis has said that Canada is gradually running out of wood.

Mr. Speaker, the short and long of this is that we are harvesting more trees than we are replanting. If we were farmers talking about the future of agriculture and we saw that 75 per cent of the topsoil was simply disappearing each year, the farming sector, the agricultural sector, the food sector would become alarmed. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is happening today. The topsoil of our forest industry is being blown away and we are not doing a thing about it. As a matter of fact, some Provinces, like that illustrious Province of British Columbia, are cutting back on the number of seedlings that they are putting into the ground annually. Specifically, Canada harvests 800,000 hectares of forest land annually. We replant 25 per cent of that land. Natural planting occurs and lifts it up to something in the neighborhood of 40 per cent. That leaves a shortfall of somewhere between 50 and 70 per cent of the land harvested annually in this country not being replanted. If that is not forest suicide, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is.

The figures put before us by every single organization involved with the forest industry tell us that we are running out of merchantable timber in this country. Considering the importance of this industry, it is something that we should indeed become alarmed about. That is why this motion urges the Minister of the Environment responsible for the Canadian Forestry Service and for forestry to call together his provincial colleagues in a working conference to deal with the challenges that face this industry, not only in reforestation, sylviculture, fire protection, disease prevention, marketing problems, but all of these combined. We have got to sit down and address the situation. Recognizing that this industry cuts across every Province and territory, I believe it is up to the federal Government to provide leadership in this respect. That is why this motion is calling upon the Minister to stand up and join together with his provincial colleagues and provide the necessary leadership that this industry so sorely needs at this point.

The Science Council of Canada just recently presented a magnificent report for Members of Parliament and others. The report says that we are destroying or wasting, on an annual basis, 6,000 square miles of forest land. I would like to talk about the encroachment of subdivisions, the movement of farms into some of the forested areas, the flooding of valleys,

the unleashed disease and pests that are invading our forests, hydro right of ways and road building.

The head of the IWA of British Columbia makes no bones about it when he says that we are running out of timber in this Province. We are at a crossroads with the industry. Mr. Speaker, the other day it was brought to our attention by a number of the lobby groups in the forest industry that now the furniture industries of Ontario and Quebec have to import maple logs from the United States. It is absolutely unbelievable that our wooden furniture industry must now import logs because of the casual approach that we take to our forest industry. I hope the Minister responsible will respond to this particular point made by the professional foresters. The information that has been provided to us by the Association of British Columbia Professional Foresters suggests that:

● (1200)

The number of person years available to research in the Canadian Forestry Service has declined by more than 50 per cent since 1968. This has occurred during a period of higher demands for more information and new technology to be applied to the forest industry. Increased research is required in almost all phases of forests and forest management.

At a time when we should be doing more research in this very critical industry in order to remain in a competitive position with competing nations around the world, what is the Canadian Forestry Service doing? It is cutting back the amount of funds provided for research in this largest Canadian industry. I suggest that the saddest comment on this issue is provided again by the British Columbia Professional Foresters. Our current spending on silviculture by all parties, including federal and provincial Governments as well as the private sector, amounts to approximately $240 million a year. This is less than 1 per cent of the total value of the annual forest production in Canada. Less than 1 per cent is being invested in silviculture. Again, this is something which competing countries such as Sweden consider to be a mindless position for governments and industry to take.

The figure which makes us acutely aware of the seriousness of the problem is the amount of money that we set aside for the Canadian Forestry Service. This past year it was $70 million. In the same ministry and by the same Minister, $146 million was budgeted for the Atmospheric Environment Service and $275 million for Parks Canada. While one does not have anything of a disparaging nature to say about money being spent on climate and weather monitoring and Parks Canada, I do say that it is nothing short of a national disgrace that the federal Government spends twice as much money monitoring weather as it spends on our forest industry. I suggest therein lies the crux of the problem in terms of lack of financial support that this Government is presently giving to this critical industry.

One could go on and on outlining the serious problem facing Canada's number one industry. The other day Members of the House found out, much to their disappointment, that the assistant deputy minister responsible for the Canadian Forestry Service has left the employ of the federal Government after working for it for a number of years. One can only speculate why he left but this was a person who was attempting to do a great deal to heighten the role of the Canadian Forestry Service in this country.

The federal Cabinet had promised, a year and a half ago, that it would set aside at least $130 million for this year and on an annual basis. That was 18 months ago. I suspect that this individual was waiting month after month for that money, having been given that commitment, only to find no money of any substantive nature coming to that critical department. I suspect that that individual simply gave up in disgust. He could not stand before his professional colleagues in the country and say that he is responsible for the Canadian Forestry Service as assistant deputy minister responsible for the major resource sector of our economy and the major exporter in our economy but was unable to get the funds that were promised to him. How could such a person who was a legitimate professional, knowledgeable about the state of the forest industry in this country and knowing what was happening to it, with the compassion and commitment of a professional forester, stand idly by and watch the demise and decay of our forests, based on the lack of interest and negative attitude presented by the Government? That is why we are asking the Minister to bring his colleagues together?

We are also asking the Minister to lift up the role and importance of the forest industry in the Government's eyes. After all, we are talking about the major industry in this country which employs the equivalent of the entire population of greater Vancouver, 1.3 million people. But to what is the industry relegated? Do we even have a minister of state responsible for this area? Is there a deputy minister? There certainly is no minister. There is an assistant deputy minister in the Department of the Environment, which is really an agency. The federal Government is clearly overlooking a role that it should be taking up.

I appreciate the fact that forestry is a provincial responsibility. However, there is also provincial responsibility in other areas for which there are federal Ministers responsible. I do not pretend that creating a Ministry of Forestry will solve the problem overnight. I will not even suggest that creating a Ministry of Forestry at the federal level will provide most of the answers. But it will send a very clear message to the industry that the Government is serious about forestry and is committed to the forest industry in terms of providing an appropriate infrastructure and financial support system to it.

It is quite clear how the forest industry feels about the role that the federal Government is providing. I do not want to suggest for a moment that I am necessarily casting any dispersions or negative comments on the role being played by the Minister because I think most Members understand that we are dealing with a situation where most Members of the House and the Cabinet come from urban areas. They have been raised in the urban tradition and perhaps they lack some appreciation for the forest industry, which tends to be rural by definition.

In closing, I suggest that the federal Government must provide a federal department, as called for by the Science

Council of Canada, to provide leadership in research in such areas as basic research, forest production and, most importantly, to ensure that adequate forest protection research is conducted. As well, the Government should work for additional federal-provincial research agreements. I believe the Minister told us the other day that there are federal-provincial agreements in place with only two or three Provinces. There is some difficulty with the major producing Provinces and that certainly must be overcome. As well, the Science Council of Canada calls on the Government to stimulate investment in research, provide priorities and co-ordinate research opportunities, to develop more support for forestry schools and also to provide more long-term funding for university research.

I urge the Minister to give serious attention to our call today for the creation of a Minister of Forestry and to consider a meeting of Ministers responsible for forests as early as possible.

Mr. Halliday: Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to accept and commend the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) for his ideals and goals with respect to the forest industry. In his remarks he mentioned Sweden several times and compared us to that country.

Would the Hon. Member indicate to the House whether he would prefer to see Canadians go the route of higher taxation in order to achieve this billion dollar input into the forest industry, which he laments we are not doing, or would he prefer to see us go the route which Sweden is increasingly taking, which is asking their people to become more involved in their own social programs by increasing their contributions as individuals to their social programs?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to respond to that question because it is a critical one. How do we involve people in the forest industry in a more meaningful way? I will respond by making two points very quickly.

First, we will not become a competitive country in the forest industry until we involve all employees in a meaningful way in the forest industry. To a large extent, we are still of the neanderthal viewpoint that there are bosses and there are workers in the forest industry. Our competing countries no longer possess that attitude. Until we democratize the workplace and involve all employees in a meaningful way in the production of our forest products, we will not develop to our maximum in terms of competitiveness and productivity.

• (1210)

A first step in the right direction that we could learn from our colleagues south of the line in the United States of America is profit sharing involving all employees, not just senior executives. This would be a major step toward real democratization of the workplace.

Mr. Thacker: Mr. Speaker, I have a follow-up question to my friend from Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis). It seems to me there have been some very major efforts to democratize the work force but they have for the most part been resisted by the leadership of the Canadian Labour Congress. Would the Hon. Member be prepared to agree that there is a need for a change of attitude at the highest leadership level in the Canadian Labour Congress on this labour-management democratization?

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to that question. I am not aware of any leader of any of the labour unions of this country that has not advocated such a position. I have yet to see a single incident—and I watch this very closely—when management has made a genuine offer of involvement that was not taken up by the employees. I have yet to see a single incident when such an officer was turned down.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Are there any further questions or comments? The Hon. Minister for the Environment.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity for this debate. It will be difficult to say things very novel in view of the debate that took place yesterday, but I will try. I also express the hope that a debate of this kind will take place in the respective provincial legislatures across Canada.

I was pleased to notice that the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) did recognize that there is in the matter of forestry a very heavy and important burden to be carried on by provincial jurisdictions. Perhaps I might also be so bold as to express the hope that a debate of this kind will also take place by boards of directors in the forest industries that have benefited so far. If things are done properly in the future we will continue to benefit if this industry and resource is managed properly. It seems to me, however, that the Hon. Member is engaging in a doubtful exercise of mixing figures when he begins to compare a federal responsibility like the weather services with expenditures made in forestry, which is a joint responsibility. I would urge him not to do that.

The Hon. Member also seems to overlook the fact—and I wish he were more *au courant* as to what is happening—that we do have a number of agreements in place in addition to the ones with Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. These are agreements made jointly, federally and provincially, under DREE some years ago which have resulted in a contribution by the federal Government to the Provinces in the neighbourhood of some $80 million or $82 million a year.

I am looking for a moment at the motion before us today. The Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap makes two propositions. One is the creation of a new ministry. Long speeches could be made on this subject. If the creation of a new ministry will result in the planting of one more tree, I would be quite positive to that kind of proposal. But it seems to me today that, given a golden opportunity to do so, the Hon. Member from Kamloops-Shuswap failed to make a good case for the creation of a new ministry. He really did. I did not hear in his remarks any substantiating evidence that by creating a new ministry our country would benefit through the planting

of trees in large numbers and better forest management. The Canadian Forestry Service is there to perform that service all the time. Its ability to perform that task has been enhanced in recent years, as I will try to demonstrate in a moment.

The second part of the motion deals with the convening of a conference at the earliest opportunity of federal and provincial responsible Ministers. Here again, I would like to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to the attention of the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap—because he does not seem to realize it—that a conference of this nature took place on September 14, 1983, in Winnipeg. I could even put on record the agenda of that meeting where we discussed the forest sector strategy in Canada. That was a big item in Winnipeg in September. We discussed employment in forestry, pest control, water bombers, softwood lumber contravening duties, fire research, the Canadian Institute of Forestry resolutions and even the restructuring of CCREM. Finally, we discussed the launching, which was itself an important development in joint federal-provincial ventures, and creation of the Canadian Interagency Forest Fire Centre. Therefore, if I look at the motion and at the reality, I must reject the motion put forward by the Hon. Member.

In addition, two years ago, as you will recall, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced a significant reorganization to more closely realign policies and programs for economic development, keeping in mind the needs of major economic sectors including the forest sector. Under this reorganization the responsibility for negotiation and management of federal-provincial forestry agreements was transferred to the Canadian Forestry Service in the Department of the Environment from the Ministry of Regional and Economic Expansion. This decision of two years ago, I am sure the Hon. Member would know, was followed by a period of consolidation which is still continuing. We are still, therefore, in the process of consolidating after having hired some 100 new people and started negotiations toward new agreements in the light of those expiring in the future. We have also expanded and reinforced our regional offices to perform that duty. As I pointed out yesterday in this House, you may recall, Mr. Speaker, this Government has responded and continues to respond to the challenges facing the forest sector.

As a first step we felt it necessary to establish a national system for the collection, analysis and dissemination of forestry data in furtherance of intensive forest management policies, planning and programs. This work is being conducted as a component of the Petawawa National Forest Institute. The financial resources approved for this program for the period 1981-1982 to 1983-1984 total some $5.7 million. It enabled us to produce the 1981 Canada forest inventory.

We have committed ourselves to enter into agreements with each of the Provinces in support of programs to meet the reforestation needs of the forest sector in Canada as a subsequent step. As I mentioned yesterday, two agreements have been signed, one with Nova Scotia worth $30 million in federal funds over five years, and another one with the Province of Prince Edward Island, which was signed in July of this year for a period of five years in the amount of $15 million in federal funds. Then we have provided an additional $16 million to enhance the agreement with Newfoundland.

● (1220)

Also we have prepared a private woodlot development policy which provides the basis for private woodlot programs in federal-provincial forest agreements. This was consequent upon the urging of several Hon. Members on our side particularly those from New Brunswick. Given the high unemployment in the forestry sector, last year we began a job-creation program by using Section 38 of the Unemployment Insurance Act. The Canadian Forestry Service provided some $34 million to top up the benefits of UIC recipients which under the program delivered some $140 million. It has provided some 14,000 jobs, representing a quarter of a million weeks of employment in the particular area of forest renewal.

I would like to stress that this program was particularly successful in British Columbia. Unfortunately, in June of this year that Province decided to curtail its involvement in the program, sharply reducing its effectiveness. In terms of forestry research and development, we have supported Forintek and we have approved the research and development component of this strategy. We have provided $5.5 million to the Canadian Forestry Service for research and development in the current fiscal year. Also we have already committed funds for the expansion and upgrading of Canadian Forestry Service research labs across the country.

The House may recall that yesterday I made reference to the Pacific Forestry Research Centre which received $14 million; to the Great Lakes Forestry Research Centre, where some $13 million was allocated; to the Laurentian Forestry Research Centre, where $10.5 million was allocated; and to the new Maritime Forestry Research Centre, where some $22.5 million was made available. In addition, some $17 million has been provided for the expansion of pulp and paper research facilities in Victoria and Pointe Claire. We have provided some $10 million to the Maritime Forest Ranger School as part of the forestry complex in Fredericton.

When it comes to human resources, we have anticipated well what might happen in requirements in this field and have made available and provided over $15 million to expand the pool of professional forestry manpower. This money will provide for forestry scholarships, contract research and development, and summer student employment for some 300 students per year. Most of this money will go to Canadian universities, particularly to the six forestry schools across the country—the University of British Columbia, the University of Alberta, Lakehead University, the University of Toronto, l'université de Laval, and the University of New Brunswick.

Another area of increased activity has been in the field of international trade. We have developed a reasonably successful program of overseas market development of British Columbia forest products under the agreement between the federal Government, the Province and the British Columbia Council of Forest Industries. This program is expected to be expanded to

other Provinces, and negotiations are under way by my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Lumley).

I could recite other elements which have been triggered in supporting and giving momentum to an approach which is so badly needed. The upgrading of the Canadian Forestry Service to the assistant deputy minister level, together with the transfer of responsibility for forestry agreements to the Department of the Environment, have helped to increase the focus and importance attached to the forestry sector within the federal Government. We must now allow the time and the opportunity for forestry initiatives to be further advanced without another organizational disruption.

The figures I mentioned earlier, whether they are taken in block form over a period of years or whether they are taken singly year by year, amount to somewhere between $700 million and $800 million which is being or has been injected into the forestry industry. Also I mentioned before the fact that forestry ministers meet every year. They met as recently as September of this year.

As I explained yesterday in the House, the strategy we have put together includes the programs the federal Government would implement to meet the challenge and the needs in the forestry field. The ongoing consultative process at the present time takes place through the CCREM annual meeting, where ministers of forestry meet and discuss issues on an agenda of the kind to which I made reference a moment ago. We met in September to discuss forestry matters. In the same month, in Winnipeg, CCREM met and discussed forest fire controls and pesticides. The Canadian Forestry Advisory Committee is composed of provincial, industry and labour representatives. It is another forum for the consultative process. The Department of the Environment, including the Canadian Forestry Service, holds annual public meetings across the country for the discussion of environmental concerns which include forestry. A federal forest sector strategy committee, which co-ordinates all federal forestry activities, chaired by the Assistant Deputy Minister of the Canadian Forestry Service, is another place where the consultative process takes place on an ongoing basis.

As well, there are constant informal consultations between provincial colleagues and myself. Actually, the whole federal program is now based upon a continuing and evolving process of consultation. A good example this year was the Canadair CL-215 water bomber program which was the result of a federal-provincial task force that called for increased forest fire protection. The Special Recovery Capital Projects program provided an excellent opportunity to respond to this particular problem. There are formal committees for discussion as well as informal ongoing consultations; there is no question about that. They have resulted in the present federal actions which were developed in a truly co-operative manner.

Therefore, I would conclude that what the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap suggested is already happening. There is an ongoing process. I would conclude my remarks by underlining that the importance of the future of the forest industry and its importance as a resource in our country will depend upon the initiatives taken at the federal level, by a number of provincial Governments, and by all participants in the forestry sector. If there were not this kind of awareness of the problem, as already outlined by the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, if there were not a co-ordinated effort between the employers and the unions, the provincial and federal Governments' even changes of a structural nature by creating additional ministries or redesigning the whole structure of the federal Government would not result in any additional trees being planted for the benefit of future generations.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister would like to respond to the facts put out by his own Department, upon which the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) touched in his speech. They indicated that only five cents on the dollar brought in by the federal Government, and in fact by provincial Governments as well, is put back into forestry. That is what we are trying to address in the debate. In this session of Parliament, the single largest industry in Canada has never been raised by the Government side. This is the second time the Opposition has raised it in the close to 600 days of this session of Parliament which has gone on for almost four years.

• (1230)

With five cents return on the dollar in 1979, and since $3 billion was brought in by the Government in 1982 dollars—and I think we can expect it was double that—does the Minister think the amount being spent by his Government on forestry and forestry-related projects is adequate?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I suppose that a similar argument could be made looking at other industries. Agriculture could probably claim a similar ratio. Maybe a similar ratio could be established by other sectors in our economy. Evidently each industry or sector at this time feels that it has to be more and better recognized by the public sector. The final result is a competitive claim on public funds. That is what this debate is about.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, let me give the Minister an example so that he can respond more directly. In Cape Breton, where the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen) has a seat, over $100 million a year is spent in the heavy water plants for the nuclear industry. There is no use for that heavy water in Canada. For three years it has been produced without any exports or any use in Canada. I, and I believe most Canadians, consider that to be a tragic waste of our tax dollars.

Within his own Ministry at this time, less than that is being spent on forestry. Canadians in areas of Canada such as British Columbia, who see their forest industry going down the pipe, want to know whether the Minister thinks that five cents on the dollar, when the Government is harvesting all those tax dollars from British Columbia, northern Ontario, the Maritimes and some areas of the Prairies, is adequate. Even comparing it to the nuclear industry which brings no direct

revenue to Canada, does the Minister honestly think that is a good return to taxpayers and the resource industry?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I would be inclined to conclude that people whose jobs depend on the plants referred to by the Hon. Member do not consider that expenditure a tragic waste of tax dollars. It keeps their jobs.

Mr. Darling: Mr. Speaker, the Minister is aware of my grave concern for the environment. Yesterday I asked a question with regard to acid rain. A serious contributor to acid rain is nitrous oxide emissions from automobiles. We know that is very detrimental to our forests. The Minister is also aware that Canada is three times as lenient as the United States in this regard. The Minister hopes to sell a much stronger acid rain program in the United States.

I know the Minister will have to talk to his counterpart in Transport, but is he prepared to recommend to Cabinet that Canadian emissions must be brought in line in order that we will have a strong card when talking to our American colleagues. Has the Minister given consideration to that? Could this not be put in force for the 1985 models? A great many Canadian-built cars meet the American standard emissions because they are exported to the United States and sold there. This involves a cost of about $200 per vehicle, but that could be included in the selling price. It could be available for the 1985 cars rather than four or five years down the road.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Chair will allow the Minister to reply to the question, but I remind Hon. Members that questions and comments must be germane to the previous speaker's remarks and not introduce a totally new topic. However, I give the Hon. Member the benefit of the doubt. It may be that the Chair did not listen as attentively as it should have to the Minister's remarks, but in my opinion this is a different subject.

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I would hate to be perceived as contradicting you. The Hon. Member has a point when he links the issue of nitrogen dioxide, NOx, with damage to forest growth. In that respect he could be understood. I thank him for his eloquent plea. I made good note of what he said. My answer is yes, I am proceeding in this direction. It is a long road. Limitations cannot be imposed in a very short time. The time frame will have to be more than two years. I hope the efforts I am making on this subject will come to fruition soon. I will make an announcement at the appropriate time.

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, before I make my contribution to the debate, I want to ask the Minister a question. On several occasions over the last week in Question Period and yesterday in debate he was asked about the forest agreements with the Provinces and about the auction that is to take place this Thursday. Can the Minister confirm or deny that his two colleagues, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) from Manitoba and the Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston), will attempt in this auction to lop off the Manitoba agreement the sum of $50 million because the benefits of that money cannot be forecast? They are unpredictable. They are nebulous. Trees only mature in 60 years. If you make a direct grant to a pulp mill or saw mill, it creates jobs right away.

Can the Minister confirm or deny that is the type of competition he is facing in this auction and how is he responding to it? Is the Manitoba agreement going to be deprived of $50 million? When will that agreement be signed? What does the Minister have to say about it, particularly since he made such a strong commitment yesterday and on previous days that he will make his best efforts to ensure that these funds will not be depleted?

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, as much as I would like to be forthcoming to my colleagues in this House, and I consider myself very deeply rooted on the floor of this House as a House of Commons man, I have to draw to the attention of the Hon. Member that I am bound by an oath of office whereby I cannot divulge matters that are before Cabinet. While I fully understand his desire to know, I hope he will understand my inability to give him a straightforward answer.

Mr. Yurko: Mr. Speaker, in speaking about and bringing before the House the meetings with CCREM, the Minister brought back memories. I would like to pose a question to the Minister. As far as I remember, the Ministers of Agriculture were not often represented at CCREM meetings. The forestry industry involves production, conservation, marketing and employment. It is a renewable industry similar to agriculture. Some of us wonder why it is not related to a much greater degree to the agriculture sector of the economy of Canada.

I remember a suggestion that forestry should be combined as a ministry with agriculture so that one might consider a ministry of agriculture and forestry. This was given consideration at the provincial level. I want to ask the Minister, in his responsibility for forestry, about his contacts and liaison with the Department of Agriculture. Are they constant and extensive in the area of joint research, marketing and the many other areas where the two industries have a common heritage and common objectives, because they are both renewable industries? They both deal with renewable resources as opposed to the non-renewable resources that we deal with in the nation.

• (1240)

Mr. Caccia: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member is making an excellent point. Perhaps I should say that my contacts with agricultural representatives are not as frequent as perhaps they should be in light of the point raised by the Hon. Member, and I will keep that point in mind. I certainly have frequent exchanges and conversations with the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) but the basic conversion of interest is a question which the Hon. Member has outlined very well and which I will keep in mind in my future work.

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I shall follow up the question I posed to the Minister. My sources tell me that $50 million will be lopped off the agreement that he is about to sign with Manitoba. That $50 million

is money that was earmarked for forest renewal in that Province. The Minister's answer was that he cannot reveal Cabinet confidence, and I appreciate that. However, I take it that his answer is in the affirmative and that that money is being lopped off the agreement.

The Minister from Manitoba and the Minister for Economic Development in the federal Cabinet have begun initiatives to reduce the amount that would have otherwise have been committed to forest renewal in the forestry agreement. I think that that is a tragedy, Sir, and I suppose that I commiserate and sympathize with the Minister because he may have his heart in the right place. However, he certainly does not sit in the right place around the Cabinet table and consequently does not get his message across to the Cabinet. It is perhaps for that reason that it is timely that we should for the third time this year debate the subject of Canada's forests. It is unprecedented, Sir, that today, for the first time this year, we will devote a full day to this important sector of our whole economy.

I welcome the initiatives taken by my hon. colleague and friend, the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis). He has put before the House a motion that is both timely and pertinent. However, I cannot help but ask myself where Members of the NDP were in 1979. At that time we were criticized for not having a clearly thought out strategy. It took us a little longer than perhaps it should have taken to lay before the House our strategy, the Throne Speech and the budget. When we did so, Sir, there was one component of the budget and the Throne Speech about which there was no doubt at all and that was our policy on forestry. There was no question or doubt about the commitment that we had made at that time to begin the painful and tedious process of rebuilding the Canadian Forestry Service. I wonder where Hon. Members of the NDP were at that time.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, they chose to join the Liberal interventionists across the aisle and defeat a Government which had set out a policy which would have respected the history of the country and the potential for economic growth in this particular sector of the economy. They rejected that in favour of certain other objectives.

There was a motion on today's Order Paper that dealt with one of those other objectives. That motion dealt with unemployment. Hon. Members of the NDP like to think of themselves as the champions of the unemployed and particularly of the young unemployed. That question was on the Order Paper today and NDP Members have now chosen to deprive us of that important debate in favour of a debate on forestry. I will not argue with them, Sir. I would like to talk about forestry for a whole week, but I sometimes question where their priorities are and just what kind of political games they are playing.

Nevertheless, I appreciate the belated interest the NDP Members take in this subject and welcome their contribution to the debate. I have no argument with anything that has been said by Members of the NDP so far with respect to the importance of the industry and what should happen in terms of assuring that the industry makes as great a contribution to our economy and our social well-being and contentment in the future as it does presently and has in the past.

Members of the NDP feel that in order to achieve that objective it would be necessary to hold meetings with the provincial Ministers. Well, Sir, I must admit that these meetings would probably be very productive. Incidentally, the Minister is quite right: these meetings are now taking place. This is one area in which we have experienced quite an enlightened and effective form of co-operative federalism because such meetings have been held on an ongoing basis. The last such meeting was held on September 14. If my friend, the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, does not know that, it is probably because his interest in forestry came late. He can certainly be forgiven for that.

Forestry is not an area in which the federal Government would be intruding on provincial jurisdiction even though the resource does belong to the Provinces. Provincial Ministers come to the Government and beg it to play the traditional and very significant role it has played in this very important area of forestry. As you know, Sir, forestry not only represents the most important industry in the whole country but has attached to it as well whole range of very important social dimensions. A whole range of important environmental and ecological considerations must be taken into account when one talks about forestry.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the fresh water and clean air generated by our forests that we in the country enjoy and breathe are not things which respect artificial political boundaries. Therefore, there must be an over-all co-ordination by and involvement of a central agency in this important area. I must agree with my friend, the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, that it would perhaps be better if there were a federal Minister of forestry who could meet on an equal basis and with equal authority and jurisdiction with his provincial counterparts to talk about some of these important things which I have mentioned.

When we consider that matter, Sir, it may be helpful to go back and consider a little bit of the history of the Department of Forestry as it relates to our present circumstances. It was in 1899 that the House for the first time established a Department of Forestry. That Department was likely established because of the keen interest shown by Sir John A. Macdonald himself in this area. As you know, he expressed a concern for the forestry industry and his words were quoted extensively in the House yesterday. He was concerned in 1877 about the imminent danger that he saw of our forests being totally depleted and this most important of our industries being destroyed.

We have now discovered all kinds of innovative ways to push back the frontier, to build road and rail infrastructures in order to gain access to the far North and discover that there are trees there. We have learned to harvest trees everywhere in Canada. However, in the Ottawa Valley, which I suppose is the area which concerned John A. Macdonald, forestry is no longer a main preoccupation. Other industries have now taken hold in the area. In this particular city, the industry of

Government is now the main preoccupation which benefits the economy of the region. However, we cannot build in all parts of Canada a House of Commons and put into place governmental structures to replace the prime resource industries.

We have built roads and gained access to trees wherever they stand in Canada and there is literally no place else to go. That is why all of a sudden there is the realization of an impending crisis in our forests. We can no longer build roads or railways, there is no place else to go and we are experiencing shortages of merchantable timber in every region of Canada. We have now discovered that in the last 50 or 100 years we should have done what other countries have done ever since they began harvesting their forests, that is, farm our forests instead of mining them. That means whenever you cut a tree, either for clearing or selective logging, you take great care to ensure that another tree or two are put in its place. It would not hurt to plant two in case one did not survive.

● (1250)

In 1949 Canadians were acclaimed throughout the world as leaders in the forest sciences. We had established research facilities and recognized, at least up until 1949, that our forests would in the foreseeable future always be our most important industry. That has been restated in this House over the last couple of days.

In 1960 we established a Ministry responsible for forests. As you will recall, Mr. Speaker, that was three years after the election of the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker. It was a Conservative Government which felt that forestry is very important and should therefore have a full Department of Government. The forest industry is of a very cyclical nature. We have our ups and downs. Indeed, the Department of Forestry had its ups and downs. The ups continued from 1960 to 1966 when it vastly improved federal-provincial relations. So for those who argue that a federal Ministry of Forestry would be an intrusion in provincial jurisdiction and take away from good relations with the Provinces, quite the opposite was the experience when we had a federal Minister of Forestry between 1960 and 1966. It resulted in the expansion of forest research facilities and a growth in staff to more than 2,000 persons. The top ranking official was a deputy minister. There was a growing awareness throughout the country at that time of the importance of our forestry sector, so 1966 was when we reached a peak in the structural profile of forestry.

Then under the Liberal administration forestry was merged first with rural development. The top official was reduced to an assistant deputy minister. In 1968 forestry was absorbed by Environment Canada. The top official then became a director general and staff reductions began. Forest economic institutes were closed and federal-provincial agreements were phased out. That is from 1968 to 1978, and that is where our problem started. I can show Hon. Members the results because they are here for everyone to see. My colleagues will elaborate on some of the consequences of what emerged as a deliberate policy of ignorance and neglect of this, our most important industrial sector.

In 1978, as you will recall, Sir, because you were with me here in this House, a federal Minister of the Environment who was to preside over the demise of the Canadian Forestry Service announced that the federal forest laboratories would be privatized. There were more staff cuts, which continued until the total manpower complement of the Canadian Forestry Service was reduced from 2,000 to 1,000 people. In 1979, that ever so brief period of enlightenment when we had another Progressive Conservative Government, we began the painful rebuilding of the Canadian Forestry Service and we started with the reappointment of an assistant deputy minister to serve the Minister of the Environment.

Let me say that I do not think forestry is well placed under the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Caccia). There are entirely too many conflicting interests, responsibilities and jurisdictions in that Department. For instance, if we wanted to begin farming our forests we would have seriously to think about the effective and responsible use of insecticides and pesticides. Would you think for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that we could take chemicals away from agriculture? Well, we cannot take chemicals away from forest farming. But if we want to restore our forests to their former health, we will have to make effective and responsible use of insecticides and pesticides, artificial fertilizers, and all those kinds of things.

Even though it is said that the Minister has some kind of educational background in forestry, his priorities are of course very much on the other side of his responsibility, on the environmental side. He has no time at all even to listen to any of the scientific community who urge him to be very careful in the way he deals with the Provinces and in the manner his Department assesses, regulates and controls the use of chemicals in our forests. So you can see that the Department of the Environment is not a good place for forestry.

The proposition has been advanced that maybe it should be combined with agriculture. Well, there are some very obvious mutual interests between forestry and agriculture and maybe that should be considered. I would commit to you, Mr. Speaker, that when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) decides to give Canadians a chance to choose a new Government, and when a Progressive Conservative Government gets back into power, we will immediately, as a matter of the highest priority, begin where we left off in the process of rebuilding the Canadian Forestry Service. Whether it will be a Ministry on the first day or not, I do not know. Certainly I hope the process will be accelerated and we can get back to the peak we reached in the 1960 to 1966 period where we had a full Minister.

I am becoming rather partial to the idea that a resource Ministry would be ideal because I do not necessarily think that mining is ideally placed with energy. There are a number of conflicting jurisdictions there as well. But the mining sector has a lot in common with the forest sector.

We talk about isolated communities in the north which depend entirely on one industry, be it mining or forestry. We talk about international trade, or about a clearly defined role for research and development which the federal Government

has in both these areas. Therefore mining and forestry would be a compatible role for a federal Ministry. We might want to give consideration to all that, but the status quo is not acceptable, certainly not to me and my colleagues in my Party, and as it appears now to our friends from the NDP.

Sir, if I may call it one o'clock, would you permit me to finish my remarks after Question Period?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I should perhaps at this time inform the Hon. Member that he has one minute of allotted time left.

It being one o'clock p.m., I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

CANADIAN FOOTBALL LEAGUE

LOCAL BAN ON TELEVISING CONFERENCE FINALS

Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, while everyone is talking about the program "The Day After", the day after, a program which many Canadians did see, I am more concerned, two days after, about the program that hundreds of thousands of Canadian football fans were not allowed to see. The volume of complaints from fans in the Hamilton-Toronto viewing area about the Eastern Conference final game blackout testifies to the insensitivity of the Canadian Football League and the CRTC in permitting these blackouts.

Consider these facts: Fact one: The Eastern Conference final was sold out at Toronto's Exhibition Stadium 72 hours in advance. Fact two: The CBC French network carried the game for those lucky enough to be on cable companies receiving Radio Canada. Fact three: The National Football League has established a policy which allows a blackout to be lifted if tickets are sold out 48 hours before game time.

I find it ironic that Canadian football fans are forced to grasp a signal out of the air, by driving to Buffalo, cramming into a beer parlour with an American satellite feed, or climbing onto their roofs to rotate their antennae, all because the CFL refuses to come out of the dark ages and enter the world of progress in 1983.

Those Eastern and Western Conference finals are as much national institutions as the Grey Cup game itself. The CRTC should instruct the Canadian Football League to lift those final game blackout provisions, beginning next year.

* * *

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

IMPACT ON MINISTER'S POLITICAL FUTURE

Mr. Gordon Towers (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, press reports tell us that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) and his colleagues celebrated the demise of the Crow by imbiding Old Crow bourbon whiskey. It would appear, on the surface, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) may have offered up the Minister of Transport as a sacrifice by abruptly shuffling him into the responsibility for the Crow. It may well be that his colleagues were really drinking Old Crow to his demise since he must, by now, have guessed his fate at the hands of western voters come next election.

A young Transport Minister came out of the west;
The Prime Minister really gave him the test.
"Rob the Old Crow", Himself said with glee,
So the Minister started climbing the tree.
Even with an axe your chances are slim,
You can't cut down a tree, when you're out on a limb!

* * *

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. Ray Chénier (Timmins-Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out to the House the unacceptable conduct of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney). I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a statement made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition in which he called the Hon. Member for Laurier (Mr. Berger) a monkey.

Some Hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Chénier: What kind of language is this, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The rules governing Standing Order 21 do not permit personal attacks on individual Members of the House.

* * *

CANADA WORKS PROGRAM

FORESTRY PROJECT LAY-OFFS

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms prohibits cruel and unusual treatment or punishment, but the Liberal Government is inflicting cruel and unusual treatment upon Canadians whose only crime is to be unemployed. Two weeks ago I met with young workers on a Canada Works forestry project. They had received training in basic forestry, operation of power saws, and safety procedures. When I saw them they were busy spacing trees for faster growth, which is very important and necessary work for our forests. However, some of these young

workers have now been laid off, not because they were bad workers and not because there was no work to do, but because they had exhausted their unemployment insurance.

The project was not really job creation. It was only a topping up of UIC. At the very time when these workers lost their unemployment insurance, they also lost their jobs. At the very time when they had developed the necessary skills for their jobs, they were laid off. One of these workers said he would have to leave his rented apartment and move in with his in-laws. Another worker said he had nothing to look forward to except welfare.

What twisted and perverse methods the Government uses in its so-called job creation! At the very least provision should be made for these workers to continue until the end of the project's life. I call on the Government to take action which will create real jobs, at real rates of pay, so that working people can have a real future.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

DROP IN INFLATION RATE

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, inflation has dropped below the 5 per cent mark to 4.9 per cent. This represents our best anti-inflation performance in 11 years. The co-operation of the people of Canada, acting together in their own best interests and in the best interests of the economic health of our nation, has helped move Canada from economic stagnation to economic recovery in little more than a year. The six and five voluntary restraint program offered by the Liberal Government has been a key to this downward trend in inflation.

The inflation rate in October of 4.9 per cent is a demonstration that the 5 per cent target of the second year of the six and five program is a manageable one. The 4.9 per cent inflation rate in October is a confirmation that the six and five program is not about loss, as the opposition Parties would have Canadians believe, but offers new vigour and growth for our economy. That 4.9 per cent is another ray of sunshine burning through the clouds of doom and gloom which the Opposition uses to try to frighten Canadians into adopting the Opposition's economic policies, which would mean recovery for only a few well placed individuals.

* * *

THE ADMINISTRATION

CALL FOR HOLDING OF GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government has brought the once buoyant united Canada to its knees. Today Canada is in a shambles. The National Energy Program and taxation have all but destroyed the oil and gas industry. The Gestapo Revenue Department is sucking the last drop of money out of small business, including farmers, causing hundreds of bankruptcies. Bill C-155 is paralyzing agriculture in the West, killing the potential of cattle and hog raisers and processors. Babies of the unemployed are crying for milk.

These socialist Liberals have killed the incentive to invest, have driven capital and jobs out of the country and, at the same time, through FIRA, have discouraged foreigners from investing in Canada. A million unemployed, thousands with no UIC benefits, are desperate, a situation leading to divorce and even suicide. So bad has this administration become that even a Liberal who is on the so-called Campagnolo Reform Committee told *Maclean's* magazine that the Liberal Party, and I quote:

—is tired, arrogant, self-serving, self-satisfied and irrelevant—

Cabinet Ministers are telling the unemployed to "starve" until the Speech from the Throne comes up, and even the Liberal President, Iona Campagnolo, is panicking. She set up a committee to "review, renew and reform" the Liberal Party. She should have told them to "embalm, encoffin and bury" the Party. I call on the Liberals to come out from behind the smokescreen, resign, and let a new leader, Mr. Brian Mulroney, and the PC Party take over the Government—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

ELECTION OF TENTH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, yesterday saw the election of the tenth Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories. In extending the congratulations of this House to the successful candidates, we would do well to recognize that, without exception, every Member of the new Legislature supports the concept of responsible government for the people of the Territories and an end to the vestiges of colonial rule retained by federal authorities.

● (1410)

Let us therefore join the new and re-elected Members of the Assembly in adopting their position, which is that espoused by the Official Opposition, namely, that the people of the North should have control over their own land, their own lives, and their own destiny; that they should be entitled to the same democratic rights and privileges as southern Canadians; and that the heavy hand of the Department of Indian Affairs be removed from their affairs.

S.O. 21

POLITICAL PARTIES

POSITION OF PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY ON NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM

Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House that there has been some criticism of the Liberal policy on the NEP. I think we should look at the fact that the Tories have modified their stand on most issues according to which part of the country they are speaking from, or to what they think Canadians want to hear. The energy issue is no exception.

Last week in Calgary the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) outlined what his Party would do if it formed the Government. He said it would dismantle the "confiscatory and punitive provisions of the NEP." He said it would change the federal Government's exploration incentive program to include foreign companies. The Leader of the Opposition was not thinking of the good of all Canada. He was thinking about the gaining of western votes. Meanwhile a Member of the Tory Party was telling a group in Ottawa exactly what they wanted to hear. He said the Conservatives supported the Canadianization of the oil industry.

The next day in Edmonton the Leader of the Opposition decided not to repeat the controversial statements which he had made the day before in Calgary. Now the Tories own energy critic cannot outline the Conservative energy policy.

We would like to know where that Party stands on the energy issue. The Leader of the Opposition and his Party's members are doing a great disservice to the people of Canada by creating confusion about a National Energy Program that is working. Canadians are informed, and they want answers.

* * *

MEDICAL CARE

QUESTIONNAIRE CIRCULATED BY MEMBER FOR PROVENCHER

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservatives in this House have been noted for their silence about the concern that Canadians have about extra billing by physicians and user fees for medical and hospital care, and the need to preserve and strengthen the principles of medicare. This silence has only barely hidden the fact that the reason they do not call for action to stop these user charges is because they privately prefer the commercialization of health care for philosophical reasons.

The PC Party health critic, the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), has once again proven the old adage that it is better to be suspected of something than to open your mouth and prove it. In a recent report to his constituents he has clearly given away his Party's preference for extra billing and user fees by asking leading questions on both these topics.

On user fees he wants to know whether "heavier users" of health care, perhaps those who visit a doctor more than three times a month, should pay more. This is even more mean spirited than that which the Alberta Government proposed. It is in favour of deterrent user fees that are charged only for the first few times. The Hon. Member for Provencher goes much further than this. He does not just want those who are mildly sick to pay for health care. He wants to put a special burden on those who are really sick and who may be asked by their doctors to come back often for close attention.

On extra billing the Tory health critic explores the idea of making extra billing acceptable by allowing it to be deducted for income tax purposes. This will be of no great comfort to the poor and others for whom regressive mechanisms like tax deductions are not beneficial—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired. The Hon. Member for Hamilton West.

* * *

ABORTION

OBJECTION TO USE OF UNION DUES IN SUPPORT OF LIBERALIZATION

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine is employed by Canada Employment and Immigration and, as such, is a member of the Canadian Employment and Immigration Union, which is a component of the Public Service Alliance of Canada. The PSAC is affiliated with the Ontario Federation of Labour and the Canadian Labour Congress. Both of these organizations have passed resolutions urging the liberalization and legalization of abortion in Canada.

Since my constituent's moral and religious beliefs are totally opposed to abortion he has asked his union to divert his dues to a charitable organization, but it has refused. A section of the program administration collective agreement allows only people who belong to a religion which forbids membership in unions to divert their dues. As he is Roman Catholic he does not qualify under this section.

Mr. Speaker, it is of concern to me that the Canada Employment and Immigration Union would not allow my constituent to divert his dues to a charitable organization. Therefore, I would like to recommend that the Canada Employment and Immigration Union either withdraw its support for the abortion resolutions passed by the Ontario Federation of Labour and the Canadian Labour Congress, or seek to ensure that in future contracts members whose religion is opposed to abortion are allowed to divert a portion of their union dues to charitable organizations.

* * *

METRIC CONVERSION

NOVA SCOTIA'S RETURN TO HIGHWAY MILES PER HOUR SIGNS

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the House that today the Premier of Nova Scotia, the Hon. John Buchanan, has made the decision to revert back

to miles per hour on all highway signs in the Province of Nova Scotia.

I would also like to report to this House that the federal Government, after forcing, by Order in Council, the retail grocers of this nation to go to kilograms, has decided to keep the federal stockyards of Canada, from Montreal right through to Prince Rupert, using imperial measurement on every pound of red meat we import and export from this country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Domm: A word of congratulations should also go on the record to the Minister responsible for the Post Office. After forcing all of the gasoline dealers across this country to go to litres the Government has decided to continue to sell at its own Canada Post at the main post office branch in downtown Toronto, all gasoline by the gallon.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ECONOMIC COUNCIL'S UNEMPLOYMENT FORECAST

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance in the absence of the Minister of Employment and Immmigration. It has to do with unemployment. Incidentally, the House would be debating this subject today if it were not for the fact that it does not rank in the order of priorities of the NDP.

The Economic Council of Canada today, in an appearance before the Standing Committee on Labour and Manpower, forecast that unemployment would remain at around 11 per cent well into 1988, and indeed would increase in actual numbers. Given the fact that we have had a peek at the "cafeteria of job creation programs", and it is more like Mother Hubbard's cupboard, can the Minister give the House an assurance that whatever programs are introduced in the Speech from the Throne to create new jobs, they will be operable during the peak unemployment months of the winter?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, rather than look at forecasts put out by one organization I would have hoped that my hon. friend would have looked at the statistics that have been released this morning by Statistics Canada. These statistics show that, for the first time since 1972, inflation was down to 4.9 per cent last month. This is the first time we have inflation below 5 per cent in over 11 years.

As far as employment and unemployment are concerned, my hon. friend knows that Canada has been creating jobs faster than any other industrialized country this year. This record is one that we maintained during the seventies. During that decade Canada was creating jobs faster than any other industrial country. That is the record and the performance that we, as a Government, want to pursue. We want to create jobs faster than anybody else and bring unemployment down as fast as we can. As to the forecasting question, I disagree with it.

CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES FIGURES

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, could the Minister explain to the House why Canada is still approximately one-quarter of a million jobs behind, since the commencement of the recession, as compared with the U.S. which not only has picked up the 1.5 million jobs lost, but has in fact created a million new jobs in the economy. How does the Minister explain that, and Canada's poor performance?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that the number of young people coming into the work force in Canada is proportionately larger than in the United States and the growth in the participation rate has been faster and larger than in the United States. Although we are creating jobs faster than anybody else we cannot bring unemployment down as fast as we would like because of the large increases in our manpower.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT—IMPACT OF CAREER ACCESS PROGRAM

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the only program now in place which addresses jobs for young people is the Career Access Program which called for $90 million to create 31,000 jobs. That Program did not become operative until the end of September. We have had about a month or two of experience with that Program. Can the Minister tell the House how many jobs have been created under this Program, and can he give the House an assurance that whatever new programs are to be announced in the Speech from the Throne they will in fact become operative immediately so that their impact can be felt during the period of peak unemployment?

• (1420)

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member refers to one particular program. He does not refer, for instance, to the Summer Canada Program that was in effect last year and also created thousands of jobs for young students. Rather than referring to a single program, I would point out there have been several programs addressed to youth which the federal Government has financed.

I would also like to remind him that about 40 per cent of the jobs created under the general job-creation programs of the Government of Canada have gone to young people. Thus, all the programs we have are addressed to Canadians at large, and young people are benefiting from them.

In addition, we have a number of programs addressed specifically to young people and, as my hon. colleague, the Minister of Employment and Immigration, has said, he is reviewing those progams in order to try to ensure the young

people of Canada will get the maximum impact and the maximum beneficial results from our money.

Mr. McGrath: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has had two. A brief supplementary.

* * *

CANADA WORKS PROGRAM

SIZE OF CONSTITUENCY FUNDING

Hon. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Incidentally, the Minister's last statement will come as news to the 550,000 young people who are still unemployed.

The Minister of Employment and Immigration reduced the constituency allocations under Canada Works by one half, by $100,000. At the same time he expanded the Program to include the private sector. The consequence of that is that there are millions of dollars worth of applications now coming to Members of Parliament for their signature. What advice does he have for Members of Parliament who now have to explain to the private sector that there are, in fact, no funds to fund their programs?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I would have to correct a slight inexactitude in the Hon. Member's statement. It is not that the funding has been reduced by half to $100,000, it is that the minimum funding is down to $100,000. Above and beyond that there is an allocation which is basically rooted in the labour surplus rate which exists in each constituency, so that there are many, many constituencies which receive far more than $100,000, indeed up to $3 million, which is the upper limit for a constituency. Therefore, whether there is a reduction in comparison with last year will depend on whether a constituency is one in which there is a high labour surplus rate or not.

I will take the Hon. Member's concluding remarks in relation to the funding for the Program as a representation that more funds be provided, and I will give serious consideration to that representation.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS FOR JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same Minister. I am sure the Minister has read, as I have, the leaked outline Speech from the Throne which comprises a so-called "cafeteria" of job-creation gimmicks. Will the Minister commit to the House that this cafeteria of so-called job-creation programs is not simply rearranging or renaming programs, or rechanneling the funds, simply to give the impression of activity purely for political reasons, and to raise the expectations of those who are out of jobs right now?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I would make two replies to that question. First, I believe the programs which we have presented now, and perhaps the new programs that we will be presenting, are programs of great importance and substance and not simply rearrangements or cosmetics, in the Hon. Member's words. I think he should also recognize that there are very substantial funds already being spent.

It is not simply a question of doing things that are new. Something over $350 million is being spent each year on training. Close to one-half a billion dollars is being spent on job creation, and $140 million on employment counselling and placement services. There are well over two million young people in this country who, over the past year, have used services provided by the Employment and Immigration Commission.

Mr. Wilson: It sounds like the Government is planning again to rearrange the deck chairs on the *Titanic*.

REQUEST FOR NEW POLICIES

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, surely the Government must realize that this last recession was a warning. It was a very serious recession, but not nearly so severe as the next recession will be if fundamental policy changes are not introduced in the next Speech from the Throne.

With current unemployment as it is, how can the Government think only of tinkering with job-creation programs such as a conservation corps, cleaning of trails in the woods, and wage subsidies, when it should be proposing far more extensive policies to address the problems of the technological revolution, the new competitive position of countries like Brazil and Korea, and the very serious problem of the complexity of the Canadian tax system?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we are not rearranging programs. We have undertaken intensive efforts to find new approaches by, yes, using existing money more effectively, and finding new approaches in support of employment, particularly on the part of young people in this society.

The Hon. Member criticizes that approach. I suggest to him that it is far more effective than that which was followed by the Government of which he was a member, which suggested closing down Canada Works and Summer Canada.

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

GOVERNMENT'S POSITION ON WORLD-WIDE PROLIFERATION

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister who will know that there are at least two great dangers facing us from the nuclear arms race. One is the spread of nuclear weapons around the globe, and the other is technical advances in these weapons which make limitation and verification virtually impossible.

In light of the Prime Minister's efforts to promote non-proliferation, can the Deputy Prime Minister tell us if the Government is now fully committed to efforts to end both horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons? What new steps is Canada prepared to take to end such proliferation?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member should be convinced that the Prime Minister is presently making a major effort to bring about the very objective which she is seeking in her question today. As I stated in my reply yesterday to a similar question, there does not seem to be a shortage of good arms control proposals. There seems to be a shortage of an ability of willingness to come to an agreement.

It has been the view of this Government that the principal reason for that stalemate, or situation, is the worsened East-West relations. If we can improve the state of that relationship then there may be a possibility for countries to look at arms proposals in a different light.

I do not, for a moment, depreciate the importance of specific proposals, but I do not think that is the real deficiency presently in the international climate. There are lots of good proposals around but, strangely enough, despite their merit, they are not being implemented. We have to ask ourselves why is that.

REQUEST FOR HALT TO CRUISE MISSILE TESTING

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, since the Prime Minister himself has said that he is pursuing efforts to create a greater degree of non-proliferation, I am assuming both horizontal and vertical, will the Deputy Prime Minister not now, on behalf of the Government, consider very seriously ending Canada's participation in the production and testing of the Cruise missile, since the Cruise missile itself will lead to both vertical and possibly horizontal proliferation? If he will not do so, will he then at least allow us to have a free vote on the subject?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think the question of the Cruise missile has been debated very extensively, not only in the House but in the country. I, and other representatives of the Government, have given the explanations for that policy. Happily, it is supported by most Members of the House of Commons. In this case the NDP finds itself in the minority because it does not share what I consider to be the larger consensus in the House in support of the Government's policy.

Miss Jewett: That was a vote of confidence, and the Deputy Prime Minister knows it. We believe that what is lacking is the legitimacy of the Government's position because it does not have House of Commons support.

REQUEST FOR DEBATE AND FREE VOTE

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I repeat and add to my question. In the Speech from the Throne that will be coming before us soon, will the Deputy Prime Minister consider bringing forward a commitment at least to try, if he wishes, to give legitimacy to what the Liberals, and apparently many Tories, want, by allowing a full debate in the House, followed by a genuinely free vote?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is somehow attempting to cast aspersions on the votes which Members of Parliament cast in the House in the course of their duties. I do not cast any aspersions on these votes. I think they stem from the convictions of Members, and I do not share the Hon. Member's cynical outlook. I think she wants more to liberate herself from the situation rather than to liberate Members of Parliament from party policy and party principles.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF AUSTRALIA, DR. HARRY JENKINS, AND WIFE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I call to the attention of the House the presence in our gallery of distinguished visitors, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Australia, Dr. Harry, Jenkins, and Mrs. Jenkins.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

● (1430)

LABOUR CONDITIONS

EFFECT OF UNEMPLOYMENT ON FAMILY LIFE

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. It concerns a survey that was released on Sunday by the Family Service Association of America. It shows that unemployment has become the greatest threat to family stability in Canada and the United States. It points out that agencies surveyed say that unemployment and the related

financial stress have aggravated wife battering, child abuse, problems with alcohol, drugs, depression, and loneliness. Is the Minister aware of this report? Is the Minister also aware that every day he postpones job-creation programs he is adding to the suffering of families that are already in desperate straits?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, no, I had not been aware of that report. I thank the Hon. Member for drawing it to my attention. I do share the kind of concern which she has expressed and which the report, I gather, indicates of the social and traumatic effects that high levels of unemployment have. I have myself spoken out often on that subject. It would be wrong for her to suggest, as I think her question implied, that we are delaying the implementation of employment programs. That is not the case. We are spending something well over $1 billion this year on job-creation programs. We are not holding back. I do hope, and I suspect in the context of the Speech from the Throne, that we will be able to indicate to the House some suggestions and proposals about how we may do an even more effective job in spending government funds for these purposes.

Mr. McDermid: It had better be good.

Mr. Roberts: We are already assaying to accomplish and achieving considerably successful results.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my concern is with the social and human costs of unemployment. The Government is not taking them seriously, and the New Democratic Party would not even agree to debate them today.

SOCIAL AND HUMAN COSTS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I want to address my supplementary question to the Deputy Prime Minister, if I could have his attention.

I have spoken about this report that has just been published and the correlation between unemployment and the desperate costs of human suffering. Is there any effort under way by the Government which the Minister represents, any real effort, to calculate the social and human costs of unemployment? Is that kind of study or correlation being carried out by the Department of Health and Welfare or by the Ministry of State responsible for Social Development?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Hon. Member's concern. I believe we all understand that unemployment does create hardship, economic hardship, social hardship, that can be seen by any one of us in our work in our constituencies. I do not believe it is necessary to have studies in order to demonstrate that fact. It is obvious.

Miss MacDonald: Just ignore it.

Mr. MacEachen: That is why the Minister, in his answer, has indicated that at the present time this Government, because of the hardship caused by unemployment, is devoting such substantial sums to the relief of the unemployed and to alleviating the problems of unemployment. I appreciate her precise interest in knowing exact correlations. I will inquire whether any specific studies of that point are being made. But on the larger point I acknowledge, and we all do, the impact of unemployment on the social condition.

Miss MacDonald: It has got very much worse in the past few years.

* * *

CROWN CORPORATIONS

SALARIES OF EXECUTIVES—DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Deputy Prime Minister. Last week the Government tabled a report which outlines the salary ranges for Governor in Council appointees. Will the Minister explain to the House why Americans can find out the exact salaries paid to heads of Crown agencies which do business in the United States, and Canadians, who pay those salaries, cannot?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, last week, when I tabled a very detailed report on salary ranges of employees appointed by order in council, I was merely observing the provisions of an Act of Parliament, and in the circumstances, I fail to see why my hon. friend is upset that the Government has acted within the period provided under Section 13(1) of Bill C-124, the Public Sector Compensation Restraint Act. I wonder why he is so shocked about the fact that we have observed to the letter the provisions of that particular section of the Act.

[*English*]

NUMBER OF EXECUTIVES IN CANADA POST CORPORATION

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's detailed knowledge of that report, I would like to make a suggestion to him. The report indicates that, for positions outside the Treasury Board guidelines, the salary range is from $63,000 to $228,000. There are 16 agencies reporting 39 positions with employees in that salary range. Can the Minister explain to the House and to the Canadian people why 18 of those positions, almost half of them outside the guidelines, are Canada Post employees? Why does Canada Post need so many highly paid executives who are outside of Treasury Board guidelines?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, once again, when we provided details on salaries of people appointed by order in council, we had to observe the provisions of the Act that was passed by Parliament not long ago. As I indicated earlier, the Act is very specific. It pre-

scribes that we are to table a report containing the names and ranges of compensation of the persons concerned. Last week, for positions for which there is no salary range, we gave the minimum and maximum rate of pay for employees appointed by order in council, for whom there is no specific salary range. We therefore had the option of not publishing those figures because there was no salary range, as required under Section 13(1) of the Act, but in order to respect the intent of this particular Act and the Access to Information Act, we decided to give the maximum and minimum figures I just mentioned, and I think my hon. colleague has no grounds for complaints. The Government, in fact, bent over backwards in tabling such a detailed report, and if my colleague would take the trouble to read the report from beginning to end, he would realize that it contains far more information than the Government was obliged to provide under the provisions of the Act concerned.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

REJECTION OF SASKATCHEWAN CABLE COMPANIES' APPLICATION

Mr. Jack Masters (Thunder Bay-Nipigon): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Communications.

An Hon. Member: Turn on the mike.

Mr. Masters: Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the operator, having come out of that discipline, in his difficulty finding the right switch.

According to an article in *The Globe and Mail* recently, it was indicated that the rejection by the CRTC of an application by Saskatchewan cable companies to receive American network signals from Canadian Satellite Communications Inc. would have a serious detrimental effect on that company. Would the Minister please comment on the impact of this decision on CanCom, and on the equalization of broadcasting services in general?

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, the interpretation put on the CRTC decision by *The Globe and Mail* is indeed an erroneous one. I think it is important that it be restated quite clearly that the Government's thrust for extension and equalization of viewing opportunities across the country remains a high priority for the Government and that the Government sees CanCom as one of the major vehicles to help attain this objective.

I would also like to add that the rejection of the application by the CRTC was based on deficiencies in the application. My understanding is that the Saskatchewan cable operators will be applying anew for this service.

● (1440)

INCOME TAX ACT

NON-PAYMENT OF TAXES BY HIGH INCOME PEOPLE

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance who, along with his Government colleagues, has been asking Canadians to make sacrifices over the last two or three years, in digging us out of the recession. He has also imposed additional taxes upon most Canadians. However, at the same time, Revenue Canada tells us in the last few days that this year there were more winners of the golden loophole award for taxation than ever before; 239 Canadians earning over a quarter of a million dollars per year did not pay a single cent in income tax in 1981. Will the Minister explain to the people of Canada, as he is calling for equality and a fair level of sacrifice by all Canadians, why his Government allows this to occur with our taxation system?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I refer my hon. friend to the budget which I announced last April 19. In that budget, if he remembers, he will have noticed that we geared the benefits of tax reductions in favour of low income people. For instance, workers will be able to benefit from a significant increase in terms of the tool allowance going from 3 per cent to 20 per cent. That will mean that several hundreds of thousands of Canadian workers will be benefiting from this kind of advantage. We did the same thing with the extension of the Child Tax Credit and with the provision for child care expenses. I could go on enumerating a number of benefits which have been geared to low income people.

As far as the specific point raised by the Hon. Member is concerned, he knows that, depending upon what happens in a particular year, where particular individuals have suffered for instance large losses either on the equity market or in other ways such as in their business operations, they are entitled to claim those losses against their income. In a particular year we may have an individual with high income not paying taxes, but this individual will be called upon to pay taxes as time goes on and as the losses he can claim disappear.

Mr. Riis: Of course those who lose their homes do not get similar types of tax breaks.

REQUEST FOR ABOLITION OF CANADIAN OWNERSHIP SPECIAL CHARGE

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, considering that the Minister is asking Canadians to support a consumer-led recovery, would he consider in the months ahead removing the Canadian Ownership Special Charge and leaving the federal tax reduction as it is, to allow Canadians to retain $7.4 billion in their pockets to participate in the recovery program?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I explained my position on this matter in my last budget. I may remind the Hon. Member that funds thus collected will be used to finance energy self-sufficiency in Canada and Canadianization of the oil industry, an objective I am sure the Hon. Member strongly supports. This tax will therefore be used to expand Canadianization of the oil industry and also to ensure Canada's energy self-sufficiency.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

REASONS FOR GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTING OFFICE BUILDING IN HULL, P.Q.

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. Yesterday, like so many other people, I noticed the Government promised to build a fifty million-dollar office building in Hull in order to relocate a number of public servants. Since the Government already has more than 47,000 square meters of office space in the City of Hull, I wish the Minister would give the real reason why his Department or the Government is pursuing this plan, although the federal Government already has enough office space.

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows perfectly well that in a Department like mine, space requirements cannot be met instantaneously. We have to make projections and that is what we have done. The Hon. Member may be interested to know that Bell Canada now wants the space where the Department of Finance and Treasury Board are located and will continue to be, but only for a few months, for its own employees. This means we must look elsewhere. An other example is that of the temporary military facilities at the base in Rockcliffe, which will have to be moved elsewhere in the National Capital Region. In any case, we have made projections, which I find eminently reasonable, that indicate there will be a space requirement, and we want to maintain, more or less, the one to three ratio that was accepted several years ago, and that is why we want to build another building on the Hull side.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT COSTS COMPARED WITH PRIVATE SECTOR COSTS

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary. Since the people concerned, those who invest in construction of office buildings, are very worried about competition from the Government, can the Minister give the House the assurance that the rates the Government will be paying will not be more than what the private sector is offering to pay at this time? The Minister knows perfectly well that in Montreal, with Campeau or in Hull, with Teron, good friends of the Government . . . Could the Minister give the House the assurance that the Government will be getting a price that will at least be similar to, if not less than, the going rates in the private sector?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would rather not endorse the Hon. Member's mathematics, but I can inform him that tenders were submitted in the summer of 1982, that they were analyzed, and that those selected were in line with the usual tenders and costs for this kind of building.

* * *

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF CRIME—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. Has the Minister taken a decision on the implementation of any of the recommendations of the Federal-Provincial Task Force on Compensation for Victims of Crime? Will he be proposing statutory changes to deal more justly and humanely with victims of crime in criminal procedures before our courts?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the brief answer is yes, but may I be permitted to add that this report on victims of crime, the so-called Sinclair report, is a very well written one which I hope will be widely studied by Hon. Members of the House and by the public. There are many kinds of steps we must take to ensure that our law properly reflects the concerns of victims and concern for other interests. I am pleased to assure the Hon. Member and the House that the Government will be moving in this direction legislatively, and that we will also be continuing discussions with the Provinces to try to bring about fuller concern for the plight of victims in our society.

Mr. Howie: I thank the Minister for his answer.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Hon. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows that there are 79 recommendations. Will he tell the House whether the nature of his amendments or changes will be extensive in terms of number or substance?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, of those 79 recommendations, my recollection is that only something like ten are directed to the federal Government. We will be moving on most of those recommendations, and some of the others require some discussion with the Provinces. Most of the recommendations, as I recall, are directed primarily to the Provinces.

CRIMINAL CODE

PROVISIONS DEALING WITH HATE LITERATURE

Hon. Jim Fleming (York West): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister of Justice. I am wondering whether he can confirm news reports this morning indicating that Cabinet has approved amendments to the Criminal Code which will make it possible to take greater or more effective action against the dissemination of hate literature. At the same time, could the Minister indicate whether those changes, if indeed they have been approved, will remove the necessity of getting the permission of a provincial Attorney General to lay a charge of hate mongering?

Mr. Nielsen: Privileged information.

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I would say to my hon. friend, who has for long been concerned about this matter, and in his previous role was very directly involved in helping to bring about racial peace in our society, that I will be making a statement on the subject this afternoon in committee. I am not at liberty at this point, before the Speech from the Throne, to release details of what the Government will do.

Mr. Nielsen: Leak. Leak.

Mr. MacGuigan: In particular, in this case we want to await the recommendations of the committee before which I will be appearing, to know just how to move. But I would indicate that there is certainly a disposition on the part of the Government to ensure that the law on hate propaganda is effective.

* * *

● (1450)

EMPLOYMENT

IMPACT OF B.C. HYDRO POWER EXPORTS ON JOBS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. It is with regard to this week's report of the B.C. Association of Professional Foresters. I am sure the Minister is aware its conclusions are that 20,000 permanent forestry jobs are threatened or are likely to be lost as a result of hydroelectric projects in British Columbia, and that an area considerably larger than Prince Edward Island has been or is about to be flooded by the B.C. Government. Since the B.C. Government has indicated an intention to sell firm contract power to California at a cut rate, does the Minister not think it is in the nation's interest to have studies of the real cost in lost jobs and losses to the environment before that occurs?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a question of great significance touching many other areas of responsibilities than mine. I will be happy to take the point which the Hon. Member has raised and discuss it with other colleagues, including the Minister of the Environment, who is responsible for forestry and see if there is some appropriate response that either he or I should make.

ENVIRONMENT MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I will direct my supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment, who seems to be the one responsible. Since it is clear, certainly to British Columbians, that B.C. Hydro is a corporate monster quite out of touch with reality, last year being the second largest borrower in the world bond market, will the Minister tell this House and British Columbians whether he supports and endorses B.C. Hydro's proposal to export cut-rate electricity to the United States?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look into this matter when it is brought to my attention in its full complexity and detail.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In the interest of recognizing as many Members are possible, Members will now be recognized for single questions.

Some Hon. Members: No.

* * *

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

CIVIL DEFENCE INFORMATION PROGRAM URGED

Mr. Robert Wenman (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the President of the Privy Council. According to projections of the 1979 U.S. Congressional Committee on the effects of nuclear war, a nuclear attack only on the United States would result in the death of over two million Canadians from fallout alone. For the 23 million Canadians remaining, the federal Government commits a crime against its own people by withholding currently printed and stored information on survival. In view of the reality of modern technology that has reduced warning time to minutes rather than 30 days, and that preparations for civil defence 30 days prior to any proposed hostility would be destabilizing and inadequate, why does the Government of Canada not launch a major civil defence information program now?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is true that the consequences of a nuclear war are disastrous and that if a direct attack were launched on North America, the chances that Canadians would escape such an attack would be minimal.

However, I can inform the Hon. Member that our emergency measures planning includes provisions that we are trying to improve and which will help warn people who would be far from the centres of attack. We are also seeking to upgrade communications systems for informing the population through

available electronic facilities. We have a number of nuclear shelters and we are trying to build more. We are working closely with municipalities and provinces, through our civil defence organizations, in order to inform and increase the awareness of Canadians. I can assure the Hon. Member that everything is being done to make as much information available as possible, even if a nuclear attack were to have the disastrous consequences he mentioned. In fact, I think the best way to prevent this is by supporting and encouraging those who are trying to get the two world powers together, in an attempt to bring about nuclear disarmament.

* * *

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

IMMIGRATION ADMISSION PROCEDURES—DELAYS CAUSED FOR RETURNING RESIDENTS

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Has the Minister of Transport met with his colleagues, the Minister of National Revenue and the Minister of Employment and Immigration, regarding the disastrous results for people entering or re-entering our country at our major international airports, such as the line-ups which result when going through immigration when there may be a problem with a certain person coming into the country. Will the Minister, in conjunction with his colleagues, implement the recommendation that there be separate lines for returning Canadians, those from the United States, and others entering our country?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as I recall, the proposals put forward in the report on illegal immigration have been referred to different Departments to examine their feasibility, and certain pilot projects are being examined at the present time. I will undertake to consult, as the Hon. Member suggests, with the other two members of Cabinet to determine if and when they may be implemented.

* * *

PETRO-CANADA

PROPOSAL TO BUILD OIL-SANDS PLANT AT FORT McMURRAY, ALTA.

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Wilbert Hopper, the Chairman of Petro-Canada, has stated that Petro-Canada is seriously considering and investigating the prospects of building an oil-sands plant in Fort McMurray. He also stated they are not prepared to go ahead or even consider building a plant unless the Government is prepared to make certain tax and royalty concessions. What is the Minister doing about this?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, such discussions are under the responsibility of the Minister of Energy. As the Hon. Member has indicated, this would involve the co-operation of both the Government of Alberta and the Government of Canada. We have shown in the past that the two Governments can co-operate in this regard. With respect to a specific proposal that the industry may put forward, the actual negotiation of the specific agreement would be under the responsibility of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

* * *

SPORTS

APPOINTMENT OF LOTTERY CHAIRMAN

Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton North): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport. If she would return to her seat, maybe we could give her a little publicity. Mr. James Gow was appointed gambling czar and head of the federal sports lottery. Will the Minister advise the House what qualification he has for this $85,000 a year job, besides being a Liberal flack?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Céline Hervieux-Payette (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport)): Mr. Speaker, I think Mr. Gow, who has just been appointed by the Prime Minister as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Sports Pool Corporation, is a very good choice. He is a very competent person. He has worked with my Department as Chairman of the Sport Advisory Council, and as such, he is respected by the sports community and all those who work in this field.

* * *

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

USE OF NEW TERMINAL AT PRINCE ALBERT AIRPORT

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. On November 4 the Minister of State responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board turned the sod to start construction on the long-awaited terminal building at the Prince Albert airport. Unfortunately, on November 10 East-West airline service to the city ceased when the temporary licence held by the Aero Trades Airline expired. Can the Minister inform the House what steps his Department is taking to ensure that the new terminal does not turn out to be a white elephant?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, these are two very separate issues. I hope the Hon. Member will recognize the important investment we are making in creating jobs in this area with the new terminal for that region. As to the question of which airline will be able to fly in and out, any airline that meets the licensing requirements of the CTC will, of course, be approved. That really is the question. If there is an appeal to be heard on that, I am sure we would

be prepared to give it full consideration. At the present time it is a matter that will be judged by the CTC.

* * *

HOUSING

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT INTRODUCE SHELTER ALLOWANCES FOR NEEDY FAMILIES

Hon. David Crombie (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for housing. As the Minister will know, in its most recent report the Economic Council of Canada recommended that the Government bring in a system of shelter allowances for needy families looking for assisted housing. That recommendation was repeated this morning in the Labour Committee. Will the Minister confirm that the Government will bring in that program in the Speech from the Throne?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): No, Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm that. We are releasing, in fact I think this very week, the evaluation of the social housing program which had been ordered by my predecessor and which is now ready for publication. From that should come changes which could examine alternative options like shelter allowance, but I am not necessarily committed to that form.

* * *

● (1500)

ENVIRONMENT CANADA

AVAILABILITY OF WEATHER REPORTS FOR PRIVATE PILOTS

Mr. J. R. Ellis (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport, but I would hope that his colleague and seatmate, the Minister of the Environment, would listen as well because I am not entirely certain of the division of responsibility for the sourcing and delivery of aviation weather reports. On behalf of private pilots everywhere I would like to complain about the lack of availability of weather reports. There is no question that that information is available, but in fact it is not easily accessed by private pilots, particularly those in major centres.

Before a plane takes off, we of course ask the pilot to check the weather reports. I wonder if either Minister could first tell me who is responsible for the delivery of this information and, second, how that Minister would go about making it more easily available to private pilots so that they do not have to wait for that information for an hour to an hour and a half.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is quite correct in saying that pilots do call upon the services offered by Environment Canada's meteorological services and depend very much on them. Our services have been strained because of budget cuts. If the Official Opposition will support increased budget allocations, we will be very glad to expand and/or enhance those services at any time.

* * *

PETITION

MR. FRETZ—RIGHT TO LIFE OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I have the honour to inform the House that the petition presented by the Hon. Member for Erie (Mr. Fretz) on Monday, November 21, 1983 does not meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * * * *

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order which relates to what I feel is a very important historical event for all Members of the House. I am sure all Members will agree, when they recall the passing 20 years ago of the thirty-fifth—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member is not making a point of order. He might well have availed himself of the opportunity of making a statement under Standing Order 21 in order to discuss a historical event. However, his point is not a point of order.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Hon. Member has a legitimate point of order, the Chair will entertain it. However, a reference to a historical event is not a point of order but should be the subject of a statement under Standing Order 21.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, may I then seek the unanimous consent of the House to make my intervention?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have the unanimous consent of the House?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions. At this point, shall we have the usual intervention made by the Hon. Member for Yukon and the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I have been giving this matter a great deal of thought, and I hope that perhaps in the not too distant future we might arrange a meeting among the House Leaders to deal not only with this question but with others as well. However, in light of my normal attitude of co-operation,

I am prepared to allow the waiving of the reading of all of the motions for today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair expresses its appreciation to the Hon. Member.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I have certainly been suggesting this for the last two weeks and it has been persistently refused by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain. I would assume that his reason for agreeing to it today is self-motivated by reason of the fact that it is an NDP motion that is being debated.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, if I were to take the words of the Hon. Member at face value and if he meant what he said, then I would simply have to revert to my normal practice. My agreement has nothing to do with self-motivation but I do believe it may well be that we could work out a more civil way of dealing not only with this particular order but with other orders that require the Speaker to read into the record each day the names of Hon. Members who are not yet prepared to proceed with matters standing on the Notice Paper.

Motions stand.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,832, 4,833 and 4,926.

[*Text*]

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR SAFETY

Question No. 4,832—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. Is there an Atomic Energy Control Board Advisory Committee on Nuclear Safety and, if so (a) who are the members (b) what is the (i) background or expertise (ii) term of appointment of each member (c) what remuneration, such as salary or travel expenses, do the members receive and, for the length of each appointment to date, what amount did each member receive (d) what other funding, if any, is provided by the Government?

2. (a) What are the terms of reference of the Committee (b) what matters did it consider in the fiscal year 1982-83 (c) how often did it meet and how often is it required to meet (d) what reports and/or recommendations did the Committee publish in the fiscal year 1982-83?

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Atomic Energy Control Board reports as follows:

1. Yes, the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Safety was established by the AECB in 1980.

(a) Dr. H.E. Duckworth (Chairman)	President Emeritus University of Winnipeg Winnipeg, Manitoba
Dr. R.E. Jervis (Vice-Chairman)	Professor, Nuclear and Radiochemistry and Chairman, Research Board University of Toronto Toronto, Ontario
Dr. W.H. Gauvin	Director, Advanced Technology Noranda Research Centre Pointe-Claire, Québec
Dr. N.C. Lind	Professor of Civil Engineering University of Waterloo Waterloo, Ontario
Dr. O.R. Lundell	Professor, Chemical Engineering York University Downsview, Ontario
Dr. K.J. McCallum	Dean of Graduate Studies University of Saskatchewan Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
Dr. A. Pearson	Former Director (retired) Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Division Atomic Energy of Canada Limited—Research Company Chalk River, Ontario
Dr. J.T. Rogers	Professor of Mechanical Engineering Department of Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering Carleton University Ottawa, Ontario
Mr. W.M. Walker	Vice-President, Engineering British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Vancouver, British Columbia
Dr. G.C. Butler (ex officio)	Chairman, Advisory Committee on Radiological Protection

Dr. W. Paskievici, Chairman, Institut de génie nucléaire, École Polytechnique, Montreal, Quebec, resigned in January, 1983 and Mr. C. E. Tupper, former Administrator, Environmental Health, Nova Scotia Department of Health, Halifax, Nova Scotia, resigned in April, 1983. Replacements have not yet been announced.

(b)(i) All the Committee members are senior professionals in the fields of engineering and science. (ii) The Committee members are normally appointed by the AECB for two years and may be re-appointed. The term of all current members expires March 31, 1984.

(c) See below.

(d) There is a provision in the Committee's current year budget for funds of $25,000 to support background studies. However, such expenditures have not been made to date. Certain secretariat costs such as office supplies, stationery, etc. are covered by the AECB.

2. (a) Terms of Reference:

(i) To advise the AECB on principles, standards and general practices related to the safety of nuclear facilities and other major nuclear activities regulated by the Board.

(ii) To advise the AECB on any general or generic safety matter associated with the sitting, construction, operation and decommissioning of nuclear facilities (as defined in the Atomic Energy Control Regulations) and the production, handling, transportation and disposal of prescribed substances, including; recommendations on proposed regulations, licensing policies, standards, and guides; interpretation of new information related to nuclear safety and advice on its relevance to the

Board's regulatory function; recommendations on nuclear safety related research and development supported by the Board; recommendations on "appropriate" or "acceptable" levels of safety for the various activities regulated by the Board, and on methods of defining and demonstrating these levels; and advice on major safety issues arising from the regulatory process.

(iii) To establish, with the concurrence of the President or a designated officer of the AECB, subcommittees or working groups to carry out committee work.

(b) In 1982-83, the Committee considered the following topics: basic safety requirements for nuclear power plants; principles for the management of radioactive waste; the role of human factors in nuclear safety; the perception of risk; review of the AECB proposed program for research; a policy on quality assurance for nuclear activities; and the concept of negligible dose.

(c) The Committee met five times during 1982-83 for a total of seven days. Also, the working groups met several times. The Committee is required to meet at least two times per year.

(d) In 1982-83, the Committee did not publish any formal reports other than the revised version of ACNS-2, "A proposed statement on safety objectives for nuclear activities in Canada", which was subsequently endorsed by the AECB.

(c)

	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		Total	
Members	Honoraria	Travel	Honoraria	Travel	Honoraria	Travel	Honoraria	Travel
Dr. H.E. Duckworth	$2,100.00	$4,119.65	$3,362.50	$2,377.86	$3,150.00	$3,228.15	$ 8,612.50	$ 9,725.66
Dr. R.E. Jervis	1,050.00	859.04	2,087.50	1,362.36	2,003.25	1,632.01	5,140.75	3,853.41
Dr. W.H. Gauvin	1,050.00	634.79	1,675.00	1,613.85	1,575.00	1,002.65	4,300.00	3,251.29
Dr. N.C. Lind	—	—	800.00	784.70	2,812.50	2,054.83	3,612.50	2,839.53
Dr. O.R. Lundell	1,225.00	1,038.80	2,200.00	1,765.90	1,800.00	1,294.75	5,225.00	4,099.45
Dr. K.J. McCallum	1,400.00	1,816.25	2,200.00	3,126.30	1,800.00	4,099.25	5,400.00	9,041.80
Dr. A. Pearson	1,050.00	1,514.38	3,950.00	3,672.81	3,487.50	1,888.79	8,487.50	7,075.98
Dr. J.T. Rogers	2,100.00	590.01	5,837.50	1,737.29	8,156.25	1,525.49	16,093.75	3,852.79
Mr. W.M. Walker	525.00	2,029.65	1,325.00	3,811.75	1,575.00	5,147.96	3,425.00	10,989.36
Dr. G.C. Butler	—	—	—	2,355.58	—	632.30	—	2,987.88
Dr. W. Paskievici	2,100.00	655.90	3,837.50	3,456.67	2,812.50	1,581.42	8,750.00	5,693.99
Mr. C.E. Tupper	—	1,903.80	—	1,570.71	—	1,742.82	—	5,217.33

Note: Members are paid an honorarium of $225 per day for those days on which they are performing the duties for which they were appointed.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION

Question No. 4,833—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. Is there an Atomic Energy Control Board Advisory Committee on Radiological Protection and, if so (a) who are the members (b) what is the (i) background or expertise (ii) term of appointment of each member (c) what remuneration, such as salary or travel expenses, do the members receive and, for the length of each appointment to date, what amount did each member receive (d) what other funding, if any, is provided by the Government?

2. (a) What are the terms of reference of the Committee (b) what matters did it consider in the fiscal year 1982-83 (c) how often did it meet and how often is it required to meet (d) what reports and/or recommendations did the Committee publish in the fiscal year 1982-83?

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Atomic Energy Control Board reports as follows:

1. Yes, the Advisory Committee on Radiological Protection was established by the AECB in 1979 and a Standing Subcommittee on Risk Estimates was formed in 1980.

(a) Advisory Committee on Radiological Protection

Dr. G.C. Butler (Chairman)	Former Director (Retired) Biological Sciences Laboratories National Research Council of Canada Ottawa, Ontario
Dr. T.W. Anderson	Head, Department of Health Care and Epidemiology University of British Columbia Vancouver, British Columbia
Dr. P. Lachance	Responsable, Programme de santé des travailleurs Centre hospitalier de l'Université Laval Québec, Québec
Dr. B. Lentle	Head, Nuclear Medicine Civic Hospital Ottawa, Ontario
Dr. E.G. Létourneau	Director, Radiation Protection Bureau Health and Welfare Canada Ottawa, Ontario
Dr. A.M. Marko	Director, Division of Health Sciences Chalk River Nuclear Laboratories Atomic Energy of Canada Limited—Research Company Chalk River, Ontario
Dr. E. Mastromatteo	Director, Occupational Health Inco Limited Toronto, Ontario
Dr. J. Muller	Former Head (Retired) Special Studies Services Special Studies and Services Branch Ontario Ministry of Labour Toronto, Ontario

Dr. J. B. Sutherland	Head, Nuclear Medicine Health Sciences Centre Winnipeg, Manitoba
Mr. R. Wilson	Director, Health and Safety Division Ontario Hydro Toronto, Ontario
Subcommittee on Risk Estimates	
Dr. J. Muller (Chairman)	Former Head (Retired) Special Studies Services Special Studies and Services Branch Ontario Ministry of Labour Toronto, Ontario
Dr. T.W. Anderson	Head, Department of Health Care and Epidemiology University of British Columbia Vancouver, British Columbia
Dr. G.W. Gibbs	Director, Health and Safety Affairs Celanese Canada Inc. Montreal, Quebec
Dr. G.B. Hill	Director Department of Epidemiology Alberta Cancer Board Edmonton, Alberta
Dr. H.B. Newcombe	Former Head (Retired) Populations Research Branch Chalk River Nuclear Laboratories Chalk River, Ontario
Dr. D.K. Myers	Head, Radiation and Biology Branch Chalk River Nuclear Laboratories Atomic Energy of Canada Limited Chalk River, Ontario
Dr. M.R. Avadhanula	Technical Secretary Atomic Energy Control Board Ottawa, Ontario

(b) (i) All the committee members are senior professionals in the fields of engineering and science.

(ii) The committee members are normally appointed by the AECB for two years and may be re-appointed. The term of all current members expires March 31, 1985.

(c) See below.

(d) There is a provision in the committee's current year budget for funds of $25,000 to support background studies. However, such expenditures have not been made to date. Certain secretariat costs such as office supplies, stationery, etc. are covered by the AECB.

2. (a) Terms of Reference: Advisory Committee on Radiological Protection

(i) To advise the AECB on matters relating to health protection concerning ionizing radiation.

(ii) To advise the AECB on any health aspects of exposure to ionizing radiation related to the activities of the Board, including such matters as:

Interpretation and application of the recommendations of the international Commission on Radiological Protection and other international bodies concerned with radiation protection, including review of proposed regulations.

Interpretation of new information on biological effects of ionizing radiation that could have a bearing on radiation protection standards.

Research and development related to radiological health and protection.

Broad or generic radiation protection issues associated with the licensing activities of the Board.

Subcommittee on Risk Estimates

(i) To provide expert advice on the health risks from exposure to ionizing radiation.

(b) In 1982-83, the Advisory Committee or Subcommittee considered the following topics: proposed revisions to sections of the Atomic Energy Control Regulations pertaining to limits for exposure to ionizing radiation; criteria for the protection of the public in the event of a nuclear emergency; assessment of ionizing radiation as a factor causing cancer in exposed individuals claiming compensation; intake limits for radon and thoron daughters for uranium miners; review of the AECB proposed program for research; review of the risk to the foetus from exposure to ionizing radiation; the concept of negligible dose; relative biological effect of exposure to tritium; and advice to the Board on responses to queries from the public.

(c) The Committee met five times during 1982-83 for a total of six days. Also, the working groups and task forces met several times. The Committee is required to meet at least once per year.

(d) In 1982-83, the Committee published: ACRP-1, "Risk Estimates for Exposure to Alpha Emitters", and ACRP-2, "Risks of Low-LET Radiation as Given in BEIR-III and Previous Reports".

(c)

	1979-80	1980-81		1981-82		1982-83		Total	
Members	Honoraria and Travel	Honoraria	Travel	Honoraria	Travel	Honoraria	Travel	Honoraria	Travel
Dr. G.C. Butler	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dr. T.W. Anderson	Not applicable (N/A)	$ 700.00	$1,648.30	$1,400.00	—	$ 450.00	$ 995.40	$2,550.00	$2,643.70
Dr. P. Lachance	—	—	879.15	—	$ 338.05	—	2,132.02	—	3,349.22
Dr. B. Lentle	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dr. E.G. Létourneau	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dr. A.M. Marko	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dr. E. Mastromatteo	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,125.00	—	1,125.00	—
Dr. J. Muller	267.55	1,225.00	1,353.90	3,525.00	515.45	2,587.50	1,017.55	7,337.50	3,154.45

Dr. J.B. Sutherland	1,240.50	525.00	1,239.75	975.00	1,125.33	1, 800.00	3,739.80	3,300.00	7,345.38
Mr. R. Wilson	605.35	—	268.03	—	214.35	1,575.00	1,358.62	1,575.00	2,446.35
Dr. G.W. Gibbs	N/A	700.00	225.83	1,800.00	—	450.00	248.2 6	2,950.00	474.09
Dr. G.B. Hill	N/A	N/A	N/A	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dr. H.B. Newcombe	N/A	525.00	412.80	1,100.00	—	2,587.50	290 .70	4,212.50	703.50
Dr. D.K. Myers	N/A	—	—	1,225.00	—	—	—	1,225.00	—
Dr. M.R. Avadhanula	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note: Members are paid an honorarium of $225 per day for those days on which they are performing the duties for which they were appointed. Public Servants receive no honorarium.

CANADIAN SALTFISH CORPORATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Question No. 4,926—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. Is there a Canadian Saltfish Corporation Advisory Committee and, if so (a) who are the members (b) what is the (i) background or expertise (ii) term of appointment of each member (c) what remuneration, such as salary or travel expenses, do the members receive and, for the length of each appointment to date, what amount did each member receive (d) what other funding, if any, is provided by the Government?

2. (a) What are the terms of reference of the Committee (b) what matters did it consider in the fiscal year 1982-83 (c) how often did it meet and how often is it required to meet (d) what reports and/or recommendations did the Committee publish in the fiscal year 1982-83?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):

1. Yes. (See list below)

2. (a) The Committee advises the Corporation on such matters related to trading and dealing in cured fish or the by-products of fish curing as are referred to it by the Board.

(b) No meetings held in 1982-83, therefore, no matters considered and no reports.

(c) Required to meet at least once a year at a time determined by the Chairman of the Board, normally during the winter period. Since the CSC had no Chairman from December, 1982 to April, 1983, no meeting was called.

(d) Nil.

Canadian Saltfish Corporation

Advisory Committee

Current Members	Background and Expertise	Term of Appointment	Remuneration since date of Appointment
Dr. C.R. Barrett Chairman	President—College of Fisheries St. John's, Nfld.	3 yrs. Jan. 21/82	—
W. Flowers	Fisherman	3 yrs. March 15/81	615.43
A. Alexander	Fisherman	3 yrs. March 15/81	222.00
E. Miller	Fisherman	3 yrs. March 15/81	351.89
Mrs. G. Nadeau	Plant Manager	3 yrs. March 15/81	388.94

Chairman's honorarium $150 per day. Members $75 per day plus half rate for travel time. There now exists seven vacancies on the Committee.

(d) No other direct funding is provided; however, certain secretariat costs, such as office supplies, stationery, ect., are covered by the CSC.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Evans: I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

[*English*]

Mr. Yurko: Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Speaker. I am threatening to use a red flag in order to be recognized. I wanted to make a comment with respect to the reading of the motions on the Order Paper and simply—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. We have proceeded to a different stage of the agenda. We would have to revert to the motions stage by unanimous consent. Perhaps the Hon. Member could hold his comments until tomorrow when I am sure he will have ample opportunity to make them.

Mr. Yurko: Mr. Speaker, I do want to indicate that I am not recognized when I should be recognized.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—FORESTRY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Riis:

That the Government respond to the emergency in the forestry sector by:

1. creating a new Forestry Ministry with the mandate to advance the Canadian forestry industry; and

2. convening a conference at the earliest opportunity of responsible Federal and Provincial Ministers to address the challenges presently facing the forestry sector.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) has approximately one minute left to finish his speech.

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I will use the final moments allotted to me to sum up what I said to the House before the lunch break. The Minister, in his speech, confirmed and confessed to the tendencies of the Government and the Provinces to delay what he calls major efforts to save our forests and delay the decisions that must be made in order to postpone or forgo the impending crisis in our forest industry.

I had also pointed out to the House that the present Minister is doing the same thing that the predecessor of a former Liberal Government had done, which was to continue to preside over the demise of the Canadian Forestry Service. The appointment of the Assistant Deputy Minister in 1979 was an initiative taken during the short term of the Conservative Government. We now see that the Assistant Deputy Minister has once again resigned his post in frustration because there is no encouragement for him or for anyone to work in pursuit of the objectives that would pay dividends to all Canadians in the future through the Canadian Forestry Service.

The Government is simply pursuing the wrong priorities and delaying the pain associated with the demise of our forest industry that will be felt by future generations.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but I must inform him that his time has expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow the Hon. Member to continue his remarks?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). I am sure he is aware of a speech given a little over a year ago by Les Reed of the Canadian Forestry Service. At that time he was bemoaning the actions that were taken to that point by the then Minister. He said the following:

Figures presented by my Minister, the Honourable John Roberts, at a recent meeting of the CIF Central Ontario Section indicate that the United States has about one graduate forester per 8,000 ha of forest land; the world on average has one per 12,000 ha; and Canada has one per 80,000 ha.

● (1510)

In light of the Hon. Member's last comment, would he indicate what kind of increase in staff and budget he would like to see in the Canadian Forestry Service, keeping in mind that he said in British Columbia a week ago that he would like to see at least 60,000 public servants fired as soon as a Tory Government took office?

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer that question. Incidentally, the statistics the Hon. Member quoted are somewhat wrong. A combination of Sweden, Norway and the U.S. would have one forester for every 15,000 hectares, whereas we have one for every 450,000 hectares.

What my friend should anticipate, if it is the decision of Canadians to ask Conservatives to manage the economy, is that there would be an entirely new set of priorities. We look at the forestry, mining, fisheries and agricultural sectors as the producing sectors of the economy. We would not delay decisions so that we can avoid depriving future generations of the benefits of our natural resource strength. There will be a rearrangement of priorities.

In 1960, when the Progressive Conservative Government established a full Department of Forestry, and in the period up to 1966, there were 2,000 people engaged in the Canadian Forestry Service in pursuit of very legitimate federal objectives, such as research and development, forest renewal and protection. As the Hon. Member knows, there are today 1,000 people in the Canadian Forestry Service. One American company, Weyerhauser of the U.S., does more in forest products and genetic research activities than the entire Canadian Forestry Service. We would turn that around. There would have to be a strengthening, as we demonstrated in 1960 and 1979, of the Canadian Forestry Service. There would be an increase in morale and therefore an increase in the productivity of the Department, which is simply lacking at this point.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I am always glad to get answers from my colleague from northern B.C. Perhaps he could be a little more specific as to what the Tory policy is on how big the increase would be in the Canadian Forestry Service. Would it be doubled, tripled, quadrupled, or quintupled? Can he say whether or not he thinks five cents on the dollar is adequate, which is what occurred under both the Liberal and Tory administrations, and at what level there would be a return of tax dollars to R and D and to the forest sector directly?

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to tell my hon. friend without equivocation that a return to the source of 5 per cent of revenue generated for the federal Government is simply not enough. If the Hon. Member would like me to tell him what the Progressive Conservative policies would be, I have a simple message for him. In the period leading up to the election it will be the policies of those people opposite and these people on my left who supported them in 1979 when they defeated the Progressive Conservative Government which will be on trial. So if the Hon. Member wants to find out what Progressive Conservative policies will be, the quickest way is to convince their bedmates opposite to bring on the next election.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) when he commented on federal-provincial jurisdiction and the fact that so much forest land in Canada is held by the public sector. Does he agree with his colleague from the Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) who yesterday indicated he felt the resources of Canada did not belong to the people of Canada but only to those who found those resources? Does he agree with his colleague when it comes to forestry?

An Hon. Member: Misrepresentation.

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the comments of my colleague from Western Arctic in the debate yesterday. He said that the people who faced the elements, who pushed back the frontier and used their industry and resources to identify, develop and bring to market the resources in the North ought to have some incentive and reward for their efforts. I dit not hear my colleague from Western Arctic say that Canada should give all resources to individuals regardless of their efforts. Usually, when we have individual enterprise and initiative, that is when Canada is most productive. He was really saying that socialism does not work, except in heaven where you do not need it, and in hell where they already have it.

Mr. Ron Irwin (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the comments of the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). I thought he gave us a very good historical background of developments in forestry. I was especially pleased to hear the overview from the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis), whose general philosophy is more in line with my thinking on this particular subject.

The problem we have had is a problem the present Minister was stuck with. He is a hard worker, experienced in forestry, wants to do the right thing, but unfortunately, federally and provincially, we do not give forestry the priority it deserves. The former Minister of the Environment said he gave as many speeches on forestry as he did on acid rain but it was only the speeches on acid rain which were published. That is the truth.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, there has been no greater stupidity, no greater tragedy and no greater lack of interest perpetrated on this country than in our wanton disregard of our forestry sector. We have learned much from Sir John A. Macdonald onwards but we have done little. I call our federal-provincial efforts in this regard a national disgrace. We have the worst forestry record collectively of any free country in this world. That is documented. When was the last time any caucus talked about the forestry sector? Search your souls. We talk about how to exploit our petroleum and manufacturing industry, how to dig things up, how to get rid of renewable resources. But when was the last time anyone in any caucus dared to stand up and talk about regeneration or reforestation? If it is one time in 100 meetings, it is a bonus.

How important is the forestry sector? Right now in Ontario it accounts for 64,000 jobs, 300,000 jobs in Canada, with 600,000 jobs in secondary manufacturing. It represents 18 per cent of all Canadian exports. It is greater than agriculture, mining and fishing exports combined. We have a Minister for fisheries, a Minister for mines, a Minister for agriculture and a Minister for energy, but where is our Minister for forestry?

In Ontario we have 750 saw mills, 22 pulp and paper mills, 21 veneer and plywood mills, and 12 paddle board plants. We bring in—and this is the tragedy—$1.5 billion in revenue provincially and $1.5 billion federally, yet we return only $300 million. That is a pittance. If we applied the percentage which is put back into forestry in Sweden, we would have to be putting back at least $750 million. In my area of Canada, northern Ontario, like Members from most ridings in Canada, we think generally in terms of our constituency, what the peole around us do. If you talk to people in northern Ontario, Mr. Speaker, you will find that most think it is the mines or the steel plants of northern Ontario which supply the jobs. In fact, in northern Ontario 54 per cent of our jobs come from the forestry sector, 55 per cent of our manufacturing, 57 per cent of value of production, and on and on. In Atlantic Canada it is the first or second industry in ten of the 16 regions. In Quebec, it is the first or second industry in eight of ten regions. In Ontario, it is the first industry in all six regions. In British Columbia, it is the first industry in eight, the second in two. In 1980, we shipped $22 billion worth of forest products. These figures are common. Most of the people who deal in the forestry sector know this.

● (1520)

It just boggles the imagination, Mr. Speaker, to understand why we spend so much time on other subjects and the most important subject in Canada is given so little time. The Hon. Member from New Brunswick will be speaking in this debate, but in his Province the wood industry accounts for 40 per cent of the Gross National Product.

Ken Greaves was mentioned. He said that the Ontario industry "spends almost nothing on reforestation". The Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap told us how much Mr. Greaves wants the Government to spend. Michael Keating of *The Globe and Mail* summed it up. He said that "it is an industry that wastes up to half of each tree it cuts and fails to replant most of what it harvests". This is a fact which is recognized, yet nothing is done about it.

The former Minister of the Environment, now the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts), said that

Canada must double its spending on reforestation to $650 million annually. When is the money coming? When is it going to happen? What we have now is a policy of restraint with controlled exploitation, nothing more, nothing less.

Of the money which the Province is spending, two-thirds to three-quarters of it is being spent on roads. Access roads to do what? To cut more trees. Some 25 per cent of fires are caused by lightning and these fires cause 90 per cent of the damage in forestry. Where are the road patterns? Where are the water bombers which we need to control the damage being caused by fires? They do not exist now, Mr. Speaker, and they are not going to exist in the next ten years unless we in common, without looking at the politics of it, insist we have these things.

Right now in northern Ontario we have serious shortfalls of timber, especially in the Hearst area, and nothing is being done about it. The UN reports indicate that by the year 2000 there will only be half of the forests we now have on this planet. The Science Council of Canada recently put out a report to which the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap referred, but how many people read it? Or if they read it, did they think about it for more than half an hour, a day or even a week? Everyone is calling for a federal Ministry of Forestry. The industry is calling for a federal Ministry as well as the northern Ontario caucus and the Province. Yet we do not have a federal Ministry of Forestry. It is said that we look on the forests as something to exploit. It is said that the high quality, old growth forest has gone. It is said that much of which is remaining is overmature and defective.

The Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap referred to the hardwood which they have to import for the furniture industry in Quebec. A walnut tree now costs from $7,000 to $9,000 to bring in because most of our good hardwood has gone. If we continue at this rate, most of our black spruce, our pine and our tamaracks will be gone with it.

There has been reference to the former assistant deputy minister of forestry. I thought he was a fine man who went as far as he could within his scope, basically as a senior civil servant. The policy has to come from here and from the Provinces, not from the assistant deputy minister or the deputy minister. The ADM said that each year 200,000 to 400,000 hectares of valuable forest are being added to this shameful waste, and he was right. The Science Council of Canada said that it wants a jump in reforestation and stand treatment from $300 million to $650 million. It sounds like a lot of money, but it is not when compared to what is at risk. It wants a jump from $250 million to $500 million for protection costs, which again is not a lot money when you look at the risk. As a matter of fact, there is a report which says we spent $89 million in other countries on their forest programs. We have more foresters per capita working out of Canada than any other country in the world. It is said that we do a better job abroad than we do right here in our own country. Our job is to grow trees, not to export civil servants.

The Science Council of Canada said that we could generate another 100,000 jobs if we brought in a reasonable program of reforestation. I do not know about other Hon. Members, but I am a little tired of these programs we are putting out which go nowhere, which do not give the people any pride in what they are doing and do not give us a profit in return. What can be better than to have a program which hires 100,000, 200,000 or even 300,000 Canadians to go out and do something which involves a little bit of pride? They do not have just to plant trees; there is more to reforestation than that. It is an industry in itself. They would have the pride of working and we would be providing for the future.

There is a phrase I use often because I like it so much. I heard it in Michigan at a conference of Amish farmers. The phrase was:

> We did not inherit this land from our forefathers, we borrowed it from our children.

We have to get that fact through our thick heads.

There are now 300 communities in Canada which could fail partially or totally if the forest industry in those areas fails. One of those communities happens to be mine. I almost laughed aloud when I heard the comment one of the Hon. Members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition put to the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap, that perhaps it was the labourers who were holding back the program. That is about the silliest thing I ever heard. I have never heard of a labourer in the pulp and paper or hardwood industries say: "I am against your putting some money in reforestation or regeneration".

The Abitibi Pulp and Paper Company in my riding employs about 400 or 500 men. It is basically your average company. There are no evil men at Abitibi. However, the thinking of that company is exactly the thinking which brought the forest industry down in Canada. In 1972, when I was mayor, the company threatened to close. It is threatening to close this year, 1983. I met with the president and he said to me: "When I started with this company 30 years ago we used to build one mile of road and harvest that one mile for three years. In 1982 we had to put in three miles of road for one year of harvest." Who does he think cut the trees? The beavers? It was Abitibi which cut those trees and did not reforest that area. Mr. Les Reed said—and he is right because it is being done in Scandinavian countries—that all you need is 100 kilometres around the plant; if you reforest that area properly, you can go on ad infinitum. But that has not been done. Certainly not in Canada. The historical summation by the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) of the Canadian Forestry Service was excellent. We have to be reminded that at one time we did have a Minister of Forestry. As Canadians we always tend to support the status quo. In this case we do not even support the status quo. The last Minister was the Hon. Maurice Sauvé in 1966. This institution goes back from 1899 to 1930. It handles four western Provinces and in some of them it did not do that great a job. Until the provincial Government of Saskatchewan took over the forestry business we had run havoc in that Province. The Canadian Forestry Service has brought much of it back under its care. From 1930 to 1983 it was concerned with basid research. Now it is "the lead agency for forestry" in the federal Government. That

sounds great, but basically there is no funding. When I last looked about a year ago they had a budget of $63 million for the lead agency for forestry in the federal Government.

• (1530)

Somewhere along the line, I guess 15 years ago, someone convinced the powers that be that the federal Government does not belong in forestry. They were probably the same fuzzy thinkers that thought that we did not belong in urban renewal. I cannot think of any place in which we do belong more than in the forestry sector. One in ten jobs in Canada comes from the forestry sector. Half of the jobs in my area come from the forestry sector. If we do not belong in forestry then where does the federal Government belong? Cutting the CFS by 50 per cent has been a tragedy.

The Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) asked the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River what the Conservatives would do if they were in power. I was hoping he would say that as a first step their policy would be to go back to what we formerly had. I do not think you can be parochial when it comes to forestry. That is why Ministers get in trouble. After two or three months the press wants to know what they are doing next week. It has taken us 100 years to get into this mess and, no matter what Government is here, it will take us ten years to bring us out at least partially and to head in a new direction.

I support the appointment of a federal Minister of Forestry. The Nova Scotia Forest Products Association wants a full-time senior federal Minister. That is another problem. If provincially and federally the Ministers of Finance or Energy or Trade and Commerce say, "This is the way it is going to be", then that is the way it is going to be. In the Scandinavian countries they tend to take agriculture and forestry and make them senior Ministries. At all eleven levels plus the Territories forestry has to be a senior Ministry.

I will deal with one aspect of acid rain and then close off. The Hon. Member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Darling) asked the Minister about acid rain and what it does. Mr. Speaker, you say that perhaps he should be more relevant. The forestry sector is concerned about carbons and nitrogens and damage that is being done to the forestry sector. From 1980 to the present we have been standing still or going backwards regarding carbon and sulphur. We put out five billion tonnes a year of sulphur in 1980. We are still putting it out. We put out two million tonnes of nitrogen in 1980. We are still putting it out. The memorandum of intent with the U.S. is in a state of limbo. Noranda will not have any controls, unless it is forced, at half a million tonnes a year. Inco, at 850,000 tonnes a year, say they do have the money. Falconbridge is doing a pretty good job at hiding behind Inco. The two main sources in Manitoba are just being monitored but there have been no controls. Ontario Hydro is a disgrace. They have no program at all except to get off coal burning and go over to using uranium. They have the problem of high level nuclear waste that they have not even solved yet. They are not environmentalists. They are just using that issue to hide the fact that they are going to get out of coal completely, which was never the recommendation of anybody around the House of Commons. That is the state of acid rain, sulphur and carbon in Canada, Mr. Speaker.

I will end with this. I heard the statement made before I got here that there is a difference between a politician and a statesman. A politician has to look to the next election and a statesman to the next generation. I do not think that these things are mutually exclusive. During Question Period we can be politicians, have a lot of fun and attack each other. When it comes to what is going to feed us and our kids and is going to take care of our workers, then we can be statesmen. On the question of forestry we can be statesmen. We can work together federally and provincially between Parties. We can bring to the attention of the Canadian public that it is vital and necessary. We can give it more attention. We can get better budgets and we can do what has to be done.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Questions and comments? The Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River.

Mr. Oberle: Mr. Speaker, the obvious question that occurs to me as a Member of the Opposition is that if it is so great a priority of the Members of the northern Ontario Liberal caucus to establish a Forestry Ministry and to restore the Department of Forestry and the Federal Forest Service to the position that it enjoyed under the administration of the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker from 1960 onwards, what influence does that part of the Liberal caucus have on the administration? What kind of response does he and his colleagues from northern Ontario get from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to their efforts to bring about a greater awareness? There is an awareness now throughout the country in all the communities that he enumerated; the scientific communities, the Science Council of Canada, the forest industry, the forest community in general, 300 small municipalities through the country, many in northern Ontario entirely dependent on that one industry. What response is there from the Prime Minister to their efforts to establish a forest Ministry and bring about a forest renaissance?

Mr. Irwin: Mr. Speaker, I personally have not spoken to the Prime Minister about this particular problem. Since the countervailing tariff dispute we have had with the United States my prognosis is that within the next five years we will have such a Ministry. We talk about Ministries of Youth. I think Ministries of Forestry are more important because they help the youth. I see a wave now that was sparked off by the Washington State-B.C. countervailing tariff dispute that has shown the importance of the forestry sector that may do just that if we stay with it, if there are more Opposition days like this and if more of us get out in the public. If that does not happen, there will be no such Ministry.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Debate.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to follow the Hon. Member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Irwin) because of the comments that he made

in conclusion about the difference between the stateman's approach and the politician's approach. I think you too, Mr. Speaker, would probably agree that forestry of all matters requires the statesman's approach, if only because it takes anywhere from 40 to 80 years for a tree to mature and be a resource that we can use in this country. We must look beyond the next election in forestry. That is one of the problems that has beset all Parties.

I am delighted that, despite the misgivings that I might have had about this particular resolution insofar as it involves the expenditure of public funds to set up a new Ministry, it has been accepted for debate so that we may continue today what we started yesterday.

● (1540)

In order to further that notion about how long it takes for the trees to mature and be of use to our society, I would like to quote a comment made by one who has devoted his working life to forestry. He is Mr. Les Reed, who was, until very recently, as the Assistant Deputy Minister in the Department of Environment in the federal Government dealing with forestry. He made a notable contribution at that time and one of the comments he made was, "Land is not something we inherit from our parents but something we borrow from our children". This is just as true of the forests. We do not inherit forests from our parents but they are something we borrow from our children. We must borrow them very carefully and we must make sure that they are restored so that our children will be able to harvest the forest.

Once again, I think of those young people who are sitting in the Chamber as pages. It is their forests that we are consuming, and if we want to borrow them we must replace them. They are not our forests, they are their forests and we must replace them in such a way and with such scientific precision that they will know, when their turn comes, how to use them in that way as well and pass those forests on to the next generation. This is one of the most important messages that we must draw from this particular debate of today and yesterday.

If we think we are being inventive by deciding to bring this matter up today, I would just like to remind the House and those who will read the *Debates*, that as long ago as 1938 the same message was laid out before us by economists and economic historians of Canada in a book on the relations between Canada and the United States. It is a series by the Ryerson Press. The principal author as A. R. M. Lower, and the other contributors were Prof. Carrothers of the University of British Columbia and Prof. Saunders. While I am sure this was written earlier than 35 years ago, A. R. M. Lower had this to say at page 201:

> Scientific reforestation may play a part, for much of old Ontario has soil fitted best for tree growth and for the white pine especially.

Speaking of white pine, I recall in the reading I was doing in preparation for this debate, although I cannot locate it at the moment, that in the days when the woods were being wantonly destroyed in Ontario—cleared for agricultural purposes but thoughtlessly destroyed—a white pine stood 250 feet high not far from where we are standing. The Peace Tower is just over 300 feet high. Have you seen a white pine standing 250 feet high?

Mr. Evans: Neither have you.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): No, I have not.

Mr. Evans: Because they do not grow that high.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): They used to and they ought to. That is the purpose of this debate. It is to make sure that that age can return and that we shall again see trees of that magnitude and of that beauty.

I do not know whether the Hon. Member remembers that there was a storm out in British Columbia approximately a week ago which blew down some trees in Cathedral Grove on the road from Nanaimo to Port Alberni. Since members of the road crew were on strike, the people went out and cleared the road. The trees that fell across the road—and I hope they were not my favourite trees—came from a grove on the south side of that road and were standing there over 750 years ago. Those trees were standing 20 feet tall when the Magna Carta was being signed. That shows the durability of those magnificent trees.

I believe that one cannot be deeply and irrevocably tied to the soil and know what Canada is until one has seen the trees in Cathedral Grove, looked up and seen them standing hundreds of feet in the air. They have been standing there for over 700 years and it is an awesome sight.

That is what we must preserve. One of the ways of preserving it, I believe, is to follow the recommendation that is in this resolution and return to that age when there indeed was a Ministry of Forestry in the Canadian Government. The record of that Ministry was laid before us this morning by the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle). That Ministry was instituted by the administration of the Right Hon. John George Diefenbaker and was then dismantled and redistributed after a period of about seven years by the Liberals. At the insistence of the Government of the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark), at least a special forestry branch of the Department of Environment was established and Les Reed, whom I mentioned earlier, was brought in to head that particular branch.

Today we are dealing with a renewable resource. I think we should recall the difference between renewable and non-renewable resources. I would like to remind the House of the manner in which the Alberta Government is dealing with a non-renewable resource. It has established, for posterity, for those like these young pages and their children who come after us, a fund which it calls the Heritage Fund. It was established out of the revenue of a non-renewable resource. While we are talking today about a renewable resource, we can establish a heritage fund as well. This is possible if we behave as the Hon. Member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Irwin) has suggested, like statesmen, and remember that that renewable resource has to be planted, tended and then harvested. It will then be harvest-

ed not by us and perhaps not even by the next generation or even their children. However, this can be done progressively, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I am not telling you anything you do not know, considering the Province from which you come. It rests to a considerable extent on wood and wood products.

● (1550)

I have before me two advertisements produced by the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association of Canada. One appeared in *The Globe and Mail* on November 7. The other one is from one of the editions of this month's *Maclean's* magazine. They are pulp and paper reports, and and I am delighted to put on the record that the industry has done at least this much. In 1977 the pulp and paper industry claimed it spent $170 million in forest renewal across Canada. Five years later those expenditures reached $300 million. These expenditures for forest renewal did not double in five years. In the next five years—this is a projection up to 1987—the pulp and paper industry expects to reach forest renewal expenditures amounting to $650 million. That is barely a doubling over the previous five years. That does not take into account the backlog that has to be restored if your forest industry in 40, 50, 60, 70 years down the line is to be a meaningful resource in this country.

Here is the second advertisement from *Maclean's* for November 21, 1983. I think it is a shameful one in some respects, commendable and heartening in another. This particular advertisement indicates that the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association is now making use of waste paper and recycling it in order to prevent the wanton destruction of our forests, in order to make use of a product that has already been processed.

Since 1977 to 1983, the Canadian pulp and paper industry has not quite doubled the amount of newsprint or paper, mainly newsprint, which it is recycling in order to save trees. But here is the surprising thing, Mr. Speaker. The industry has admitted it right in the advertisement as follows:

> In fact, over one-third of the recyclable paper consumed by Canadian mills is purchased elsewhere, mostly in the United States.

We are importing used newspapers in order to produce more newspapers. The rate at which the Canadian people—and I think Parliament is not to be exempted from this criticism either—pour forth paper is enormous. While it may be somewhat amazing, it is also frightening, terrifying, because it means that some of our forests have to be destroyed.

I read a recent publication, which I would commend to all who are interested in the forestry matter in Canada, a publication called "Cut and Run", subtitled "The Assault on Canada's Forests" by Jamie Swift. At page 208, writing about the consumption of our forests, Mr. Swift says:

> Each year the Great Lakes mill was processing over 200 square miles of the boreal forest.

That was in the early 1980s. That is 200 square miles of virgin forest. That cites just what one company does in order to produce paper. I am sure that in your Province, Mr. Speaker, in the Province of the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) and the Hon. Member for Sault Ste. Marie and in my Province as many square miles are being destroyed annually. But how many are being replanted? Somehow or other we have to think beyond the next election and have our forests restored so there will be that heritage fund to reproduce and replicate, to use the modern word, in living timber the heritage fund that has been established in Alberta to deal with the wasting resource, the non-renewable resource that is being consumed rather wantonly, I think by us, but being produced in Alberta.

There are so many of these facts which I would be pleased to be able to set forward uneditorialized. Maybe what we need is to be shocked into realizing how wanton we are with that which is not ours, which is ours in trust but which really belongs to the generations to follow, and which we received and should keep in trust, restore and reforest.

There are a number of such stories in this book entitled "Cut and Run" by Jamie Swift. I do not even know where to start because the cost, for example, in 1978, of regenerating a single hectare of forest is calculated in British Columbia as being about $500. What is it now, five years later? That is replacing only those trees cut that year, not taking account of the backlog and replacing those so that we will have something approximating the forest resource that we were so fortunate to inherit.

I do not know how much time I have left but there is one other thing I want to mention: not only are humans attacking our forests but we have to deal with fire and insects as well. We have to deal with those problems. I think we should do so jointly and co-operatively. But I cannot see this Government, because of its confrontational policies, really facing this problem.

We also have to remember that our forests are very much involved in the climate we have. They provide the shade, or they used to, for the soil so that when the rain does fall it does not evaporate immediately. The trees provide nutrients when the leaves or when the needles fall. Even when some of the trees are chopped down, nutrients are provided for the soil so the next generation of trees may grow. Trees break the wind and thereby prevent erosion.

Those of you who may have crossed the Prairies in the 1930s, as I did, can remember farms just moving from west to east. Trees used to be known on the Prairies but they have been destroyed.

The Sahara desert is gradually creeping south because of the manner in which those south of the Sahara are using what little scrub there is to boil beans or whatever it is, and this is causing the Sahara to expand foot after foot, year after year. Let us remember that our forests are not just a resource to make money. They are a resource for our protection.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Questions, comments, debate?

• (1600)

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, at least once a year in the House we have a debate on Canada's forests. I think it is altogether fitting and proper. As has been said numerous times already today, no resource is more important to the country than our forests.

I will try to make my remarks today along the lines of the two or three speakers who preceded me and stay away from the partisan approach. I believe the forests of Canada are too important for partisan politics. I could pose many questions to the two Members of the Official Opposition who have already spoken, but I will leave it to another time. However, I want to say that it is unfortunate the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) had to refer to the so-called confrontational attitude of the Government of Canada in dealing with the Provinces. Of course that is nothing but an invention of the Tory Party and the Tory provincial Government. No Government in the history of the country has ever been more generous with its tax resources to the Provinces than this Government. In fact, in my Province forestry is more important to the daily livelihood and to the economy of the Province than in any other Canadian Province. Most of the provincial budget comes directly or indirectly from Ottawa. The forests of New Brunswick are noted to be the most productive in Canada. We harvest more wood per acre and we have more acres per capita in our forests than any other Province in Canada. I believe more people in New Brunswick rely on the forests for part or all their livelihood than in any other Province. Yet it has only been in very recent times that any serious effort has been made to ensure that the forests will be regenerated; we still have a very long way to go.

There are companies in New Brunswick that have exploited the forests for generations and until the last two or three years never planted a tree. Now, under the new regime of the Department responsible for natural resources, they are required to take much better care of the forests than they have in the past. We have a lot of room in which to grow in the forest industry, but it is diminishing all the time because of the waste of the past and the waste of the present. Unless we stop the wanton waste of wood fibre, we will not have room for expansion.

This is one of the reasons I believe there should be a Minister of Forestry at the national level in Canada. It is rather strange that we have Ministers of State for almost everything imaginable these days, but we do not have a Minister of Forestry responsible for a predominant industry in Canada which is the largest earner of foreign dollars and our biggest provider of jobs. In fact, Canada sells enough forest products on a yearly basis to offset more than our deficit in auto trade. Those are pretty significant figures. We should have a federal Department of Forestry with a Minister in charge of Forestry at the national level, his Department being a co-ordinating body for research and development, if nothing else.

However, I can understand why there is not one. When there was a federal Ministry of Forestry, co-operation and co-ordination among various Provinces and the federal Government were not all that great. Some Provinces were jealous that there was a federal Minister of Forestry and indicated quite boldly that there should not be such a Minister at the federal level because forestry was a provincial responsibility. If there is no Minister of Forestry today, it is not just the federal Government which must shoulder the blame. Let us not worry about the blame. Let us continue to lobby for a federal Department and a federal Minister of Forestry which will be the co-ordinator and facilitator of research and development in forestry that we need so much if we are to continue to be the leader in forestry products we have been over the years. That will take some co-operative federalism and some co-operative provincialism.

It would be interesting to know—and I hope in coming months that we will know—what the Tory policy on forestry will be. I look forward to hearing it and debating it. I do not think any Party will be able to go to the Canadian people in the future without a clear policy on an issue as important as forestry.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: You change your policy after an election; that is the trouble.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): We have a prairie forester, a city forester, speaking from his seat because he has nothing to say on his feet.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: There are lots of trees in Saskatoon.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): He is not a bad guy; he just talks too much. A moment ago I spoke about the willful destruction and waste of our forests. I wonder how many additional products there might be and what value they might have if we utilized all the wood harvested in the country. It has only been in very recent times and as a result of an incentive program of the Government of Canada that we have had major forestry plants using their own waste products as hog fuel to cut down on the consumption of other natural resources such as petroleum.

Also it is important to realize that forestry is not only important from the point of view of the money or products obtained from wood fibre. It is important for other reasons as well. To some extent the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich referred to how the land will dry up and turn to desert if there are not the necessary plants to hold in the moisture. Some of the plants have to be sturdy plants like trees. There are other consequences which we have to bear in mind in terms of the destruction of our forests, such as what it does to our lakes, rivers and streams, to the wildlife of the forests and to valuable fish resources which spawn in our water systems. I have no doubt that one of the main reasons for the decline in Atlantic salmon stock is the denuding of the forests of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec where not very many years ago the rivers were rich and teeming with salmon; today they are very scarce indeed. It is not the only reason. Some pretty foolish management policies contributed to that as well. Wanton destruction of those species in the oceanographic feeding

grounds by greedy nations also contributed to that situation. Destruction of the forest contributes to the destruction of our wildlife, fish and water resources as well as to the destruction of recreational facilities and land. It contributes to the greater devastation of forests when fire strikes.

• (1610)

Many who spoke before me spoke about the need for better management of the forests in order to protect them. For example, there should be a better expenditure of funds on forest roads. That is important. As well, we need a strong program to educate our young people. There are many of my generation who will never learn that unless they respect each tree of the forest, they will not respect them all. The roads that have been constructed and which give easy access to the forest today also contribute to the destruction of the forest through greater incidents of fire and theft of wood. It may sound like a rather strange occurrence in Canada that someone would steal wood, but that happens all the time. For example, the Department of Natural Resources of New Brunswick loses thousands of dollars each year in stumpage fees because of stolen wood. I am sure it happens in other Provinces as well.

I will conclude so that more Members will have an opportunity to participate in this debate. I reiterate my support for a federal Department of Forestry or federal Ministry of Forestry with a full-time Minister who will co-ordinate and plan with the Provinces if they agree to do so in order to enhance the reforestation and the re-establishment of the wealth of forests that once were Canada's.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Questions, comments, debate?

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, there is probably a little under-estimation of the value of the forest industry. Canada's forest industry contributes to our balance of trade, more than agriculture, mining, oil and gas all put together, more surplus than they do in our trade balance. It should not be correlated merely to the auto trade imbalance, but must be recognized as the greatest contribution that we have to our favourable balance of trade. I repeat what the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) said. It is indeed fact that, relatively speaking, the forest industry to New Brunswick is of more economic importance than it is to the Province of British Columbia, which happens to have a multitude of other resources contributing to its GNP, many more than we have in New Brunswick. I would like to read some remarks I made some time ago with respect to the forests.

It was of little consequence 300 years ago that insect or disease infestation might wipe out wide areas of a particular species. With or without probable fire, nature would then replace a dead species with another. Maybe spruce would be followed by white birch and poplar, in turn to be replaced by other varieties familiar to all of us. Pine, maple, spruce or birch forests were never in one area in perpetuity, and the supply of all species was never constant in any century. Nature followed its own course. Budworm damage was then of no particular consequence. It ate itself out of house and home and starved to death. It would do the same today, in this century.

Federal Government participation in forestry as it relates to New Brunswick has been in the University of New Brunswick, the Acadia Research Station, in the research area of forestry associated with the University, and it has indeed made a contribution, but there must be a greater contribution made. I am not particularly critical of the historic conduct of the forest industry because that industry operated within a different sphere than the industry which is operating today. It operated in a sphere of over-supply of product in a viable location for the viable operation of lumber mills, pulpmills and so on.

That era in New Brunswick disappeared in 1970 or thereabouts. With encouragement from Government and with the proper investment opportunity which existed, new operations opened in New Brunswick which then reached a level of consumption which absorbed the production of our forests in total. Unfortunately, at about the same time the budworm had made an infestation in our forests which reduced our annual growth and reduced our available supply of wood. I want to give you an idea of just how that supply is balanced at this moment in time.

All told, the wood supply available annually for the New Brunswick industry on a sustainable basis totalled 7.9 million cubic metres annually. The softwood supply from small freehold totalled 1.7 million cubic metres, from large freehold, 1.4 million cubic metres, from Crown, 4 million cubic metres, and the net import/export amounted to .8 million cubic metres, for a total of 7.9 million cubic metres available to the industry.

How well do softwood demand and supply balance? The balance between sofwood demand and supply in New Brunswick is extremely tight. The 7.9 million cubic metres available annually will meet the average annual consumption levels of the existing softwood industry on a continuing basis. The forest could not sustain the industry if it operated continuously at its maximum capacity of 8.8 million cubic metres annually.

The annual demand must be matched by an annual supply both in terms of total volume and in terms of the quality of raw material. While a major portion of the total demand is in the form of pulpwood, which has a relatively low quality requirement, sawmills require about 30 per cent of the total roundwood volume, and this must be in logs that are of a size and form suitable for conversion into lumber.

Based on present sawlog specifications, the current sawlog harvest cannot be maintained in the future. This is a chronic problem. The custom of high-grading the forest for the highest quality components began with the exploitation of white pine and has continued ever since with an inexorable decline in the quality of material available at each successive harvest. The balance between demand and supply for raw materials to the forest industry indicates that, in terms of quantity, New Brunswick can maintain its present softwood industry, but that there is no room for expansion. New Brunswick is harvesting quality material faster than it is produced in the forest. Please note, Mr. Speaker, that New Brunswick is harvesting material

faster than it is produced in the forest. That means that we in New Brunswick are harvesting our capital. We are withdrawing from our bank account, and this is a very serious situation. Sawmills, and other users of quality material, will have to adopt better utilization standards than are currently practised, and accept lower quality raw material, if they wish to survive in the future.

• (1620)

Can this balance be improved, Mr. Speaker? I submit to you that it can, but it can only be improved if forest policies in New Brunswick and, in a very rapidly expanding way, in all of the Provinces recognize that our present forest harvest is at a level which puts us in the sphere of farming on forest land. If we do not treat this land and its harvest as the agricultural sector would treat its crops, we will find ourselves in a position which will be economically embarrassing. It will then, of course, become a very important social problem.

I am, have been and shall continue to be supportive of the agricultural approach to forest management and harvesting until greater evidence than has ever been amassed as yet can persuade me otherwise. I would like to tell you why this is so, Mr. Speaker. I remember at one time being associated in the provincial Legislature with the former Minister of Highways from the County of Northumberland, Mr. Anderson. He is since deceased and was quite old when I knew him. However, he said to me: "I want to tell you, Fred, about a time when we had the budworm in the Miramichi. I was just a young boy at that time, but the devastation that that budworm perpetrated in our area was such that one could stand on a hilltop and look for miles and not see a live evergreen tree." He said: "You could go into the woods to hunt. There were no deer and no moose, but you could travel on deadfalls without ever putting a foot on the ground because those evergreen trees had died as a result of the budworm presence." He went on to say: "My family was a forest family," as I am sure the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi knows, "and our family business existed and survived for years with only little patches of forest. However, while we existed, virtually all of the then massive logging industry on the Miramichi disappeared from existence."

How important was that conversation, Mr. Speaker? The Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi will remember when Chatham was one of the biggest banking centres in Canada by virtue of the export of lumber from the Miramichi and other watersheds close enough to be exported through that facility. More money changed hands in banks in Chatham than in most city banks in Canada. The depression which exists on the Miramichi today can be attributed in very large measure to the early decline of the forest industry and its failure even to this day to recoup itself through natural regeneration to the level that existed in 1900.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): It started in 1825.

Mr. McCain: This was an additional infestation. The first one was in 1825.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): And the great fire.

Mr. McCain: At that point in time, the great fire of the Miramichi took place, and I think it is of interest to note that if one is to examine the history of the forest from the Miramichi to the Penobscot watershed, one would find that the budworm did in fact virtually eliminate forest from the estuary of the Miramichi to the Penobscot watershed in the State of Maine, and most of it burned shortly thereafter. It is from that state that nature did regenerate a forest.

I say that we must farm the industry because we have what is known as a fire forest. That is the official professional term applied to the kind of forest that exists particularly in eastern Canada. The forest grows up, matures and becomes a victim of old age, insect or disease and is replaced. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you yourself can remember the white ridges of hardwood that came into existence as the yellow birch died and whitened. We no longer had a significant hardwood industry over those ridges nor will we have in this century any significant yellow birch harvest.

That is an example of what has happened to the forest in our lifetime. We are also experiencing at present the infestation of the budworm. I will refer to an example of what would happen if we do not treat this industry as a farm operation. As all Hon. Members will remember, there was a court case in Nova Scotia, and I am sorry that I do not have my summary of that court case with me. I have said this before and I reiterate it because it is so important. Among other evidence given at that trial, it was said that if forest management is not improved and if the budworm is continually allowed to ravage that forest, there will be a loss of 8,000 jobs in the forest industry in the Cape Breton area of the Province of Nova Scotia. That is what we are looking at in southwest New Brunswick where we have already lost 10 million cords of wood, wood that is no longer fit for harvest. That is the price we have paid. How close does that price come to the loss of 8,000 jobs in the southwest corner of my Province?

Those who object to spraying the forests have said many a time that forest management is the answer, and I agree. However, the application of pesticide must become a part of forest management if we are to have a forest crop at all. Why is that, Mr. Speaker? That is the only way the reforestation referred to by the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi can be carried out effectively in not all but in much of New Brunswick, because the soil is so productive that not only will it produce wood fibre but it will produce ferns, white birches, blueberries and hazelnut bushes. These plants spring up almost simultaneously when the ground is denuded of forest coverage. If we then reforest that ground and if we do not protect the seedlings from the cover of these weeds—and I refer to them in the farming sense as weeds because they are not of an economic value—do you know, Mr. Speaker, what the mortality rate would be of the little trees that are planted there? It

would be higher in some instances than 80 per cent in the reforested area. If we do not find and use a weed killer which will in fact protect the reforested area, our efforts at reforestation will virtually be in vain and we will not be able to anticipate a crop.

I have some sympathy for the environmentalists who say that we should not spray the forests. However, I shall ask them to have sympathy for me. I am allergic to wool. Should I then form an association for all of us who are allergic to wool and say: "Let us destroy all of the sheep in the world because I am allergic to wool"? I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be as practical for me to say that as for the environmentalists to say: "Let us not spray at all." That is the problem.

I speak particularly about the forest industry in New Brunswick because I know it so well. Not only in New Brunswick but in Canada as a whole, we must start to farm our forests. I do not want to be partisan because this subject is too dear to my heart. However, I do want to say one thing. If there is support for good forestry practices in this nation and in the House of Commons, I ask for that support from all Members of the House. So that the Forestry Committee of the House of Commons can in fact sit down and study the best forest management practices that can be put in place. Along with the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker), I tried to generate meetings like this last srping, but they fell afoul of someone's opinion about what the committee should do and there were only one or two meetings held.

● (1630)

Since we are not going to be partisan, I will support the Government and ask Government backbenchers and Ministers to support me. Let us study the forest industry in committee. Let us put on the table all the facts concerning the hazards of pesticide application, forest management, fire forests and the rotation of crops in our forest lands. In that way let us learn to understand the economic meaning of forestry, why it should have the attention of that committee and why we should have a Minister of Forestry.

Since I have been in this House, Mr. Speaker, forestry has been the responsibility of the Minister of the Environment. There has been an automatic conflict of interest which has never been resolved. The environment dominated employees working at any level in forestry, and I wonder how often the ADM of forestry had access to the Minister and how often he was told to go through his Deputy Minister, not to the Minister of the Environment. That happened, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe the present Minister knows that, and I believe it is proper to give him credit for not knowing that that situation existed in the forestry branch of his Department.

The initial action in New Brunswick for reforestation, Mr. Speaker, was taken by the Irving interests, and they deserve full marks for their leadership. They are approaching the point at which they are planting as many trees as they are harvesting. They have set the example which has stimulated Government and other forest harvesters to take more action in reforestation. But that brings us back to forest management. If we do not manage in such a way that the reforested plots are allowed to grow productively, then that is a serious loss to both the Irving interests and the Province of New Brunswick, along with all other interested parties.

We have been told not to spray; let us manage the forests. Our forests are in such a position that if we begin management now, the earliest adequate supply of pulp we can supply is 30 to 40 years away, in some areas 50 years away, depending on the growth capability of the land. If we are looking at replenishing the supply for the saw log industry, it will be from 40 to 70 years. If we are looking at hardwood species, we are looking at 100 years. That is the kind of management program that has to be in place. But we cannot wait for reproduction of trees; we must preserve the trees we have. Therefore, not only should we have a Minister of Forestry, but we should immediately have, with or without him, a meaningful and in depth forest study in committee, and I challenge the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi: let us get it.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen)—National Revenue—Designation of British Columbia School Board as charitable organization; the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow):—Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission—Pay TV—Sale of First Choice network. (b) Request that Minister review Commission's decision; the Hon. Member for Peterborough (Mr. Domm)—Metric Conversion—Court decision on legality of Imperial and Metric Measurement Systems—Government position. (b) Inquiry whether appeal will be launched.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 62—FORESTRY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Riis:

That the Government respond to the emergency in the forestry sector by:

1. creating a new Forestry Ministry with the mandate to advance the Canadian forestry industry; and

2. convening a conference at the earliest opportunity of responsible Federal and Provincial Ministers to address the challenges presently facing the forestry sector.

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter this debate. Before putting a bit of factual material on the record, I would like to spend a few moments touching upon what the Minister responsible for Forestry had to say. The motion before the House is really quite simple and one would have hoped it would have been supportable by the Government. It is designed to set up a new Ministry under a senior Cabinet Minister and set a date for a First Ministers' conference to deal in a much more serious way with the plight of the forest industry in Canada. It is interesting that the two Liberals other than the Minister who spoke, the Hon. Member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Irwin) and the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) supported these two ideas. It seems the Minister has left himself somewhat out on a limb in that he seems to be the only one speaking in this debate today who is opposed to this very sensible idea.

The reasons the Minister put on the record for saying no to this proposal seem to me to be highly simplistic. He says there are no facts to support a separate Ministry, but I am going to add a few further facts to those already put on the record today by those who support the idea. The Minister went on to say that the major thing done in the three years this Government has been in power is that regional economic expansion programs have been placed under the umbrella of the Canadian Forestry Service and Environment Canada, and the $34 million has been put into a fund to top up the UIC. Well, that is the Liberal response to the largest single industry in Canada, certainly the most important in balance of trade, employment, and an industry which is now in dire trouble.

I think a few of the facts I am going to put on record today will make clear why Canadians across this country, certainly in the 300 main forestry communities, are alarmed that the federal Government is doing nothing really to help in reforestation or finding new markets, new technology and so on.

As I think most Members know, the Science Council of Canada came out with an extensive report just over a month ago. I would like to put some of that on the record because I think it is important that the Minister finds the time, since he could not be in the House today for this important debate, to sift through a few facts one night while he is mulling over the need for a Minister for forestry. I quote:

On a world scale, Canada has more than 10 percent of the world's forest resources. The total area of Canada is 9.9 million Km^2. Over 40 percent of our land area is in forests which cover more than 4.4 million Km^2 and contain a wood volume of about 23 billion cubic metres. About one-half is commercially productive forest land with the balance having some tree cover but not capable of sustaining significant annual wood volume production.

About 10 percent of Canada's land area, 4 percent of Canada's forest land, and 19 percent of Canada's productive forest lands are found in British Columbia. The most productive forests are also located in British Columbia as evidenced by the fact that the Province has more than 40 percent of the total wood volume in the nation.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF OUR FORESTS

Canada's forests generate an industry worth $23 billion. It has more economic impact in terms of our country's trade balance than agriculture, mining, fishing and fuels combined. More than 300 communities, many in British Columbia, are solely dependent upon the forest for their existence and provision of a high standard of living for their residents.

In excess of 10 percent of the nation's employment, more than 1,000,000 jobs, is generated by forests and forest manufacturing. In British Columbia, more than 100,000 people, second only to the retail trade sector, are directly employed by the forest industry. Approximately 40 percent of the wealth of B.C. is generated through forest-based activities.

Mr. Speaker, those first few statistics should reveal to the Government side the need to have someone senior on the front benches dealing with forestry matters. We have Ministers of State for almost everything imaginable, lotteries, you name it. But for Canada's largest, most important industry we have no one effectively speaking for forestry from the Government side. The Science Council of Canada articulated a few of today's problems, which I think is also worth having on the record for Hon. Members to mull over, and I quote:

● (1640)

The forests of Canada are renewable but *not* without a degree of reinvestment of the wealth they create. Government and the public have perceived the forests of Canada as an endless resource that requires little attention to maintain productivity after harvesting. More than 800,000 hectares are harvested annually in our country but less than 25 percent are planted or seeded. The Canadian Forestry Service estimates that 25 to 50 percent of the area harvested annually fails to regenerate or reverts to non-commercial weeds. Losses due to fire, insects, disease and wind are equal to two-thirds of the annual harvest, more than 90 million cubic metres annually. This waste of productive land lying idle is a national shame and will result in serious consequences for the future and our nation's ability to employ its citizens. The results will affect all sectors of our society. The costs of dealing with the problems increase annually and will not be solved by short-term, single-program solutions.

The situation in British Columbia is somewhat better than the rest of the country but only marginally. Less than half of the forest area cut annually is replanted. The balance can be left for natural regeneration but still requires some degree of assessment or treatment to prepare for a new crop. More than 1,000,000 hectares need reforestation and B.C. is adding 20,000 to 50,000 hectares annually to the situation. Recent B.C. Ministry of Forests budget cuts will increase the problems.

I believe the Association of B.C. Professional Foresters has really hit the nail on the head. In British Columbia now we have a Social Credit Government which is interested in cuts. At the same time it is allowing forestry companies to take the profits which they have made historically from the forest industry to Indonesia, to Brazil, offshore or wherever. However, the industry is as culpable as are those right wing Governments which refuse to put money back into making sure we have good quality forests for future generations to reap.

The recommendations, Mr. Speaker, are of particular importance and I am only going to put two of them on the record. However, I believe they are particularly important because the foresters call them "Political Impediments to Forest Management". Point four, I believe, is worth mentioning, and I quote:

High technology, political fascination with high profile projects such as jet planes, nuclear reactors and electronics are viewed by many as the prime economic motivators for job creation in the future. We believe that the forests of our nation suffer from our efforts being applied to areas that do not result in

wealth creation. The forests and their management can utilize our best efforts in the fields of technology.

Time is a major factor in forest management in our country. We take 40 to 100 hundred years to produce a commercially harvestable tree. In the growing period of a forest, there can be as many as 20 elected governments, all with varying priorties and demands from the public. Forest management suffers from instability in government priorities and this has been the case in Canada to date. We need a long-term commitment to management with fixed goals that aim to maintain productivity of the forest land base. We cannot continue to shift our priorities in the forestry arena.

I believe that really hits the nail on the head. Governments are always promising to do things, yet in the lifespan of a forest, as the foresters point out, there may be 20 or more Governments, all with different priorities as to what they want to do. Some want to spray. Some want to cut. Some do not want to replant. Some do not want to put any money back into forestry, and some do. It is one of the largest problems we have to face in this country. As I said before, this is only the second time in the longest sitting Parliament in the history of this country that the issue of forestry has been debated. One of the recommendations of the professional foresters is worth quoting: It reads:

The federal government estimates that the benefits of improved management would create 100,000 new jobs, increase product sales by $22 billion and increase exports by $12 billion, doubling the present values, have significant indirect benefits in supply and service industries, and create additional tax revenues of $3 billion.

One cannot help but wonder why, Mr. Speaker, for such a small investment with such large potential benefits to be accrued, not only to workers but to the economy generally, the Government continues to sit on its hands.

The report goes on, and I believe here is where we really see the results of forest policies for British Columbia and Canada generally:

European foresters have estimated that Canada could produce three to four times more wood per hectare through better practices. The Scandinavian countries (Norway, Sweden and Finland) are capable of cutting a volume of timber equal to all that is harvested in Canada. The production is from an area of one-third to one-quarter of Canada's productive forest land.

It is astonishing, Mr. Speaker, how backward our policies are in this country. They recommend the following:

The present status of the Canadian Forestry Service must be elevated to a departmental level with its own Minister to reflect the actual importance of forests to the nation.

I quote that for the record, and for the Minister who thought there were no facts. I believe Hon. Members of this House need to know where the priorities of this Government lie in terms of forestry.

Just a few days ago I received a letter from the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) extolling the virtues of CIDA and what he is doing internationally. Many of the projects which I am going to touch on today are ones which I support and endorse. However, I believe Canadians from coast to coast must be alerted to what the present Government is doing—and what its Tory colleagues did while they were in government—with forestry projects internationally. From 1976 to 1983, Mr. Speaker, the federal Government has spent $430,165,000 on 102 international forestry projects. Before I comment on some of the specifics of that, Mr. Speaker, it is worth quoting from *The Globe and Mail* of March 24 of this year. The headline reads "Forest spending seen rising to $650 million in five years". It was the big announcement of the then Minister responsible for Forestry, now Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts), who said the following:

"The federal Government is moving into increased direct support of forest renewal,"—

"We have approval in principle to spend a minimum of $130-million a year by 1987," compared with $50 million in 1982, he said.

This Government, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, spent this year $18 million in Guyana for forest management and planning. Canada is spending in one country, Guyana, half of what it is spending in the whole of our country for our largest industry. In Bangladesh, for rehabilitation and upgrading of a mill, it spent $8 million; $35 million in India for a social forestry project; $25 million in Honduras, with a militarily inclined government, for "development of a new district in the Corocito region, including forest industry". The Government has spent in Honduras this year half of what it spent in all of Canada for silviculture, and so on. In Brazil, for post-graduate training in Canada to the Ph.D. level, it spent $800,000. We offer better programs in forestry training to Brazilians than we do to Canadians, whether they be from Vancouver or Prince Rupert, British Columbia, or from Fredericton, New Brunswick. There was $3.5 million spent in Peru for the establishment of a post-graduate school in forestry sciences, and a further $26 million spent in Peru for a loan for logging and sawmilling equipment. It goes on, Mr. Speaker, page after page. In most cases, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, these are very worthwhile projects, but what kind of government spends more money every single year on forestry outside of Canada than inside its own country for its single largest industry? I will leave it to Canadians to determine what kind of government that is. However, I think we can agree that it is a government which is not particularly bright or future-oriented.

The business section of the Vancouver *Sun* last week ran a headline which reads, "Foresters condemn hydro projects". I raised this today in the House with the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) and the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Caccia). I pointed out, again as the B.C. Professional Association of Foresters have noted, that 20,000 permanent forestry jobs have been lost or are about to be lost in British Columbia as a result of flooding for B.C. Hydro projects. They go on to point out that some 834,000 hectares of land are flooded, are reserved for flooding, or for power lines and so on.

● (1650)

Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth noting that the last speaker was from New Brunswick. Maritimers know that Prince Edward Island covers only 565,000 square kilometers. We have a situation in British Columbia where we are losing our very best forest land. We are damaging our salmon and fisheries resources. We are damaging our tourism because all the dams have draw-down areas so at certain times of the year the banks of these man-made lakes are muddy and there is no

tourism potential. They were not properly logged. Mr. Speaker, the association concludes by saying:

The Association believes alternatives to large-scale projects exist—such as co-generation of power from industrial processes and waste products. Political will is required to encourage the development of these resources.

The Association's brief was endorsed by a coalition of resource industries, user groups including the B.C. Federation of Agriculture, B.C. Forest Foundation, B.C. Wildlife Federation, the Fisheries Association of B.C., the B.C. Institute of Agrologists, the Canadian Institute of Forestry, Greenpeace and the Sierra Club.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is pretty clear that when we are talking about forestry matters it goes far beyond what one might think. The companies in this country in many cases have gone in and ripped off the resource. They have gone in and cut it, made the biggest boom profit that they can and then they have taken off with the profits and left a heritage, as is pointed out by the Professional Foresters Association, of close to half the land that is logged being of no value to future generations in terms of logging or wildlife values or fishery values and so on.

The Minister of the Environment is saying no to the proposal for a new Ministry. This famous Royal commission with the $800 a day man travelling around does not agree obviously with the Liberal Cabinet. We read this:

FOREST PRIORITY HINTED—MACDONALD PREDICTION AT HEARINGS

Royal commission chairman Donald Macdonald dropped his first hint Thursday about what he will recommend to the federal Government—higher priority for the forest industry.

The article goes on to say that it is about time the federal Government did something about it.

Some of the speakers today touched on the fact that provincial Governments are at least partly responsible for the devastation that we see now in the forest sector. In British Columbia we now recognize that there is what is called a 20 year falldown effect. There simply are not enough trees to continue at today's level of harvest and mill production. We cannot continue to cut at today's rate 20 years from now. Where are the logs going? What are the Tories' good friends in Victoria, Bill Bennett and the Socreds, doing with trees during this downturn in the marketability of pulp and of sawn wood? Mr. Speaker, any day you can take almost any newspaper in British Columbia and see lists of logs for sale, application no. 1914, application for hemlock spruce pulp, Metropolitan Trading, E.R. Probyn Limited, Crown Zellerbach, Canadian Overseas Log, and so on. The Socred proposal is simply to go in and cut the logs and send them overseas, let them be milled somewhere else and let the jobs occur in another country. They consider that to be good business. Let us see what the effect of those kinds of log exports are. I quote from a report run just a little while ago. It reads:

Log exports alone are going to cause a shortfall of 30,000 jobs—

Those are permanent jobs, Mr. Speaker:

—by the year 2000.

The IWA in British Columbia was protesting the export of those logs. Those are the same workers who would be affected by slowing down the cutting of trees for that kind of processing.

Mr. Speaker, *Harrowsmith* recently ran an editorial which I think is worth reflecting on for a moment in the House in terms of whether or not this House is actually going to do something, get a senior Ministry, get a First Ministers' conference together and actually get on with the job of getting the forest sector back on its feet.

Reflecting on the report of the Science Council of Canada, which apparently the Liberals have no intention of pursuing, they say the following:

One-eighth of Canada's productive forest area has deteriorated to the point where huge tracts lie devastated, unable to regenerate a merchantable crop within the next 60 to 80 years. Each year, some 200,000 to 400,000 hectares of valuable forest are being added to this shameful waste.

Those are lands, Mr. Speaker, that are now lying totally idle in terms of the capacity for them to be exploited, whether for pulp marketability or for saw logs:

Annually, from coast to coast, some 350 million tree seedlings are planted in Canada. By contrast, Sweden, which is roughly the size of Alberta, plants 400 million seedlings. Some 300 Canadian communities are primarily dependent on logging and timber processing for their livelihood . . . Moreover, as each job in the woods and mills is associated with one additional job locally and a second elsewhere in the national economy, a decline in the forest industries will have a pervasive effect on the economy as a whole—

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what we are seeing now. The Minister of Employment and Immigration sent me a letter saying I should not worry about getting additional funding from the federal Government because unemployment in the forest sector in Skeena and the northwest of British Columbia is now only 50 per cent of peak employment levels. Well, la-di-da! I simply cannot sympathize with a Government that takes that kind of approach, not only to the individuals affected but to an industry of such great consequence to the country. Canada's forests generate over $1 billion in tax revenues for the federal Government, more than the earnings from fishing, mining, fuels and agriculture combined. What is the Government spending? I think this is what Canadians and workers in the industry need to know. Those in the media need to know this so they can start writing some appropriately sharply pointed editorials about the lackadaisical attitude of the present Government.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from a speech given by Les Reed who was the Assistant Deputy Minister and who brought a ray of hope and sunlight into the Canadian Forest Service of this country. Unfortunately he has now resigned, one can only assume because of the lack of action on the Government side. He said the following:

Provincial, federal, and industry spending for silviculture in 1979 was estimated to be about $178 million. Estimated public revenue generated by the forest industry for 1979 was over $3 billion. Unfortunately, only 5 cents of each dollar of revenue generated to governments is put back through forest renewal.

Mr. Speaker, I think that says it all. The Government, in the largest single wealth producing sector of this country, is only prepared to put back 5 per cent. I think that is shameful. One final point just to sum it up, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired, unfortunately.

Mr. Fulton: Just one more point.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have unanimous consent of the House to continue his remarks?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There appears to be unanimous consent.

Mr. Fulton: Thank you Mr. Speaker. It is a very short point and I will be very quick, pointing out that Canada now imports telephone poles from Finland and railway ties from Malaysia. The quotation of Sir John A. MacDonald of June 22, 1871 is appropriate with which to end my speech:

> The sight of the immense masses of timber passing my window every morning constantly suggests to my mind the absolute necessity there is for looking into the future of this great trade. We are recklessly destroying the timber of Canada, and there is scarcely a possibility of replacing it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there Hon. Members rising to ask questions of the Hon. Member who has just spoken?

Mr. Nickerson: I have a question for the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton), Mr. Speaker. He proposes a very ambitious program, one which in general terms, I am sure, most Members of the House could support to some degree. He would like to see further processing of logs in Canada. He would like to see a good deal more reforestation and attention given to forest lands. If these programs were to be implemented it would undoubtedly be pretty expensive. Has the Member given any attention to how these programs might be financed? Would he expect additional taxation on the forest industry so that Governments could then carry out these programs? Would he further worsen the deficit by spending existing Government revenues without increasing taxation in any way? What would be his approach to the financing of these ambitious programs?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to respond to that. The figures that I put on the record make it quite clear. Of the $3 billion in direct revenue taxation that the Provinces, the Territories and the federal Government are bringing in, only 5 per cent is right now going back into any kind of forestry programs. I am talking here about university level programs relating to silviculture, reforestation, investigation into pesticides and so on. The Government is putting in less than 5 per cent. That revenue is already being brought in so that right now there is $3 billion that I see as being very readily earmarked without changing the level of taxation of anyone in this country, including that of the industry. That money should be first applied to the programs.

• (1700)

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I come from an urban area, as most Members of the House now do, where we have cut down our trees. We know about the forests from what we see from the plane or the train. We also know about them from Canadian literature and the music of singers such as Gordon Lightfoot and Bruce Cockburn who write about the wilderness. I think people from urban areas are aware of our forests.

I know that the Member is perhaps the only Member in the House who actually lives in a log cabin in Tlell, British Columbia. What kinds of jobs are available in the forest industry for urban people if, in fact, the Government did what the Hon. Member suggested, which is to undertake, as also suggested by the Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson), an ambitious program of upgrading the forest industry in this country? What kinds of jobs could people in my riding expect to get from this industry that perhaps they are not getting already?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, the studies that have been completed both by the Association of the British Columbia Professional Foresters and the Science Council of Canada indicate that for every one job there is in the bush, which includes skidder operators, buckers, fallers and people involved in silviculture, road construction, pulp mills and saw mills, which jobs are in rural Canada and mostly in northern Canada and British Columbia, there are two spin-off jobs as a result of the nature of the forest industry. In some Provinces it is 1.7, but across Canada it is roughly two.

When I am talking about a major ambitious program in terms of forestry, moving at least that initial $3 billion into the forest sector and silviculture in order to get those backlogged lands into a growth process, there is an indirect spin-off of two jobs for everyone whether in Vancouver-Kingsway, Edmonton, Regina or anywhere in the country. I think that is the important point that needs to be made to people in urban areas. It is the urban lethargy in this country that is creating the devastation in rural areas.

An example of that is the new proposal in British Columbia, in order to try to get the industry on its feet again, to cut the environmental ease strips. They are the two chain areas along the edges of streams, lakes and rivers in British Columbia which have been put there for good, sound, scientific and biological reasons in order to protect the fish and enhance the wildlife, including moose, deer and bears. Those are now being proposed to be cut as a quick shot injection into the cash flow of the forest companies in British Columbia. Not only is it chaos, it is fiscally, scientifically and biologically criminal to be involved in those kinds of activities, especially when we see the barrenness that already exists in British Columbia.

One can only conclude that the message is not being given by Members of the House, politicians in the country and the media to urban Canadians that it is important to help the forest industry. It is important for the House to take it more seriously. This is only the second time in four years that this vital issue has been debated. As my colleague pointed out, I

built my own home out of logs in my own constituency. I cut the logs, peeled them and built the dwelling myself. I split the shakes. It is beautiful to work with wood and to see the life systems that live within the forest.

As I said earlier, Sir John A. Macdonald noticed 112 years ago what was happening to the forests of this country. Nothing has been done for more than a century but, hopefully, urban Canadians will wake up and realize that there is a great future in spending wealth to create more wealth in this sector of our economy.

Mr. Friesen: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) knows that between Juskatla and Charlotte City in his riding, MacMillan Bloedel is engaging in extensive tree farming and working with hydrids to shorten the growing time for trees and enhance productivity. Is he satisfied with the work that MacMillan Bloedel is doing in his riding?

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Speaker, certainly some of the projects and programs that MacMillan Bloedel and other companies are involved in are good. However, the essential problem I see with corporations such as MacMillan Bloedel is that they are taking the lion's share of cash flow and available capital to Brazil, Indonesia and other areas of the world at a time when one can fly over the Queen Charlottes and see huge areas where there is no regeneration of any kind. What happens when one cuts some of the very ancient forests, which in some cases are 800 to 1,000 years old with trees 20 feet across the butt, is that when the level of precipitation is high the water level comes up and the small trees simply cannot get a good roothold until the stumps actually rot. This means that 40 years from now small seedlings begin to grow on the stumps of the forests cut down around the time of World War II when spruce was cut from the Queen Charlottes for small Mosquito bombers that Canadian airmen flew overseas.

It is a situation in which MacMillan Bloedel is doing something, but I suggest one would be hard pressed to find many knowledgeable foresters in British Columbia who believe that there is a single company in British Columbia which is doing what it should, which is to take a long-term approach to the forest lands which have been tenured to them not simply on behalf of our generation but of many generations to come.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Gimaïel (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, in my riding, the most important industry is the forest industry. In Quebec, and especially in the Saguenay, Lac-Saint-Jean, Abitibi, and Témiscamingue areas, the forest industry, including pulp and paper and sawmills, is the main source of income.

I am delighted that the Member for Kamlops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) decided to present a motion dealing specifically with the forestry industry.

An Hon. Member: Too bad he could not stay in the House!

Mr. Gimaïel: It is too bad he could not stay in the House to hear the rest of the debate, including speeches by his own colleagues from British Columbia who spoke to the motion and asked questions, all of which is of considerable interest to them, to him and to all the people of the Province of British Columbia, which, I must admit, made a tremendous impression on me when I was there, especially the trees which are fantastic. I think this marvelous wood from British Columbia is one of our most beautiful resources, and one that is so often used in Canadian artifacts and in decorating our own homes, and as for the New Democratic Party, as I was saying, I am happy to note its interest in the forest industry.

I admit I am a little more surprised at the position taken by the Progressive Conservative Party, because I was told that this morning, the Progressive Conservative Party's House Leader did not seem to be interested in having the motion considered today. Furthermore it seems that yesterday, a motion on resources which was also presented by the Official Opposition got only three paragraphs on forestry resources, and the same Member who was responsible for those three short paragraphs on forestry came back today to speak again to the same subject, owing, I believe, to a definite lack of interest on the part of the Official Opposition with respect to the forest industry. I know that their new Leader comes from one of the mining regions of our country, which is quite all right, but this may have prevented him from being equally familiar with the forest industry, which is the largest industry in Canada, if we realize that $20 billion are involved each year in this industry. I think the Official Opposition would do well to have some of its Members specialize in this area, and I know some of my colleagues who have been involved in the construction industry are already well aware of the importance of the forest industry for our country. I was rather surprised that yesterday, the Opposition did not give more consideration to the forest industry as a resource and that today, it preferred to delay the debate on this extremely important issue.

Personally, I shall, if I may, get back to what was said by the previous speaker, the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) in British Columbia, when he referred to the $48 million the Canadian Government was spending each year on the forest industry. The Hon. Member forgot a host of other Departments that are now involved in the forest industry. For instance, in the past two years, the Department of Employment and Immigration, especially under the provisions of Section 38, has been playing a major role in cleaning up our forests, collecting organic matter on the forest floor, planting trees, developing access roads, improving land and whatever else is involved around sawmills and pulp and paper mills, while we must not forget that for years, all on-site or on the job training in the forest industry has largely been paid, for periods of between six months and one year, by the federal Department of Employment and Immigration. These policies

are not given a lot of publicity by the Government, but they are effective policies that affect a great many people.

• (1710)

In my riding, for instance, the sawmill at l'Ascension belongs to Abitibi Price, which started the mill a few years ago. The mill's several hundred employees were trained with the help of federal funds made available to the company by the Department of Employment and Immigration. The same is true of other facilities belonging to the same company at Saint-David-de-Falardeau. The same also applies to another company for which the Canadian Government has just earmarked $1 million to modernize facilties at Saint-Fulgence and Sainte-Rose, in another part of my riding, which belong to Consolidated Bathurst, and the same may be said for many other sawmills and companies involved in the forest industry, whether they are manufacturing particle board or pulp and paper, where Government involvement has taken place in ways other than through direct funding by the Department of the Environment.

And when people accuse . . . Earlier, I heard the Member of the Official Opposition accuse the Department of the Environment of playing a negative role in the development of the forest industry, and attribute this negative attitude to the Government itself. I think it is unfortunate the Hon. Member should have such a limited view of what is being done by the Department of the Environment. In fact, this Department is trying to meet one of its increasingly important responsibilities, which is perceived as such by all Canadians and especially our youth, for protecting the Canadian environment and doing so in conjunction with the economic development of our country. I think these objectives have been achieved. There has been a kind of specialization so that the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, created in 1968, has tended to be more often involved in the financial side of developing the forest industry, including pulp and paper, the lumber industry and related activities. Why? Because the majority of these industries are located in resource areas. Because until the middle of the 1960s, these were areas whose economic development had been somewhat neglected. The resources were taken out, and I am reminded here of a quote by the Hon. Member for Skeena of what Sir John A. Macdonald said several decades ago, the resources were taken out and that was it.

DREE, however, started developing local industries that would use these resources, in order to create employment in areas where this was a tremendous problem for young people, and so forth. Hundreds of millions of dollars were spent by DREE on converting sawmills to making particle board in Saguenay Lac-Saint-Jean, Abitibi, Northern Ontario and all the Western Provinces, including British Columbia, and on all kinds of industrial development, plus various infrastructure projects. In fact, even if the DREE Act prevented the Department from getting involved in the infrastructure area through the Regional Development Act, DREE did so in 1978 through agreements signed with the Provinces. The agreements dealt with forest development, forest access and developing forest regeneration. And in that respect, in the Province of Quebec alone, DREE contributed $190 million to forest development over the last five years. This is not to mention certain special agreements that led to the development of plants, such as the Donohue-Normick facilities in Amos and the Donohue plant in Saint-Félicien. These plants produce either pulp alone or pulp and paper. Without that investment by DREE, it is unfortunate to say that this probably would never have been accomplished. The best proof of this is the Saint-Félicien case where, after a 12-year wait, the project finally could proceed when DREE said: "Yes, we will provide the $30 million". And I am proud to mention this because at the time I was Executive Assistant of the Minister who signed that agreement with the Province of Quebec. I can certify that this agreement has been instrumental in creating a number of industries, in achieving a rationalization of the entire forest industry in a large section of my constituency of Saguenay Lac-Saint-Jean, and the consolidation of a number of mills and, to wit, in the maintaining of many very important jobs.

Therefore, to blame the Canadian Government for not discharging its responsibility in the area of forestry is in my view, quite misleading, because if Environment Canada did protect the environment as it is required to do, the other departments, whether Industry, Trade and Commerce, or CIDA the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton) a short while ago drew a fantastic picture of the extent to which the Canadian Government is involved in the development of forestry. All the examples he gave show that in this country, we have the best qualified people in matters relating to forestry and also in the area of servicing the forest industry. Those people who went ahead and built sawmills, pulp and paper mills—they are still doing it all over the world—are considered to be the best engineering firms, the best manufacturers of sawmill equipment, the best builders of pulp and paper mill facilities. This is why they are sought after, because in that area of federal jurisdiction, the Government has done what was required for us to become the most qualified people in the world and so we are fortunately, from whatever province we are. Because I can say, for instance, that the engineering firms which built a sawmill, rather a pulp and paper mill in my area were from British Columbia. The Hon. Member for Skeena forgot to mention that fact, which tells a lot about the people of British Columbia; that small detail is being ignored.

There are proposals in the air. Indeed, my colleagues from Abitibi and Saguenay-Lac Saint Jean, the Hon. Member for Chicoutimi (Mr. Dionne), the Hon. Member for Jonquière (Mr. Marceau), the Hon. Member for Roberval (Mrs. Beauchamp-Niquet), the Hon. Member for Abitibi (Mr. Gingras) and the Hon. Member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Tousignant), and I did not simply wait for the Government to act, Mr. Speaker, this last year. You see this bulging file? It has to do

with a proposal for a possible half-a-billon plus investment, allocating to each of our six constituencies whatever can be done by the Canadian Government over the next five years in the area of forestry. If we had been satisfied to sit and weep as did the NDP Members, we would never had gotten this paper. What we did was to pack our bags and go round to see our constituents. We met with companies, we sent them information about what the Government planned to do, we asked for their advice and for some answers, and we worked with them to put together an integrated forest development program.

Today, we know that what the Canadian Government can do unilaterally will be done in our region because we cared and did our job fully aware that 65 per cent of the lumber produced in Quebec came from our region; this means 2,030,-000 fbm a year, Mr. Speaker. We also knew that 25 per cent of the pulp and paper industry is located in our region. We were aware of the billions of dollars this meant for our people. We did our homework and made some recommendations, some of which have already been implemented, such as asking the Government to become directly involved in the private industry through programs such as Canada Works, and to spend so many dollars per man-week both for non-profit corporations and the private sector.

The recommendations which came from our caucus and ourselves as representatives of our constituents have been implemented. What we did, Mr. Speaker, was to understand that we must represent those who sent us here. In this context, far from being satisfied to simply make speeches, we went to see these people. We asked them for their opinions and wishes and we worked a year and a half at preparing a paper. We then gave this paper to the Government which now takes this material into account as the development takes place, because we are involved.

This is what the Hon. Member for Skeena and his colleagues should do. The same is true for the Progressive Conservative members. Unfortunately, as I have already said, it is a well-known fact that they show a lack of interest in forestry. It is not their fault. Their constituencies probably have mostly oil and mineral resources or else fishing resources, and so on, but it is a fact that the whole country benefits from our forest industry. It is extremely important that we can now sit down and express our views as Members of Parliament not only orally, but also by writing to our Government.

● (1720)

This leads me to mention another aberration which came to my mind earlier when I was listening to the Member of the Official Opposition, namely the creation of a new Federal Department of Forestry. I am not automatically opposed to the creation of such a ministry. Constitutionally, Mr. Speaker, forestry comes under provincial jurisdiction, and the way my colleague was talking a few moments ago, I got the impression that the provinces had disappeared and did not even fit in the picture. I think that the existing structures enable us to do everything we can to improve the situation, fully develop our forests and help our forest industry pick up steam, but perhaps a federal or interprovincial body might be required to coordinate everything. That may be the shortcoming I can notice. Given that context, it is not up to the Canadian Government or any Member of Parliament to twist the arms of the provinces. They own their resources, they can decide who will have cutting rights, they have their own logging operations and forestry development is their responsibility. The federal Government has no business telling them what to do. Even if I, Pierre Gimaïel, wanted to pass myself off as an expert in British Columbia forestry, I would not fool anyone because a tree in British Columbia is 25 times bigger than a tree in the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area, because the entrance of a British Columbia sawmill must be huge, a lot more so than the entrance of a Lac-Saint-Jean sawmill. We must keep in mind the technical constraints, the different climates, and the fact that Canada is a continent bordering on two oceans. That being said, I think it would be an aberration as well as a constitutional encroachment to create a new federal forestry ministry.

I would much rather leave things as they are—we have a Department of Environment which inclues the Forestry Service. That service can play a larger role, as it has been doing for two years in cooperation with various federal Departments to coordinate the activities of Manpower and Immigration and Industry, Trade and Commerce, or, if you will, regional and industrial development in forestry and silviculture. There is nothing to stop us, provided we respect the various jurisdictions.

It would be unfortunate if we went to war over our forests. We have had the experience of this department which the Government of Canada had set up to deal with urban affairs, which had to be abandoned because of its overlapping with provincial organizations here there and everywhere.

I am surprised at the attitude of the Official Opposition, especially as this Government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars over the past few years under various agreements with the provinces. The more so because most premiers except the creditist premier of British Columbia and the PQ premier of Quebec, are representatives of each of the parties in this House. Therefore it is easy for Hon. Members of both the Official and NDP opposition to have their say about their parties policies in their own provinces. Moreover, I suggest that in this area the Government of Canada should let the various provinces find their own solutions to their particular problems. What it should do is allow them to rely on the huge resources of the Canadian Government. That is what our job is all about. We are not supposed for instance to force a solution devised here in Canada, upon the Government of British Columbia but rather to urge the people, as I have done myself in the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area, to come to Ottawa and

tell us of their requirements so that we may negociate with their province the setting up of an upgrading system for our forests.

What is needed is imagination and a new department. I have nothing against that. It means Liberals would have one more minister possibly for one hundred years more. Apparently, Liberals are always heading the Government in this country. Perhaps that is a good thing. Such a department would provide new political leverage, but for the sake of efficiency, I feel that the existing system is better.

While I am on my feet, I shall deal with an important issue. As Hon. Members know, we are wasting our forests. What I mean is that we should have encouraged recycling, although some provinces have already taken the initiative. Thirty per cent of our forest resources could be spared by merely recycling the paper we use. Never or almost never do we hear anything about that. This was also mentioned in that document, Mr. Speaker. It is something we have also dealt with, because in our own areas, more and more emphasis is put on the subject of recycling, we see more and more youngsters salvaging used paper, and sending it to feed pulpmills to be processed into an excellent grade of paper. This is another area in which the Canadian Government has shown leadership.

Somebody was asking me: Why those brown paper envelopes? Because it is impossible to make white envelopes from recycled paper. It is easy for a Government to say: We are going to use kraft paper envelopes instead of white ones. This is what is being done. Ninety per cent of the time, correspondence from the Canadian Government is forwarded in kraft paper envelopes to help the recycling industry. Such initiatives are taken by the Canadian Government without any fanfare, and should be imitated by others. The Provinces should follow the lead. Hon. Members here should be aware of that. Our environment problem is very much the same as the problem facing the forest industry.

Earlier, one Hon. Member opposed the two. It amounts to almost the same problem. If sulphur escapes through our chimneys when we burn wood, it is because it is not reclaimed. The sulphur goes up through the chimney. The same thing happens in our forest industry. If we waste so much of our forest products, it is because once the fibres have been used, they are thrown away.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by stating that forestry in my constituency of Lac-Saint-Jean is a major industry. We have nine sawmills. As a Member of Parliament, I took the liberty of outlining here what was needed to help my people develop that industry, and I would urge Hon. Members to do the same. Let us go beyond speeches, let us help the Government develop good policies by rolling up our sleeves and working with the people in our constituencies.

[*English*]

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Parliament from northern Ontario, I realize the great importance of the Canadian forest industry to the economy of the towns and villages in my riding of Timiskaming. Since one in ten working Canadians are directly or indirectly employed in the forest industry, it is very important to my riding.

I would like to take a moment to discuss how directly forestry is involved in the riding of Timiskaming. Cutters, timberjack operators, truck drivers, sawfilers, boardwalk workers, owners of saw mills and waferboard plants are related directly to the forest industry. I could go further and deal with the schools, hospitals and municipalities in northern Ontario; they are directly or indirectly involved in that industry. It has been estimated by the federal Government that 70 per cent of the manufacturing labour force in northern Ontario is employed directly or indirectly in forestry-related work.

I do not want to bog down the debate with reams of facts and figures, however the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle) indicated yesterday and in his excellent report entitled, "The Green Ghetto", that the forestry industry is in serious difficulty with respect to its place and position on the world stage. Our nation's traditional competitors, the United States, Finland, Sweden and Norway, are now stepping up their efforts to increase pulp and paper export sales. This, coupled with new international competitors such as Brazil, Chile, New Zealand and South Africa, to name a few, are in positions to undermine the entire Canadian forest industry. Cheaper labour conditions in many of these countries, together with greater Government subsidies, allow these countries to enter the world market as very formidable opponents for Canada to compete against.

The Canadian Pulp and Paper Association indicated in one of its recent reports:

> Competition will continue to be tough, and the low-cost producers, whoever and wherever they are in the world, will be the winners.

The importance of the Canadian forest industry was recognized by the late Right Hon. John Diefenbaker when, in 1960, his Government, with unanimous support, created the new Ministry of forestry. Mr. Diefenbaker had the foresight and vision to realize the importance of lumbering and its related industries back in 1960. Today our Party is still on record as favouring the establishment of a Ministry of Forestry.

I am a Member who represents a riding where another primary resource plays an important role, namely, mining. Like the Canadian forestry industry, mining employs several hundreds of thousands of people in direct and indirect jobs. It adds significantly to the GNP of the nation, last year totalling over 4 per cent. However, another similarity mining has with forestry is the lack of concern and attention that the Government has shown to this extremely important sector of the Canadian economy. Like the forest industry, the mining industry has no one in the federal Cabinet to represent exclusively the concerns and interests of those associated with the mining industry. This week represents the second month that the mining industry has not had a voice in Cabinet. However, more astonishing is that the federal Cabinet has not had a

separate Ministry of Forestry since the 1960s when Mr. Diefenbaker proposed that one be established.

● (1730)

I was not so much shocked as I was amused when the Minister responsible for the Canadian Forestry Service, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Caccia), said in the House today that he did not think it was necessary to create more paperwork and another Department to take care of the forest sector of our economy. This statement comes from a Minister who represents the same Government that forced Canagrex on the Canadian agricultural scene. This is the same Government that created Petro-Canada and created the Canadian Development Investment Corporation. With all of this bureaucracy, it is a wonder we have not run out of trees to produce all the paper required for the paperwork this Government has thrust upon the Canadian people.

The establishment of a separate and distinct Ministry of Forestry is needed in this country. At present, as the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) pointed out in an earlier debate, the jurisdiction for Canadian forestry policy is now handled by an Assistant Deputy Minister. Our number one industry in Canada does not even rank Deputy Minister status.

The forest industry is in deep trouble for a number of reasons. World-wide competition has hurt us, together with the fact that the federal Government has not paid enough attention to the industry. The Science Council of Canada's recent report on the state of Canada's threatened forests is frightening, to say the least. It is frightening because if decisive action is not taken jointly by Government and business, our forestry industry will meet the same fate as the dinosaur and the dodo bird. These species did not respond to the challenge of change in order to survive and they became extinct.

Today, we cut about one million hectares of forest each year. At least one-third of that amount is not sufficiently restocked, and today we find about 12 per cent of our forest land in this sad state. What can be done about this horrendous situation? According to a survey carried out with 34 Canadian pulp and paper companies in 1980-81, of every dollar earned by this industry, only ten cents on the dollar goes into dividends. Not surprising, an additional ten cents from every dollar goes to Government fees and taxes. It is therefore of the utmost importance for Governments at all levels to realize that taxing the industry over and over again will mean that more and more money will not be put back in reforestation. it will not be re-invested to update equipment in order to remain at the same level of competition with the United States and the Nordic countries.

In conclusion, a several pronged approach is needed to help the forest industry grow, expand and develop. Reforestation and forest management are vital aspects that have been neglected far too long. Neglecting them any further will simply mean that future generations will never be able to debate this subject again because the forestry industry, if neglected now, will not be around tomorrow for debate.

The first point I would like to make is this. Year in and year out we have a tendency to look at reforestation. The problem that we run into each year is this. At the time we are dealing with reforestation, whether it be with the private sector or the provincial Ministers, the tubelings and the trees and the hiring of individuals each spring must be looked at. We have a problem when we start off. We are hiring inexperienced people. In doing so, we have the problem of thousands and thousands of trees being destroyed. There is not a proper understanding of the planting of trees. I have been in touch with the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Roberts) asking him to give thought to having a program instituted each spring for those who will be employed in the industry. Those who do not have the good fortune to be fully employed look for this seasonal employment. There should be a training program at the beginning of each season. In this way, we will have proper soil and planting. This would not only save the industry, but would save the taxpayer thousands and thousands of dollars. There should be a one-week program implemented.

Second, in order to co-ordinate the efforts of all provincial Governments and the aspects of the forestry industry that are a federal responsibility, a new Ministry of Forestry is needed. For an industry to be ignored as much as is forestry is truly a shame on the part of the Government. Within the Ministry of the Province of Ontario, one that I can maybe relate to better than others, thousands and thousands of cords of wood are left in the bush to rot each year. I urge all Members of Parliament, particularly those from Ontario, to give serious consideration to this.

We look at saving energy. Why not have a program whereby individuals can go into the bush and cut the tops of the trees that are left and the remaining cords of wood? This can be brought into the communities and sold or given to senior citizens and others who cannot afford to purchase wood for fuel. We have thousands of cords of wood not only in Ontario but in other parts of Canada that are not being used and are being left to rot. This is something that should be looked at.

Northern Ontario, which has always had as its major economic base primary industries such as forestry and mining, will not survive if the forestry industry is allowed to rot like a decaying tree. If the Government is not willing to examine the problems that are plaguing the forest industry now, we may soon find ourselves in very serious trouble.

The over 300,000 men and women across Canada in the forest industry join with me in urging the Government to make this all important sector of our national way of life a priority once and for all. I know there are others who want to speak. I appreciate the opportunity of being able to speak on this very important subject.

Mr. Ray Chénier (Timmins-Chapleau): Mr. Speaker, I know that the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) would like to say a few words. I will divide the time in such a way that he has that opportunity.

Timmins-Chapleau in northern Ontario is really the microcosm of the forestry sector of Canada. We have in our area lumber mills, wafer board mills, pressed wood mills, pulp and paper mills and finally, I am sorry to say, we also have in our forestry sector wastage in the same way that there is in the rest of the country. When a person walks through the forests in northern Ontario, it is almost shameful for that person to see whole timber tracts, hundreds and thousands of hectares, wasting in the bush. It is a shame for that person to see mature trees that are standing ready to fall because they are rotting. Why is this so? Because at the turn of the century when the pulp and paper companies moved into the area, they were given large tracts of land. In those days, it was not a matter of cutting timber but a matter of mining the forests. There was no thought given at that time to reforestation, regeneration or forest management. It was a matter of using the forests as if they were a renewable resource.

• (1740)

What do we see in northern Ontario today, Mr. Speaker? We see that these large tracts are dying. In other areas, we see that clearcutting has taken place with no replacement planting, and we see weeds and shrubs growing in place of the forests. That is why I believe the federal Government does have a role to play but not necessarily the role as described by the Hon. Member for Timiskaming (Mr. MacDougall). He feels that the Government should do all of the work. I think he should speak to the Leader of his Party and then to officials of the Province of Ontario who have been collecting royalties on the timber lands of the Province for over a century and have not put one cent back, except perhaps in the last two or three years. Let him talk to that Government which has done nothing for the forests of Ontario.

We in the federal Government do collect income tax from the people who work in the lumber industry. We collect taxes from the wood producers. I believe that some of that money which has been going back to the lumber industry and to the forestry sector must continue to be paid to the federal Government, and perhaps the amount should be increased. However, I think it is not a one-sided affair. We will have to work with the provincial Governments and see that they put some of their royalties into regeneration, reforestation and management of the forests of Ontario.

I have looked at an agreement we made with the Province a few years ago. We wanted to turn to reforestation and regeneration, but officials from the Ontario provincial Government said: "No, no, we want roads for access to resources". We gave them roads. What did they do with those roads? Were they used for reforestation or regeneration? No. The roads were used to play their own political games with the mining companies and with certain privileged timber tract owners, and we have really not benefited from that.

I believe we must try to co-operate with the provincial Government, but we also must do some of the things we want to do. I can think, for example, of some of the things that need to be done in the transport sector of the forest industry. There is a port in my riding, the Port of Michipicoten. If that port were to be developed, we could transport our lumber, pulp and chips out of my riding and out of the riding of the Hon. Member for Timiskaming at probably half the money we are spending now. This is what I hope the federal Government will spend its money on. I hope it will spend money not necessarily on doing what the Province of Ontario wants it to do but on what the lumber and paper producers want it to do. As well, another sector in which the Government could be of some assistance is the private forest owners in reforestation. If it is possible, I would rather put our federal money directly into programs such as those.

We must immediately begin very intensive negotiations between the Canadian Government, the provincial Governments and the producers in order to achieve a more efficient use of our forests. I have seen logs coming into certain paper mills which are 60 centimetres, 70 centimetres, 80 centimetres in diameter. These logs were to be made into pulp and paper while, in the cities of Timmins, Chapleau and Wawa, I have seen wood that is 15 centimetres in diameter being cut into studs. What a waste that is, Mr. Speaker. We must have an efficient approach to the use of the logs across northern Ontario. I believe that this is where research and development facilities can get involved, provided the Provinces wish to co-operate. We must get involved in the use of the other kinds of wood that we have in our forests. Right now we are using poplar for waferboard, but what about all of the white spruce that dies the moment the foresters come? The use of those trees must be developed.

What about tree tops? The Hon. Member mentioned that we could use tree tops as firewood. When a forest in northern Ontario is clearcut, 40 per cent of the wood remains on the floor of that forest. I think we can make better use of that wood than firewood. I think we need to have portable chippers and portable mills so that that wood can be turned into something that is productive.

The Government of Canada has done more than its share regarding fire losses. We were criticized by those dear Conservative provincial Governments across the country whose officials said: "Why is the Government trying to shove those CL-215's down our throats?" We were not trying to shove those planes down their throats. We were trying to encourage them to protect their own forest by telling them that we would buy one plane for every plane they bought.

Mr. Nickerson: You were trying to bail out Canadair, that's what you were trying to do.

Mr. Chénier: The Hon. Member says that we were trying to bail out Canadair. Maybe that is true, but does he have something to say about the Government trying to fight forest fires in his area? He is a person who comes from the Northwest Territories where there are fires every summer. He has been crying in the House that he does not get protection. We give him the planes to protect his forests, and he says that we did so because we wanted to protect Canadair. He would probably prefer us to buy an airplane from the United States

or from Poland or from somewhere else but if it is made in Canada, we should not buy it. What a true Canadian. I love him. He is a great Canadian.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a number of Hon. Members have suggested that we need a Forestry Ministry. I am not really against that concept, but on the other hand, I believe we are now starting to move in a very positive direction. The present Minister is totally committed to forestry. I think that if the Official Opposition and the other Opposition get together and work closely with the Minister, we can really encourage the development of programs with the Provinces, programs north of sixty and follow-up conferences such as the one that was held in September of this year. In that way, I think the forest industry of Canada will remain a viable industry and will not continue in the direction it appears to be going in now. If it does in my riding and, I am sure, in the riding of the Hon. Member for Timiskaming and the riding of the Hon. Member for Cochrane-Superior (Mr. Penner), there will no longer be any more wood to cut 20 years from now. Ten years from now, Abitibi in northwestern Quebec will begin to close some of its lumber mills.

That is a shame, Mr. Speaker, and I will not accept total responsibility for it at the federal level. I think we have done our share and we have done more than our share. However, I think we must do more again in order to encourage the Provincial Governments to return to the forests some of the money they receive from the forestry sector, money they throw into the general fund to use for the little political games that they have played over the last 40 years.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise and speak to this motion which calls for the Government to respond to the emergency in the forestry sector. The Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap (Mr. Riis) had two suggestions to make which were aimed at involving the Government a little further in the forest industry of the country.

I would like to begin, Mr. Speaker, by reacting to the speech of the Hon. Member who just spoke. In a normal year, the Governments in Canada collect $3 billion in taxes. Half of that amount is collected by the federal Government. Only 25 per cent of that amount, and in most years even less than that, is put back into the forest industry. Of this amount, about half goes to the federal Government and half to the Provinces. However, spending on forest renewal is 20 per cent by the federal Government and 80 per cent by the Provinces. So it is the federal Government which needs to look at how it is protecting and helping to regenerate our forests, which is really the biggest issue as far as we are concerned here.

● (1750)

I come from an area with a pulp mill, a great number of saw-mills, a plywood factory and a number of businesses related to the forest industry. About 60 per cent of Saskatchewan is covered by forests, but commercial timber is disappearing at a dangerous rate. Out of the total productive area of 4.4 million hectares, about 11,000 hectares were burned last year. About 16,000 hectares were harvested, and only 7,390 hectares were naturally reseeded and 6,470 hectares restocked by the forestry branch. That means something over 13,000 hectares of forest disappeared last year in Saskatchewan. This causes us to be very concerned about the fact that the Government does not spend enough time, money and effort to make sure that the forests of Canada will be producing 10, 20 or 50 years from now.

Softwood timber is being cut in Canada 20 per cent faster than it is being regenerated. We are in competition with countries like Sweden and the U.S. which employ methods which allow them to harvest five to six times as much per acre in Sweden and ten times as much in the southern States. I spent a number of years in New Zealand where a tree was grown from a seedling to pulp size in seven years. That kind of competition is going to be very hard to deal with, and we are not even bothering to plant the trees let alone selecting those which will reproduce at a much faster rate. A couple of years ago I spent some time in Norway which is now replanting all of its forests because they found that selected seedlings will produce pulpwood or lumber class wood twice as fast as the naturally reseeded forest.

Foresters tell us, Mr. Speaker, we are a little bit stupid as Governments because the Canadian forest industry has declined more than 50 per cent since 1978, and provincial foresters tell us that money for research and development in the Canadian Forestry Service has declined by more than 50 per cent since 1968 as well. They also tell us that if we were to put some of that money into research and development and into reseeding and reforestation, we would have an immediate return in the form of an increase in jobs in the industry. We could have as many as 500,000 people helping in reforestation, which would increase the Government take from income tax a great deal.

The forest industry in Saskatchewan Mr. Speaker, employs 3,600 people directly, mainly in the Prince Albert area. There are another 7,000 indirect jobs and that is only in a very small area around Prince Albert. The value of Saskatchewan forest products was the second highest of any commodity in Saskatchewan's manufacturing sector last year. So in Saskatchewan, as in other parts of the country, it is a major industry. Direct revenue from that industry in Saskatchewan in 1982-83 was approximately $2.8 million. This is expected to go up to $413 million in the next 20 years. That is partly because the Saskatchewan Government has in the past insisted on a much higher level of reforestation in relation to the amount cut. The failure to regenerate forests adequately threatens the existence of as many as 300 communities over the next 15 to 20 years. Each year an area approximately the size of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia combined is removed from the world forest inventory and not replaced. That is approximately 50 acres a minute.

So we cannot lay all the blame on Saskatchewan, on Canada or on any particular part of our country, because it is happening all over the world. The difference is that some parts of the world have recognized that something has to be done and are

starting to do it. I give you as examples Sweden, Norway, New Zealand, and even Brazil is making some attempt at reforestation. Right now in Canada we are buying our telephone poles from Finland and railway ties from Malaysia, things that we supplied ourselves for many, many years.

Of the 800,000 hectares of timber harvested each year in Canada, only 25 per cent are replanted artificially. Granted, about another 37 per cent will be naturally replaced, but it still means we are losing 400,000 to 500,000 hectares of forest each year. So it is very necessary that this Government, indeed all Governments in Canada, look at the forest industry as a priority and establish a policy which will allow us to regenerate and continue to be one of the major industries of this country.

• (1800)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL REVENUE—DESIGNATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA SCHOOL BOARD AS CHARITABLE ORGANIZATION

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, in the better than nine years I have been here an issue has arisen periodically in the House during Question Period regarding the policy of Revenue Canada as it affects charitable organizations and non-profit organizations. Usually it centres around the issue of lobbying because, as you will understand, Mr. Speaker, non-profit organizations are very interested in the interpretation bulletins. I am not speaking simply of the law now. I am speaking of interpretation bulletins which are sent out by the tax department and which guide tax officials in applying the law to organizations across Canada. The issue usually centres around the interpretation bulletin which focuses upon what the tax department considers as lobbying.

I feel we should understand, Mr. Speaker, that any organization in Canada, a non-profit organization or a charitable organization, is interested in how the law is drafted and how it is going to affect that organization, so that when it comes to speak to Members of Parliament, Members of Cabinet and to the Government, it naturally is engaged in some form of lobbying. It seems to me that it is just pure logic that an organization, as a Canadian corporate entity in Canada, ought to be entitled, under the freedoms which we enjoy, to lobby the Government regarding the application of laws and how those laws would affect those organizations. Nevertheless, the Government has always been very twitchy about the activities of some organizations and the lobbying in which they might engage.

I will be the first to admit, Mr. Speaker, that there are some organizations which I suspect sometimes exceed the bounds of propriety, and I speak particularly of some church organizations. I wonder if some of the preachers are not frustrated politicians rather than preachers of the Gospel. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it is wrong, I feel, on the part of the Government to put in jeopardy the entire organization because some of its members might exceed the bounds of propriety in the way they lobby.

In that spirit, my colleague, the Hon. Member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean) several weeks ago raised a question of an organization in Canada, the Canadian Mental Health Association, and the fact that it felt jeopardized by members of Revenue Canada in that its charitable status was going to be called into question. When the Hon. Member asked that question, I called back to my memory something I had read in the Vancouver *Province* under a headline, "The taxman giveth". It came to my memory, Mr. Speaker, that during the past year, good old National Revenue gave charitable tax status to a school board in Kelowna, British Columbia. I hope my good friend, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Bloomfield) is not going to get up in his place and say that that is a piece of misinformation, because I want to inform him that it is not. The tax number for that school board is 0646737-20-26.

We now have the strange situation of a school board having charitable status in central Okanagan, and that raises some very profound questions as to the effect that that is going to have on the taxpayers across Canada. For example, if that school board derives its authority from a municipality, might the municipality not be able to issue tax receipts for the purpose of charitable donations? The school board received its charitable status under the category of advancement of education, which we can understand. I think all of us accept the fact that trustees of that school board compaigned very vigorously, politically for that position. As a matter of fact, the New Democratic Party in its conventions for the last number of years has urged its members to get elected to local offices under a Party ticket. It would be pretty hard, therefore, to suggest that a school board is a non-political organization since it is engaged almost exclusively in lobbying.

• (1805)

How can the Minister give a number to a school board as a charitable organization, a school board which conducts much of its activity in lobbying! We might ask ourselves whether those taxes that we pay, our property taxes, allocated to schools and education, would now be a tax deductible item on our income tax. That would be a very interesting innovation, Mr. Speaker, which I frankly would like to see happen if the Government is going to do this. Mr. Speaker, it opens a wide area of dispute if the Government is going to do this. Sooner or later the Government will have to decide this issue of what constitutes lobbying.

I would like to have my friend tell me tonight what the Government defines as lobbying. Are charitable organizations

permitted to lay their case before us as Members of Parliament, before the Government, without being accused of lobbying and therefore being threatened by the tax department to have their charitable status removed?

Mr. Garnet M. Bloomfield (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member appears to have problems with the matter of charitable registrations. He refers to the fact that the Department has counselled a charitable organization against changing its constitution so as to be in a position to undertake different activities, the different activities being related to political objects. Strangely enough, charity has not been defined in the Income Tax Act. That being the case, in our common law tradition we look to the findings of the courts. We discover that the courts have held consistently over the last hundred years or so that charity comprises the relief of poverty, the advancement of education, the advancement of religion and other purposes beneficial to the community that do not fall under the three other headings. It is true that certain school boards are currently registered as charity. Each application for a charitable status received in the Department is evaluated on its own merits and must meet the stated criteria to be approved. The Department endeavours as well to ensure that the groups which have been granted status as charities adhere to the objectives as they have been outlined to the Department.

I should further explain that the courts have held that political objects are not charitable in nature, that is, they do not come under the three specific headings or under the general heading of other purposes beneficial to the community. Since the Income Tax Act requires that all the resources of a charity must be devoted to charitable purposes, an organization seeking registration or wishing to maintain a registered status may not, therefore, engage in political activities. This is not to say that the purposes of an organization seeking to affect our laws may not be highly commendable. It is only to say that the organization may not be given the right to issue receipts for donations that may be subsequently claimed as deductions from taxable incomes.

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION—PAY TV—SALE OF FIRST CHOICE NETWORK. (B) REQUEST THAT MINISTER REVIEW COMMISSION'S DECISION

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, last week I directed two questions to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox). I asked him to look into the application which was made to the CRTC for the right to transfer ownership of the First Choice pay television network to Astral Bellevue Pathé, and not only to look into the question, but to look into the haste which the CRTC was ready to deal with the question, and to look into whether or not he should overrule the decision of the CRTC to permit that transfer of control. That proposal, which the CRTC approved, was objected to and criticized by virtually every person and organization involved in television, except the appellants.

• (1810)

I have a copy of a letter sent to the Secretary of the CRTC written by the national office of ACTRA, which represents over 8,000 members of the Canadian film and television production industry, including writers, performers, directors, producers, technicians and production management personnel. I will read one sentence from this letter, which was ignored by the CRTC. They state, "We oppose a transfer of control because it is in violation of the Commission's established policy on vertical integration and is contrary to the interests of both the public and Canadian film and television industry."

The CRTC spent ten years and commissioned a number of in depth studies about how to deal with pay TV when it would be offered to the Canadian public. It made a number of policy decisions. For instance, it decided that it would have a number of competing companies and that no company should be permitted to control all aspects of television production. Those policies, which were adopted after ten years of study, have, in the space of less than one year, been proven to be completely unworkable. We have First Choice, Super Channel and C Channel. C Channel is gone and First Choice is in such difficulty that it had to ask for an infusion of new capital. That is the reason for its proposal to be taken over by Astral Bellevue. Super Channel is in trouble as well. There simply have not been enough Canadians willing to contract to get pay TV to allow the healthy operation of a number of channels.

When this company takes over pay TV, it means that the policy which was worked on for so long by the CRTC will be stood on its head. As I have indicated, the CRTC's policies have proven to be a total failure.

The CRTC ignored its own rule that applications should be held for 50 days before they are considered. It is a rule which makes a lot of sense because a 50-day delay would give all those interested enough time to prepare their positions and detail their objections if they had any. The CRTC ignored its own policies and agreed to hear this applicant after ten days and to make a decision quickly. In effect, this excluded many of those organizations and other industry participants who wanted to prepare and make submissions. Therefore, we have the takeover of First Choice by Astral Pathé. This is a holding company which controls companies which are in every field of activity in films and television. It controls Astral Film, Astral Bellevue Classics, Astral Video, Astral Television, Pathé Video, Pathé Quebec, Pathé Sound and Postproduction Centre and Astral Film Productions. It has an agreement with Twentieth Century Fox to fund jointly production projects for pay TV and television markets.

Therefore, this is a company which will control everything from the concept of television production, writing, producing, acting up to the delivery to the customer. That is completely contrary to established CRTC policy, completely contrary to policies which the Government agreed to over the years. What it will do is to give a completely unfair advantage to this one company. It will put all aspects of the industry from the writers to the actors to the producers virtually at the mercy and give complete control to this one company. This is what

the CRTC has done. This is what the Government has agreed to. It is something which has received the unanimous condemnation of virtually everyone in the industry except the people who were involved in First Choice, who were afraid, for good reason, that they would lose a major part, if not all, of their investment, and give control to Astral Bellevue and the people who are involved in very large corporate interests and have very large financial stakes.

• (1815)

We are told by the CRTC in its ruling that it has laid down very stringent rules as to how Astral must not do the things which the CRTC has always said companies shall not be permitted to do, that is, it will not be able to use the power which it has as a vertically integrated company.

Over the years the CRTC has said to applicants for TV licences that they would have to do these things and have Canadian content—plays, music and ballet. Those have been ignored by the successful applicants for the regular TV channels. I predict they will be ignored by Astral Bellevue when it takes over First Choice.

Mr. Jack Burghardt (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, first may I say that I am rather surprised at the criticism levelled by the Hon. Member upon the CRTC regarding this transfer of control of First Choice to Hees International. It seems to me that quite often the CRTC is criticized for not responding quickly enough to the needs of the broadcasting industry. Here is a perfect example where the CRTC has responded to a specific problem relating in this case to First Choice and it has responded in a very positive manner.

Mr. Orlikow: To the detriment of everybody else.

Mr. Burghardt: The Hon. Member mentions a letter from ACTRA regarding the vertical integration. The CRTC has specifically made mention of this, that this is one of its major concerns as well in considering the application of transfer of control. The Commission also said that it gave consideration to the concerns expressed by interveners, obviously ACTRA as well, particularly with respect to this issue of vertical integration.

I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that the Member has mentioned the strict conditions placed by the CRTC in granting approval. All he has to do is to read the decision handed down by the CRTC and he will inform himself of those strict controls. Never in my experience in the broadcasting industry have I seen such strict controls placed upon a particular decision.

Mr. Orlikow: What happened to the other controls?

Mr. Burghardt: So the CRTC in this case certainly has put very stringent controls in approving this application.

The other point which the Hon. Member does not mention is that some of those who opposed this application of transfer of control took their case before the Federal Court of Canada. The Federal Court of Canada obviously felt that there was no case, and allowed the decision to be made.

If time permitted I could go down and list some of the very strict commitments which this decision renders upon the principles involved. For example, the board of directors of First Choice will be independent of the board of directors of Astral. The Hon. Member knows this.

Mr. Orlikow: If you believe that, you will believe anything.

Mr. Burghardt: The board of directors of First Choice will include, in addition to the present representation from some of the Provinces, additional representation from British Columbia and also from the Atlantic Provinces. There is complete separation of First Choice from Astral. The management of First Choice will be entirely separate, distinct and independent from that of Astral.

I see that I am running out of time, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest to the Hon. Member that he read in detail the decision handed down by the CRTC in this case and I am sure he will feel much better about the decision.

• (1820)

METRIC CONVERSION—COURT DECISION ON LEGALITY OF IMPERIAL AND METRIC MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS—GOVERNMENT POSITION. (B) INQUIRY WHETHER APPEAL WILL BE LAUNCHED

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, on November 2, 1983, we had some discussion in the House dealing with the regulations which caused the Government to force metric on various sectors of the retail trade. At that time it was pointed out to both the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) that a judge in Toronto had ruled that imperial measurement would remain legal in the Province of Ontario and that they could not enforce the regulations.

The Prime Minister confirmed in the House of Commons, in response to questions on November 2, that it would be impossible to enforce metric regulations in Ontario at that time. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs alluded to the possibility that if they were to launch an appeal of this provincial court decision, at that time they would start enforcing the regulations. I am pleased to announce that since that day the Minister has agreed with the Department of Justice which advised her that it would not be possible to prosecute anyone in the Province of Ontario for the use of imperial measurement until the outcome of the appeal was known.

In my discussions with various lawyers involved in the case, it has been drawn to my attention that it will probably take a year or two to get through the appeal courts if the Government decides to appeal the case. The sad thing is that the Government cannot seem to make up its mind on whether or not it intends to appeal. While it is trying to make up its mind, I would like to draw its attention to a couple of incidents which have occurred in Canada. Perhaps the Parliamentary Secretary who will respond to my comments will endeavour to answer these concerns.

The Premier of Alberta, Peter Lougheed, has clearly stated that anyone prosecuted in his Province would be defended by the Department of the Attorney General of the Province. Because of that claim or statement by the Premier of Alberta, the Government dropped its charges in the case involving the floor covering industry over a year ago against Mrs. Kasparian in Calgary. It decided not to proceed and allowed her to continue selling carpet by the square yard. Also in the Province of Alberta, the Government itself, through inspectors, went into a service station and removed wires which it had placed on the pumps of a service station operator in that Province. The service station operator was a Mr. Carritt. I would ask the Government, or offer a word of caution to it that, as inspectors, it has been removing wires from pumps in the country. Who should be in the courts today if not the inspectors from the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who removed wires from the pumps of retail operators in the Province of Alberta?

If we add this dilemma to the Government's problem of trying to decide whether or not to prosecute, I would ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Berger) what the response of the Government might be on the legal matter of prosecutions and the statements by the Premier of Nova Scotia on the six o'clock news on the CTV network this evening that if they are going to prosecute any retailers in the Province of Nova Scotia, they had better start prosecuting the provincial Government in Nova Scotia.

Does the federal Government intend to prosecute provincial jurisdictions on consumer matters which both Mr. Lougheed and Mr. Buchanan claim are their jurisdictions, or will it do what it does in other areas of the law where federal regulations or legislation conflict with that of a provincial regional area? Will it respect those provincial regional areas and not prosecute?

It is not sufficient to tell the majority of Canadians, some 70 per cent to 80 per cent who do not really understand metric, that they are a tiny group of fanatics, that they are a dying group of dinosaurs, that their opinion does not really matter and that only the opinion of the Metric Commission, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and a few Members of Cabinet who support mandatory metric matters.

● (1825)

There has never been a vote in this House of Commons making it illegal to sell by the pound in the grocery stores of this nation. We have been denied that opportunity to represent our constituents. There has never been a vote in the House of Commons making it illegal for gas stations to sell a gallon of gasoline. This has all been done by Orders in Council. They can talk about the permissiveness of the regulations and legislation passed in 1970 all they want. The truth is that we agreed on two basic principles when we went metric in Canada. First, we would move keeping in pace with our major trading partner, the United States, where we do 70 per cent of our trade in Imperial weights and measures. We do not do one cent of weighted food for the United States in metric. It is all in imperial measurement.

Why is the Government converting back to using only imperial measure in the stockyards of this nation where we buy and export all our red meat in imperial measure? They do not use metric. They do not auction meat at the stockyards in metric. Why is the Canada Post Corporation, the former responsibility of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who is also responsible for the Metric Commission, dispensing gasoline at the main Post Office in downtown Toronto in gallons?

All of these questions need to be answered. The most important question is, when will this Government listen to the majority of the Canadian people? They do not want metric rammed down their throats. They do not want Orders in Council making it illegal to use imperial measurement. The farmers do not want their fertilizer bags marked in metric only. They do not understand. It is a disservice and an insult to people with regard to safety when dealing with crops and air traffic. They do not understand. I hope the Government will listen. I hope the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) listens to the judge in Toronto and stops this nonsense about mandatory metric.

[*Translation*]

Mr. David Berger (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): In his remarks, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member said that the Government cannot seem to make up its mind on whether or not it intends to appeal the decision rendered by Mr. Justice Ross on November 2 last. I can tell him that the written grounds for the decision were received late last week and they are now being fully looked into by officials of our Department and those of the Department of Justice.

[*English*]

The Hon. Member said that the Government was forcing metric on the various sectors of the retail trade. It is quite something how he takes isolated facts, makes them into general principles and distorts this debate. I have said on many occasions in this House that metric conversion was introduced as a result of requests from many sectors of the economy; industry, the teaching profession and every other sector of the economy. Less than a month ago the Minister met with a number of representatives from the retail food industry and the Consumers Association of Canada. This group expressed a strong desire to complete the implementation of the metric program as early as possible.

I am sure the Hon. Member also understands the many issues that have been raised by the judge's decision, one of them being the effective administration of the Weights and Measures Act which is designed to protect the business community and consumers alike, to prevent the use of inaccurate measuring devices and prohibit the use of devices that have been deliberately altered or modified to measure in a faulty manner. These questions must be considered prior to making a decision about the appeal.

In conclusion, I want to refer to the matter of our trade and Canada's exports. We all know the importance of exports to Canada's economy. It so happens that one half of our exports to the United States today are in metric units. When it comes to taking lessons from the Americans, I think the Hon. Member might like to reflect upon the tremendous commercial deficit in the United States. It might be better for Canadians to take our lead from the Japanese and the Germans in this case and perhaps base our commercial policies on countries that have shown how to succeed in the area of exports.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at two o'clock in the afternoon.

At 6.31 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 23, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

• (1405)

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

THE LATE JOHN F. KENNEDY

ANNIVERSARY OF ASSASSINATION OF UNITED STATES PRESIDENT

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, 24 hours ago marked a very important and historic day for the whole world. I had intended to recognize and pay homage to the thirty-fifth President of the United States, the late John F. Kennedy, and to request that all of us in this House who, I am sure, remember quite vividly and with sadness the assassination that took place 20 years ago, do so also. Considering all the negotiations that go on between this country and our friends, our neighbours south of the border, some 225 million Americans, I would like to transmit a special message of condolence, not only to the President and to the citizens who live in the United States of America, but also to the Kennedy family.

If it is at all in order, Mr. Speaker, I would request and seek unanimous consent that we send such a message from this Chamber to the President of the United States and to the American people and, in particular, a special message of condolence to the Kennedy family, marking that recognition—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. please. The Hon. Member's time has expired. The Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen).

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

LEBANON—AGONY OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN IN REFUGEE CAMPS

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Mr. Speaker, a year ago in September the world was shocked by the news of the terrible massacre in the refugee camps at Sabra and Chatila. All of us were unnerved by the heinousness of that massacre. Headlines in the world's newspapers were vividly describing what was going on. There were headlines such as, "Reprisal for Gemayel death was horrible, indiscriminate". There were placards that read, "Down With Begin's Blood-shedding Government". All of this was accompanied with the clinical scrutiny of the cameras as to the brutality of that massacre in those camps, all of the scrutiny necessary, and all of it deserved.

Now another massacre is occurring. It is the conflict between the PLO forces in Lebanon, and again it is the true refugees who are suffering. The women and the children and the Lebanese nationals who have absolutely no interest in that conflict at all are suffering the most. But there is this difference, Mr. Speaker, the difference of the deafening silence on the part of the world's media on the agony being suffered by those refugees and Lebanese nationals. Where are the cameras now to examine the agony of the women and the children in those refugee camps? Where is the condemnation of the warring factions using refugee camps as armed camps rather than refugee camps?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

STATUS OF WOMEN

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF CONSTITUTIONAL ACCORD

Mr. Jack Burghardt (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, two years ago today the women of Canada won a resounding victory in their battle for equality. After an 18-day endeavour, Section 28 of the Canadian Constitution was amended to guarantee equality of the sexes. On that historic day, the House of Commons was informed that the Government had been able to obtain agreement from all those Provinces party to the accord that Section 28, on the equality of men and women, would apply without the override clause.

The Minister responsible for the status of women has pointed out that during these past two years there have been many important initiatives in the area of women's rights. These initiatives include Canada's ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women; Treasury Board guidelines concerning personal harrassment and sex-stereotyping in government communications and the first federal-provincial-territorial conference of Ministers responsible for the status of women.

There was also the appointment of Bertha Wilson as the first woman on the Supreme Court of Canada, and of Constance Glubé, appointed first Chief Justice in the Province of New Brunswick.

The child care expense deduction has been doubled to $2,000 per child. Amendments have been made to the Unem-

S.O. 21

ployment Insurance Act to improve maternity benefits and, for the first time, payments will be available to adoptive parents.

While serious problems remain to be addressed and there is still much to be done, all women should feel both proud and encouraged by the initiatives already taken by this Government.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

THE CASE OF HUGH HAMBLETON—UNRESOLVED ISSUES

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada (Mr. MacGuigan) said in the House on Friday, in answer to a question of mine, that as far as the Government was concerned the Hambleton spy case was closed. How can the Minister take such a stand when the account of that espionage operation on behalf of the KGB, which lasted some 30 years, as set out in Leo Heap's recent book, entitled quite simply "Hugh Hambleton, Spy", outlines a number of unresolved issues?

● (1410)

For instance, was the Canadian Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) correct in denying that an offer of immunity from prosecution was ever made to Hambleton by Canadian authorites, when evidence that such an offer had been made is on the record of the trial in Britain, as brought out by the British Attorney General who was prosecuting the case? Or was the Canadian Solicitor General suggesting that the British Attorney General was dealing with tainted, or even falsified, evidence?

Here is another unresolved issue. Why did the Government not bring this case to trial in Canada under a law similar to the one under which Hambleton was tried in Britain? Who, in this Government, was sheltering a spy? Who was it that warned Hambleton, not once but twice, not to go to Britain or, having gone there, to turn around and fly back to Canada? Who did that, and why? Who is responsible for bungling this espionage case involving—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time is up.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

HUNGER STRIKE BY POLISH IMMIGRANTS SEEKING EXIT VISAS FOR FAMILIES IN HOMELAND

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, ten Canadian residents of Polish origin have been outside the Polish consulate in Toronto for 17 days on a hunger strike. They are all week, anxious, and tired, but remain determined to achieve their objective—reunification with their families. They have applied for family reunification under the joint Canadian-Polish program, and the families of four of these men have received negative replies for exit visas from Polish authorities. Our Department of External Affairs had promised these individuals some action by Monday or Tuesday of this week, causing some additional anxiety as these days slipped by without movement on the part of the Department of External Affairs or the Polish Government.

It is with deep regret that I must express my disappointment and that of my Party, the New Democratic Party, at the continued violation by the Polish Government of one of the most basic human rights—freedom of movement. With calculated cynicism some Polish citizens are virtually blackmailed into leaving their homeland, while others are held to ransom. I hope the Polish Government will rectify this state of affairs in the future, and I urge that the Department of External Affairs redouble its efforts and press its representations to the Polish Government on this very tragic human drama.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY

SUPPRESSION OF QUOTAS—CONSEQUENCES FOR PROVINCE OF QUEBEC—NECESSITY TO TAKE IMMEDIATE MEASURES

Mr. Normand Lapointe (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, the ministers concerned, are certainly aware that import quotas in the shoe manufacturing industry will be lifted as of November 1984. This industry plays a major role in the economy of my riding, because of the great many jobs it provides for both men and women. Several plant owners are already worrying about what will become of them after the quotas are lifted.

On behalf of this industry which is a major source of revenues for Canada, I wish to make Cabinet ministers aware of this situation and ask them to meet with the representatives of the Canadian shoe manufacturing industry and listen to what they have to say concerning shoe imports. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will certainly agree with me that we had better act quickly to avert the problems we experienced two years ago.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

SUGGESTED PROCLAMATION IN 1984

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, permit me to cite a proclamation made by the President of the United States of America in the first month of 1983. I read the President's words:

> Now therefore, I, Ronald Reagan, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim Thursday, May 5, 1983, "National Day of Prayer". I call upon every citizen of this great nation to gather together on that day in homes and places of worship to pray, each after his or her own manner, for unity of the hearts of all mankind.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 27th day of January, in the year of Our Lord, 1983, and of the Independence of the United States of America the 207th.

Canada did not follow the President's example in 1983. However, may I suggest that this Parliament proclaim a day of prayer in Canada in early 1984, a day on which we might all pray for world peace and brotherhood.

• (1415)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*Translation*]

CORPORATE SHAREHOLDING LIMITATION ACT

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Last Friday, the Minister said that the Liberal caucus unanimously supported Bill S-31. Is that still the case and does the Minister intend to proceed with consideration of this Bill?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs will be here in a few minutes, but I can inform the Leader of the Opposition that the caucus has examined this matter and has made suggestions to Cabinet. Bill S-31 is now before the Senate, and since the House intends to adjourn shortly, it stands to reason we will not be able to consider and pass this Bill before the end of this session. The caucus—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lalonde: I wonder why my hon. colleagues opposite are so surprised, because they know perfectly well we intend to start a new session very shortly, and that this Bill, like so many other Bills that are before the Senate or before the House, may not be considered by the House before the end of this session. Regarding the legislative program for the next session, the Leader of the Opposition will have to wait until the program is announced. However, as the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is aware, Members of the Quebec caucus have suggested that before proceeding with a new Bill during the next session, there should be further consultation with business and the Provinces.

Mr. Mulroney: I assume, Mr. Speaker, the Minister meant to say no.

Since the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is now in the House, as far as Bill S-31 is concerned, the

Member for Longueuil said this morning, and I quote: "Bill S-31 is already dead."

Considering this very straightforward statement, does the Minister intend to let the Bill die on the Senate Order Paper or does she intend to proceed with this legislation?

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the normal course of events, of course, will unfold, and as to the future of S-31, I would say to the Leader of the Oppsition, and I am terribly pleased that we have the head organ grinder asking the question today, S-31 will be thoroughly discussed with the business community. If the House prorogues, the normal course of events will follow and the bill will die. This Government, and I might add this caucus, even those members of the Quebec caucus who issued a statement this morning, approve in principle the intent of S-31.

[*Translation*]

OPPOSITION OF CERTAIN QUEBEC INDUSTRIAL LEADERS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Minister, twenty-one Quebec industrial leaders, all of whom . . . , the Minister is being coached by the Minister of Finance, perhaps I can wait for a while . . . , all of whom are reasonable and respected citizens, twenty-one industrial leaders wrote to the Minister . . . I know this hurts the Liberal Members from Quebec, I know it does. They are busy changing their position, and I can guarantee we are going to see them all do that. Mr. Speaker, my question is as follows: twenty-one Quebec industrial leaders wrote to the Minister this morning, if I am not mistaken, stating their fierce opposition to the Bill. Does the Minister intend to take into consideration the views being expressed by reasonable and serious minded Quebecers, in her decision concerning Bill S-31.

• (1420)

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the Leader of the Opposition in this manner: if he is going to quote and use numbers, I shall also use the same technique.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Erola: The supporters of this Bill within the Province of Quebec are numerous. If the Leader of the Opposition and Members of his caucus have followed events carefully, they will know that *The Gazette* said that "the truth is that this Bill, or something very much like it, is in the interest of

Quebecers as well as all other Canadians". It is reported in *Le Devoir:*

[*Translation*]

Mr. Campeau, in his arguments, is acting more like an irrational alarmist, instead of being logically persuasive.

[*English*]

Those are only two of the opinions, Mr. Speaker. May I add that within the Leader of the Official Opposition's own caucus there is considerable support for Bill S-31.

I would like to indicate that a Conservative Member, the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall), said in 1977:

Good laws should be applied to the interprovincial and international movement of goods and passengers. This is necessary for the sake of the industry as a whole and the proper and good order of the development of the movement of passengers and goods interprovincially and internationally . . . The intent of the Bill is clear. It is a good one and one we are prepared to let pass.

Those comments were made by one of the members of the Conservative caucus.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Last supplementary.

INQUIRY WHETHER GOVERNMENT WILL ALLOW BILL TO DIE IN SENATE

Mr. Brian Mulroney (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if the Minister is having some trouble with this problem, the Chairman of the Liberal caucus is not—

[*English*]

Given the genius of the Quebec Liberal Party for solving difficult problems, we have heard this morning that the Quebec Liberal caucus will recommend that this thorny matter be submitted to the Macdonald Royal Commission for resolution. Now, there is a stroke of genius for you, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mulroney: Did the chairman of the Quebec Liberal caucus charge $800 a day for that opinion?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we just want to know whether the Minister intends to withdraw her Bill, yes or no? This Bill is becoming increasingly obsolete, and we would like to know whether the Minister, considering the objections to the Bill voiced by Liberal Members, intends to let the Bill die on the Senate Order Paper.

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to the Leader of the Official Opposition how I think events will unfold. However, I would like to reassure him that the future of Bill S-31, or similar legislation, is still a principle to which the Government adheres. I would suggest to him that he wait until the new Session begins to see when and if a version of Bill S-31 is introduced.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): I am pleased to see that the other side can still generate enthusiasm for something, because after the general retreat we have witnessed here in the House, there is certainly no great enthusiasm for this Bill.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (1425)

[*English*]

ENFORCEMENT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION'S PROVISIONS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, the Minister has just admitted the political collapse of Bill S-31. I would like to ask some questions about legality and propriety. Will the Minister confirm that, even though this Bill has not been received or approved by the House of Commons of Canada, it is already being enforced as the law of Canada? If that is the case, will she tell us on what authority she is enforcing a law which the House of Commons of Canada has not received, let alone approved?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the second hitter. There has been no attempt to enforce this Bill but we will, of course, be getting legal opinions.

PARLIAMENTARY PRACTICE

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I have a letter signed by the predecessor of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs which is addressed to Canavia Transit Inc. indicating, and I quote: "However, I feel that an exemption to the Corporate Shareholding Limitation Act", that is Bill S-31, "—would be inappropriate and in many ways unnecessary." In other words, the Government is acting on a Bill which has not been received here in the House of Commons.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, this is a dramatic breach of the practices of this Parliament. It is objectionable enough that budget measures should be administered before they are approved by the House of Commons, but at least budget measures must be introduced in this House. This Bill was not even introduced in the House of Commons. It was introduced in the Senate of Canada. This is an entirely new dimension in the breach of the privileges of this Parliament.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): On what authority is the Government of Canada entering into this brand new breach of the rules of Parliament? Will the Minister give us her undertaking

right now that this practice of enforcing this Bill stop immediately, at 2.27 p.m. this afternoon?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Member for Yellowhead that the Senate is a part of Parliament. It is not unusual to introduce legislation in Parliament. There has been no attempt to enforce this Bill. There has been no need to enforce this Bill. I can assure the Hon. Member that the Bill, of course, would not become law until it has passed through both Chambers.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER CITE PRECEDENT

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister cite one example, in the whole history of Parliament, where this has been done before?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has some concern about questions that involve an interpretation or a level of detail.

Some Hon. Members: She needs all the help she can get.

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that a number of Bills have been brought in with effective dates which do reflect a certain amount of retroactivity. I will undertake to find all of the precedents and bring them to the attention of the Member.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

GOVERNMENT'S POLITICAL WILL TO CUT UNEMPLOYMENT IN HALF

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Yesterday the Chairman of the Economic Council of Canada, the Government's own economic advisory body, while appearing before the Labour Committee of the House of Commons suggested that unemployment could be cut in half if the Government of Canada possessed the political will to accomplish that. Do the Minister and his Government have the political will to cut unemployment in Canada in half within the 1980s?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT SET UNEMPLOYMENT TARGET

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, considering the strategies that the Minister of Finance has raised in this House, that answer is completely unacceptable. The Minister's colleague, sitting behind him, who is the Minister of State for Economic Development, while appearing before the Macdonald Commission, as well as before the Finance Committee last night, indicated that it was absolutely necessary for the Government to set performance targets in order to measure its performance.

• (1430)

The Government has set targets for research and development. It has set targets for inflation. It has set targets for the growth of the Gross National Product. However, there is one obvious and glaring omission. The Government has failed to set a target for reducing the level of unemployment. Will the Minister now continue on in that tradition, support the vision of his Cabinet colleague, and set a target for unemployment in this country so that we will have something to shoot for in the months ahead?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I shall consider the Hon. Member's question as a suggestion and take it under advisement. I may remind the Hon. Member that under the 6 and 5 program, the Government set a target, and that we were able to meet this target and even to go beyond it, that is, we have succeeded in bringing inflation in this country down to even lower levels.

Regarding specific projections for inflation, unemployment and so forth, I would remind my hon. colleague that in my last budget I gave a number of projections covering a period of five years. If and when a budget is brought down in 1984, I should be pleased to revise these projections, and the Hon. Member will be advised of such revisions at the same time they are announced to the Canadian public.

[*English*]

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, I believe we are all encouraged to hear that the Minister will now consider setting a target for unemployment.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

REQUEST THAT MINISTER ORDER REDUCTION IN INTEREST RATES

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister be prepared to consider one other item? With the huge balance of payments surplus now, a number of analysts have suggested that the Canadian dollar will remain firm if real interest rates were reduced. A number of organizations and agencies have suggested to the Minister of Finance that the best step he could take to bring consumer and investor confidence back would be to reduce the real interest rates in this country. Will the Minister consider approaching the Governor of the Bank of Canada and directing that real interest rates be reduced, to allow more investment and consumer spending in an effort—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is going beyond a supplementary at this point.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I remind my hon. friend that the consumer confidence to which he refers stands at an 18-year high. This is the highest level of consumer confidence we have known in 18 years. I remind the Hon. Member that today inflation is at its lowest level since August, 1972. I remind him that personal loan rates at the present time are at their lowest level in ten years. These are quite significant factors happening in the economy at the present time.

Mr. Riis: What about investment?

Mr. Lalonde: With respect to the specific question raised by the Hon. Member, I do not intend to give such a directive to the Governor of the Bank. The Canadian dollar has been floating over the last ten years. I believe that policy has served our country well. I do not believe that an artificial directive would be something which would instill more confidence in the Canadian economy, either among investors or consumers. I believe that the policy which has been followed by the Government in the monetary field over the last year has been very successful, and we should continue to pursue it.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CORPORATE SHAREHOLDING LIMITATION ACT

OPPOSITION BY QUEBEC BUSINESSMEN—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Last Friday, Mr. Speaker, you were in the chair when the Minister told us that there were no objections from her Quebec colleagues to Bill S-31. I am not saying that she deliberately lied to the House, for I think she was quite misinformed about the opposition taking place, and she knows that today, she knows now that several Quebec Members have come to the conclusion that it is a bad piece of legislation. She was received a letter from about twenty Quebec businessmen who are not separatists and who are urging her to shelve the Bill.

In light of such strong opposition, why does the Minister refuse to announce today that she will drop the Bill which is unacceptable to a French-speaking group that is entitled to voice its opinion about Canada's economy?

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the impression which the Hon. Member has that there is no support for Bill S-31 among the Quebec caucus. Au contraire, the Quebec caucus this morning stated explicitly that it was committed to the principle of Bill S-31 but felt perhaps there should be a change in tactics. No more, no less.

[*Translation*]

TEN PER CENT LIMIT ON INVESTMENT BY CAISSE DE DÉPÔT ET PLACEMENT OF QUEBEC—INQUIRY AS TO CONSEQUENCES OF BILL DYING IN SENATE

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, here is my supplementary question: since the Minister refuses to tell the House that she is prepared to forget that Bill—indeed, it is obvious that the Government will let the Bill die in the Senate—under the circumstances, can the Minister, honest as she is, I admit, tell us whether the moment this Bill dies on the Senate Order Paper, the 10 per cent ceiling on investments by Quebec's Caisse de dépôt et placement will be automatically lifted and that this institution, like all others, will be free to expand on a country-wide scale?

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, of course if there is no legislation in place, as I said earlier, in the normal course of events it would die. However, as to the future of a similar Bill, or a commitment to the principles of Bill S-31, I would like again to reiterate that this Government is committed to those principles. The Hon. Member will just have to wait and see what happens in the Speech from the Throne.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

LEVEL OF GRAIN QUOTAS ALLOCATED TO FARMERS

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport in regard to wheat quotas on the Prairies. According to "Grain Update", the export of wheat and grain from the Prairies is up 29 per cent while at the same time farm deliveries are down 19 per cent as of October 19. Considering the cash flow problems which farmers are facing, will the Minister look into the problems of quotas? At this time last year the quota for the delivery of grain was nine bushels. Today it is three bushels. Or is it the Minister's intention to play into the hands of the railroads with regard to Bill C-155?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member knows that the purpose of Bill C-155 is to expand substantially the capacity of the railway system so that farmers can grow more grain, sell more grain, and export more grain. That is the purpose of Bill C-155. I will certainly take note of the Hon. Member's concern about the present quota system and raise it with my colleague, the Minister of State. We will try to have an answer for the Hon. Member as soon as those consultations are completed.

CASH FLOW POSITION OF FARMERS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Len Gustafson (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. If the Minister would check with the grain elevators across the

Prairies he would find that many of them are empty and have no grain to ship, while others are possibly half full. The Minister said earlier, in terms of cash flow and so on, that he would move at a time when it was prudent. Is the Minister playing politics with the cash flow of farmers, waiting for a prudent time?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think the question of the Hon. Member once again demonstrates how essential and vital Bill C-155 was, so that we could have in place a new system for allocating and organizing the transportation system.

As far as the second part of the Hon. Member's question is concerned, Mr. Speaker, I continue to exercise my prudence.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

TÉLÉ-MÉTROPOLE STRIKE AT MONTREAL—PARTIES' POSITIONS ON APPOINTMENT OF MEDIATOR

Mr. Jacques Olivier (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour, and as a preamble I would like to stress, with respect to the Leader of the Opposition's attempts at rationalizing my quotes, that there is one which he overlooked, namely that I will never have the opportunity to suggest that the Progressive Conservative party is already dead, because it has never existed and will never exist in Quebec, especially his leadership.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour concerning the Télé-Métropole strike or lockout in Montreal, where workers have for quite a long time been affected by a labour dispute. Some weeks ago, the Minister called upon both parties to state whether they agreed on having a special mediator appointed. Will the Minister now report to the House that both parties are in agreement as to having a special mediator appointed, and if so, when does he expect to appoint one?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have indeed received a formal request from both parties for the appointment of a special mediator in this dispute. This morning, I informed both parties that Mr. Raymond Lebœuf, from Verdun, had been appointed mediator under Section 195 of the Canadian Labour Code. Hopefully, this development will get both parties closer together and lead to a satisfactory arrangement. I am sure that with the help of Mr. Lebœuf who is an experienced mediator, this long standing dispute should be resolved for the benefit of both parties and the general public without further delay.

● (1440)

CORPORATE SHAREHOLDING LIMITATION ACT

REASONS FOR GOVERNMENT NOT PROPOSING AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the distinguished Senator for Nickel Belt. Last Friday, the Minister told me that the Canadian Labour Board lacked the authority needed to regulate in the area of interprovincial and international transportation. In view of the statement made yesterday by prominent Quebec businessmen that the Board has all the authority it needed, can the Minister explain exactly what are those essential powers needed by the Board to regulate in the national interest in that area, and why she did not introduce any amendment to the National Transportation Act if the current powers are not adequate?

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that on February 22, 1977, in the case of Pacific Western Airlines, the Supreme Court of Canada, in a unanimous decision, found that Her Majesty in right of the Province is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Canadian Transport Commission. I do not think I have the time now, but I will be very pleased to provide the Hon. Member with the complete written decision which states very clearly that the CTC does not have the power we need in Bill S-31 which we are presenting in the Senate.

[*Translation*]

CONSEQUENCES FOR QUEBEC

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, the Minister is very much aware that Quebec's Caisse de dépôt et placements is not an agent of Her Majesty. So that is ridiculous! Despite the statement made by the Minister that all the Members from Quebec support the principle of Bill S-31, the Liberal Member for Longueuil had this to say yesterday, and I quote:

The people of Quebec and the Quebec caucus are against Bill S-31.

Given the opposition from the Quebec Liberal caucus and that of even the unanimous Progressive Conservative caucus from Quebec, how can the Minister insist on reintroducing in the forthcoming session of Parliament that Bill which has stolen millions of dollars from the Quebec taxpayers?

[*English*]

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has made some charges which I think he must substantiate, because this is not a Bill which is robbing millions of dollars from the people of Quebec. Indeed, it protects the investments of millions of Quebecers. I would like to make it very clear that the Bill grandfathers those voting shares owned by the caisse populaire. I would also like to make it very clear that the caisse

populaire is an agent of the Crown. I would like the Hon. Member to substantiate those charges, and I would be very happy to provide information which will prove to him that Quebecers are winners, not losers, in S-31.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

PRICING AND MOVEMENT OF FEED GRAINS

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport who answers for the Wheat Board. Presently there is complete chaos in the pricing and movement of feed grains in western Canada because of barley quota manipulation, a large differentiation in the barley and other bases, and a low initial board price for barley and other feed grains. Will the Minister immediately cause an investigation to take place to eliminate the reasons for this totally unacceptable situation?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, again I think it would be prudent to take the description of chaos by the Hon. Member with some degree of skepticism. We are examining the question. I think he would recognize that the Government did advance payments on feed grains, particularly barley, because of the substantial increase in world prices of some 30 odd per cent over the last two or three months. We are providing a much stronger cash flow to the farmers in this area. If, however, he has some evidence of problems he is encountering in his area, I would certainly be very glad to look into it.

INITIAL GRAIN PRICES

Mr. Stan Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, the off board quota is traditionally seven bushels higher than the board quota, and those quotas are now the same. The price of board grain is $15 lower than off board grain. Farmers are sitting on their grain, the Wheat Board does not have sufficient quantities to deliver for export, and barley sales are being deferred. While the Minister is partying over the death of the Crow tonight, will he look at immediately increasing the initial prices for board grain, and also ask the Wheat Board to increase the off board quota so that some semblance of a system can be put back in place in the West?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, when we honour this evening the proclamation of the railway expansion act which will bring major benefits to western Canada, we will also give some time to consideration of the situation in the feed grain area. As the Hon. Member knows, we have had a very volatile market in feed grains over the past two or three months, which has caused some of the disparities he mentioned. We are attempting to look at it, and I would have to do this in consultation with my colleague, the Minister of State. We will undertake those discussions and try to have a report back to this House as soon as possible.

NATIONAL REVENUE

DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO MUNICIPAL DATA BANKS

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board who has the responsibility for regulations safeguarding the privacy of Canadians. Was his Parliamentary Secretary, the Hon. Member for Kitchener, speaking on behalf of the President of the Treasury Board in an interview with the Kitchener-Waterloo Record, in which he condemned the attempt by the Department of Revenue to plug into municipal data banks and said he was "convinced that the request was inappropriate and I am making representations to ensure that similar requests are not made in future of Kitchener or any other municipality"? Was his Parliamentary Secretary speaking for the President of the Treasury Board?

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, my Parliamentary Secretary was speaking in his capacity as Member for Kitchener. In that capacity he was and is doing a very good job for his constituents.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER END PRACTICE

Hon. Perrin Beatty (Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, perhaps we will see how effective he is. The Hon. Member said that, in addition to lobbying the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Justice, he sent a letter to the Minister of National Revenue condemning this and asking for a change. He also gave an interview in which he said this is not the way things are done in a parliamentary democracy.

In light of the growing opposition, both within his own Caucus and among Canadians as a whole, to this outrageous request, is the Minister of National Revenue now prepared to put an end to this odious practice, to admit the request should never have been made to the City of Kitchener, and give a guarantee to Canadians that similar requests will not be made to other municipalities, as has been suggested by the Hon. Member for Kitchener?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I believe that this whole question should be clarified. The Hon. Member and everyone else in this House will recall that when I replied to his question last week, I did state that it was not our practice to ask for all the information and data stored in the date banks of a city or municipality. What we wanted to get was specific data concerning certain information which in any case are available to the public, and this is what we are doing. If the letter sent by a departmental official to the City of Kitchener gave the impression that something else was required, it is a wrong impression which does not reflect the policy of the Department.

SOCIAL WELFARE

REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION OF QUEBEC PROVINCIAL POLICIES

Mr. Pierre Gimaïel (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. This morning, the Minister met her Quebec counterpart, Mr. Marois, who is responsible for social development policies in Quebec. This meeting followed a recent announcement by the Premier that the welfare policies would be changed in Quebec to provide work for young people.

Since the federal Government pays at least 50 per cent of the cost of Quebec welfare programs and even more because of equalization, I would like to ask the Minister what resulted from her meeting with Mr. Marois this morning, and what are these major initiatives which the Quebec Premier did not mention when he announced the new social welfare policy for Quebec?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will let Minister Marois announce himself, since he so wishes, the details of the projects which he discussed in general terms with me this morning. I can confirm that I told him after this meeting, where he showed a very good spirit of co-operation, which was a pleasant surprise, that we indeed pay 50 per cent of every dollar spent for welfare assistance, and that, whatever means Quebec wants to take to help people on welfare, as long, and this seems to be the case, as the rights of welfare recipients are respected, and that everything is done on a voluntary basis, that all the usual rules apply and that no cheap labour is created, we shall be very happy to continue to pay 50 per cent of the costs of the Quebec social welfare plan.

* * *

● (1450)

[*English*]

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

GENEVA TALKS BREAKDOWN—REQUEST THAT CANADA REFUSE CRUISE MISSILE TESTING

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. It concerns the tragic breakdown yesterday of the Geneva talks. He has said repeatedly in the House that the problem in Geneva was not a lack of proposals but the lack of a good political climate. Of course, now that political climate has taken a turn for the worse.

Would the Minister not agree with George Kennan, the former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, that a dramatic move is needed to break the stalemate? Would the Minister not make that dramatic move himself and help us get off of the nuclear treadmill in this world, by announcing, for example, that Canada will not test the Cruise missile in our country?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that that suggestion, if it were implemented, would have the effect that the Hon. Member desires. The negotiations have broken off in Geneva, and that is very regrettable. However, the Soviet Union has known for four years now that, if an agreement was not reached at the talks, deployment would take place. That is what is about to happen.

The Soviet Union has taken the view at the Geneva talks that it ought to have a monopoly of land based intermediate missiles in Europe. Since the beginning of the negotiations, the Soviet Union itself has deployed 100 SS-20s in Europe. It seems to me that for Canada to say at this stage that we will not test the Cruise would have no effect and would likely confirm the Soviet Union's view that it ought to have a monopoly of land based intermediate missiles in Europe. It wishes to deploy all of these missiles and give the U.S. nothing. Therefore, the Hon. Member ought to understand that that problem has to be tackled, and it would not be helped very much but by what I would consider not only useless but dangerous gestures by Canada at the present time.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Halton.

Mr. Nystrom: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Halton.

* * *

TOURISM

EFFECT OF TAX IMPOSED ON PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL PRODUCED IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Otto Jelinek (Halton): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. I am sure that he knows that there have been over 70,000 jobs lost in the tourist industry in Canada in the first six months of this year alone. This is primarily due to the Government's taxation policies, which have virtually been pricing this vital sector out of business.

Instead of taking initiatives by way of tax rebates and other positive measures, why has he resorted to counterproductive protectionist tactics, such as a recently implemented 9 per cent tax on American material destined for Canadian markets? Can he justify the creation of this latest obstacle to the tourist industry in Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Hon. Member could care to be more specific about the 9 per cent tax to which he is referring. I would

remind him that with a $31 billion deficit, the Government is not putting an undue burden on taxpayers, and that we have taken all kinds of measures to stimulate the tourist industry, and I hope that in the months to come, we shall also be able to announce further measures to encourage the tourist industry in Canada.

[*English*]

REQUEST THAT MINISTER WITHDRAW SALES TAX

Mr. Otto Jelinek (Halton): Mr. Speaker, the Minister should know that, as a result of his Government's action, the United States is now retaliating by taxing Canadian promotional tourist material, to be specific, that is destined for the United States. Since Canada sends far more material to the United States as a result of its larger market, the clear loser in this area is the Canadian tourist industry. Therefore I ask the Minister, very clearly and specifically, as a result of this negative obstacle to the tourist industry in Canada, is he prepared, in fairness to the industry, to withdraw this detrimental 9 per cent sales tax on U.S. tourist material?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason that the Hon. Member ought to know that we also want to encourage employment in Canada, and that insofar as this kind of work for the tourist industry can be done by Canadian printers, we are prepared to support this measure rather than stimulate employment in the United States, at the expense of Canadian workers.

* * *

[*English*]

PENITENTIARIES

MILLHAVEN RIOT—GUARD WRONGFULLY BLAMED BY PARLIAMENTARY SUBCOMMITTEE

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. In 1977 a parliamentary subcommittee on the penitentiary system, of which the Minister was the chairman, reported that prison guard Bernard Evans uttered statements that precipitated the riot at Millhaven Penitentiary. After a lengthy judicial procedure, the Public Service Appeal Board ruled yesterday that Bernard Evans did not make the remarks attributed to him by the subcommittee.

Given the injustice that has been perpetrated, and the negative impact that this has had on Mr. Evans' career, what steps is the Minister prepared to take to see that the stigma that has been attached to Bernard Evans no longer exists?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this is not a question which is addressed to me in my capacity as Minister of Justice but, I gather in a former capacity, and since the Speaker has allowed the Hon. Member to ask the question, I guess I may be allowed to reply.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Speaker does not attempt to determine which Minister, but the question should be asked of the Solicitor General.

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I can only say at this time that the Correctional Service of Canada is reviewing and seeking legal advice on the decision which was handed down yesterday to see whether anything can be done within its terms of reference in relation to the findings of that Board.

Miss MacDonald: This is hardly good enough, Mr. Speaker. I was seeking legal advice from the Minister of Justice, and that is to whom I directed my question. What I am saying is that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With all due respect, legal advice is not permitted. If the Hon. Member wishes to ask a question involving the operation of the Solicitor General's Department, then that is in order.

Mr. Nielsen: That is up to the Minister.

REQUEST THAT APOLOGY BE EXTENDED

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough that the House of Commons, or a Minister of the Crown, cops out on this question. A serious mistake has been made, a serious mistake by Parliament. If we in Parliament cannot admit to our mistakes and take methods to correct them, how can people expect justice here—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please ask her supplementary question?

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister at least arrange for an apology to be extended to Bernard Evans for the wrong that has been done to him?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the wrong to which the Hon. Member refers was not done by the Correctional Service of Canada. The wrong to which I gather she is referring is the unanimous report of a parliamentary committee. I do not think that a Minister of the Crown should be called upon to take steps in relation to a report of a committee.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE MEMBER'S OPINION

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew-Nipissing-Pembroke): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Some time ago, when speaking to an Ottawa Valley audience, the Hon. Member for Mississauga South was questioned by the audience on how long it would take a PC Government to turn the Canadian economy around. That great fountain of

accurate news, *The Renfrew Mercury*, reported that the MP said it would take—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has considerable concern about the nature of this question within the rules. The Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

QUOTA SETTING POLICIES

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. When the Minister checks into the conditions that were referred to by my colleagues from Assiniboia and Wetaskiwin he will find out there is a serious problem. When he is checking into it, I would ask him to see what he could do to rectify the situation so that it does not happen again. Producers are being hurt. We should not have to raise these kinds of issues in the House of Commons. They should be looked after before getting to that state of affairs.

● (1500)

One of the suggestions I would make to the Minister, if he is looking for remedies so the situation does not happen again, is that the Canadian Wheat Board be more open in its policies of setting quotas so that producers know when a quota is going to come and, if the quota is not coming, the reasons for it not coming.

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I never thought there was anything particularly wrong about the Chamber of the House of Commons being used to raise a variety of concerns and issues of constituents. That is what the forum is for. However, as I say, we will be taking a look at that aspect. The Canadian Wheat Board is one that has commissioners on it who are chosen and who do reflect a pretty broad base of interests. We will be reviewing that situation as it now exists to determine to what extent the problem exists, and how we might solve it.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

IMPACT OF RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. When the Resource Development Impacts Funding Program for Indian people expired last March, the Minister said that other funds would be found. However, this has not happened. What help would the Minister give to people like the Carrier-Sekani Tribal Council which faces massive impact from such projects as the Northeast Coal and the Kemano II project? Does the Minister have any help for them, apart from writing nice letters to Gulf Canada and other corporations asking them to be considerate? What real help is there to aid these people face these impacts?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I would tell the Hon. Member that we do have moneys, not nearly as many as last fiscal year—the Hon. Member is quite right—to fund Indian people for social impact studies. If the group of Indians in British Columbia, for whom the Hon. Member is speaking, are short of money, I hope to be able to address that this year. I am taking matters up now—I have not got a decision—but I am taking matters up now with the purpose of getting additional moneys for that very objective. I hope to have a decision very shortly.

POSSIBLE PARTICIPATION OF YUKON INDIANS IN KING POINT DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have a short supplementary for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Is the Minister or his Government considering a proposal by the Council of Yukon Indians for the advance of a repayable loan of $80 million, or of any sum, to enable the CYI to participate in the King Point development with the proponent of that development? If so, is that proposal being considered favourably with a view to the Minister reconsidering his freezing of the project, to the lasting benefit of the economy and the unemployed in the Yukon?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, knowing the Hon. Member for Yukon to be such an authority on House rules, I view his question with some humour as to how he could piggy-back that on as a supplementary to a question about impact funds for Indians adversely affected by development.

An Hon. Member: Answer the question.

Mr. Munro (Hamilton East): Nevertheless, let me say this. Yes, I think that proposal, prior to my rejection of the application of Keiwit, was under consideration by my colleague, the Minister responsible for industry. I would suggest that when the Minister is back in the House the Hon. Member for Yukon address the question to him.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Presenting reports from special and standing committees.

Mr. Nielsen: I have a short supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have gone beyond the normal hour for Question Period and I did extend a supplementary to some one else's question to the Hon. Member for Yukon, a courtesy not always extended. I will allow a short supplementary, but could it be short?

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Point of Order—Miss MacDonald

MINISTER'S POSITION ON KING POINT PROJECT

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I am acting on the assumption that the application by CYI will be approved. Will the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development then reconsider his refusal to allow the King Point development to go ahead, and give a green light to that project?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, one thing I have learned from watching the behaviour of the Hon. Member for Yukon over the years is that I know enough now not to answer hypothetical questions of that kind.

Some Hon. Members: A short supplementary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Presenting reports from special and standing committees. The Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead (Mr. Clark).

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

MR. CLARK (YELLOWHEAD)—STATEMENT OF MRS. EROLA DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs indicated by her answers today in relation to Bill S-31 that the Government may be intending to carry on a practice of enforcing a law which has not been received or approved by this Parliament. I am rising simply to reserve my right over the next few days to regard the propriety of this and perhaps—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I think the Hon. Member has made his point. It is not a point of order strictly. He has made his observation.

Mr. Nielsen: He is the Right Hon. Member.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Presenting reports from special and standing committees.

MISS MACDONALD—INDICTMENT OF BERNARD EVANS IN REPORT OF PARLIAMENTARY SUBCOMMITTEE

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order with regard to the questions I raised during Question Period which have to do with a report of a parliamentary subcommittee on the penitentiary system. In this report a person by the name of Bernard Evans was indicted, which indictment has subsequently been proven incorrect. That has, as a result, had a very adverse impact on the life and career of that individual. This report was issued by a subcommittee of this Parliament.

I am seeking your advice, Sir, as to how I should now proceed to have this situation corrected since neither the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) nor the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan), when I asked them the question, would undertake to address this matter or to have that very serious grievance rectified. Therefore, I would like to know how something that has been done by Parliament itself, which is incorrect and unjust, can now be corrected?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair cannot direct a committee to reconsider anything.

Mr. Nielsen: Parliament can.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair cannot give instructions to committees of the House. However, the Chair will examine the matter raised. I have one observation, however. There is the device of a motion available to the Hon. Member which she may well wish to consider.

* * *

THE LATE JOHN F. KENNEDY

ANNIVERSARY OF ASSASSINATION OF UNITED STATES PRESIDENT

Mr. Maurice Harquail (Restigouche): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think that if you seek it, you may find unanimous consent with reference to a statement made under the provisions of Standing Order 21 this afternoon on a very special matter relating to a request of the House to transmit a message through the Acting Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) to the American people and the Kennedy family on the assassination of the President, the late John F. Kennedy, the thirty-fifth President of the United States of America.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. Member have the unanimous consent of the House to introduce a motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member present his motion?

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I refer to my statement under the provisions of Standing Order 21, which sets out—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has been given leave to introduce a motion. Will he present his motion?

Mr. Harquail: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move:

That the Acting Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs on behalf of all Members of this House and Canadians transmit and express our condolence on the occasion on the twentieth anniversary of the assassination of the thirty-fifth President of the United States, the late John F. Kennedy.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for the Yukon (Mr. Nielsen).

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe we share the sympathy expressed by the Hon. Member. Let me make that clear. But since what he is requesting is that the feelings of all Members

of this House be conveyed to the Kennedy family, I think it would be much more appropriate if that sentiment were conveyed by yourself on behalf of us all.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there agreement that on behalf of Madam Speaker, I convey such a sentiment to the representative of the United States of America in Canada?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Harquail: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would endorse unanimously and agree that this message be transmitted through the Chair.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MISS MacDONALD—INDICTMENT OF BERNARD EVANS IN REPORT OF PARLIAMENTARY SUBCOMMITTEE

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) in her question and subsequently on her point of order seemed to leave an implication that there was a question to which I should have responded. The document to which she was referring was a report of a parliamentary committee representing Members of all Parties. It was an unanimous report. All of the Members of that committee have equal responsibility for it and none have more than others. It is not a matter on which I can pronounce in my present position. I said publicly recently in the Hon. Member's city of Kingston, that it did appear, in the light of the coming forward of another gentleman, the words would not be to take credit—, but to admit to responsibility for having uttered the words to which the report referred, that we had indeed made an error in our attribution. I presume all other members of the subcommittee would feel the same way. I do not know any way a subcommittee, which no longer exists and has not existed since 1977, can now make amends. I am certainly prepared to endorse any move which would have the effect of doing that on behalf of the House.

• (1510)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has indicated that it will take the matter under advisement. Does the Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) have something which he wants to add to this point?

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) has been allowed to do so. Since he was chairman of that subcommittee, he knows that it was set up primarily due to my own personal instigation. I was one of those on the subcommittee who provided part of that unanimity in the report, but I am also one of the first to say that we made a dreadful mistake in the conclusions that the subcommittee reached with respect to Mr. Evans.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Minister avers that he should not in his official position now be taking a position on the matter, I agree totally with the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) that Parliament, having set up the subcommittee and being responsible for the deleterious effects on Mr. Evans, now has the responsibility to undo the wrong it has caused him.

I urge the Government and the Minister, particularly as past chairman of the subcommittee and as part of the present Government, to urge his Cabinet colleagues to take the matter under advisement for the purpose of finding some solution which will restore Mr. Evans to his previously respected position in the Public Service.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has previously indicated that it will take the matter under advisement. The Chair, however, made a suggestion that the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) may wish to consider putting forward a motion on the matter. That is something the Hon. Member may well want to consider.

Mr. Nielsen: The Government should act.

Miss MacDonald: It should be the Government.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one very brief comment on this matter. I think the point is being missed, quite frankly. An apology is one thing; it is about all we can do on this side of the House because we do not have the ability to introduce any motion which would involve compensation or the expenditure of public funds.

I think the point my House Leader made is a very appropriate one. It is the responsibility of a Government Member, a Member on the Treasury benches, to bring forward a proposal that would in fact compensate Mr. Evans for the loss he has suffered as a result of a very unfortunate occurrence in the subcommittee. Mr. Evans was precluded, for whatever reason, from giving evidence as to his side of the case. Only one side was heard, and that was the allegation made against him. My point in brief is that it is the obligation of the Government to come forward in terms of compensation for Mr. Evans in this very unfortunate incident.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Claude-André Lachance (Rosemont): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Rosemont (Mr. Lachance), on the same point of order.

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Speaker, yes, as a Member of the Sub-Committee, I would like to point out that it bothers me a little that Hon. Members are trying to turn this into a matter of one side of the House against the other side. If we are to seek an equitable solution, we should do so, but then as Members of this House and not as a Party or as the Govern-

ment, and I would urge the Minister to consider the matter in this light.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

PRESENTATION OF SIXTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the sixth report of the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

[*Editor's Note: For above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

PETITIONS

MR. YOUNG—ENACTEMENT OF SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition signed by approximately 5,000 residents of the Province of Ontario who ask the House to provide a remedy for the problem of toxic chemicals posing a serious threat to the potable waters of this Province. They indicate that presently there is no legislation to guarantee the safety and healthfulness of those waters and that Canada's neighbour, the United States of America, has legislation entitled, "The Safe Drinking Water Act, 1974".

Wherefore we, the undersigned, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to enact the safe drinking water Act which will protect and enhance drinking water quality in all areas of Canada. This petition was circulated under the auspices of Pollution Probe.

MR. DOMM—INCREASES IN BELL CANADA RATES

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition protesting increased Bell Canada rates in townships in the northern part of Peterborough County, namely the Townships of Smith, Dummer, Harvey and Burleigh-Anstruther. These townships now have to effect price increases, in some cases for telephones just across the road, when dealing with municipalities of fewer than 3,000 people.

I humbly request the consideration of both the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) and the House in reviewing the petition to see if anything might be done to provide corrective measures for the hundreds of constituents who are petitioning the House in terms of increases in these extremely rural areas of Peterborough County effective November 15.

CANADA SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-697, an Act to protect and enhance the quality of drinking water in Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce Bill C-697, an Act to protect and enhance the quality of drinking water in Canada. This Act would provide opportunities for public involvement in the making of regulations to set maximum permissible levels for contaminants and other substances in drinking water. It would also provide that it would be an offence for the operator of a public water system to provide water which contravenes the regulation or to fail to comply with monitoring and notice requirements.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

GARNISHMENT, ATTACHMENT AND PENSION DIVERSION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-171, an Act to amend the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

LABOUR ADJUSTMENT BENEFITS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Labour) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-172, an Act to amend the Labour Adjustment Benefits Act and to authorize certain payments in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

● (1520)

[*Translation*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

MEASURE TO CHANGE NAME OF ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF HULL

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Hull) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-698, an Act to change the name of the electoral district of Hull.

Some Hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Isabelle: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this public Bill which concerns the district of Hull is to add the name of Aylmer after the present name.

The new federal riding of Hull has regrouped the constituents of just two towns, Hull and Aylmer. It would therefore be logical and reasonable to identify the district in which these constituents are located in such way that the name reflects their location, namely, as the district of Hull-Aylmer.

Mr. Speaker, that is the gist of my presentation on this Bill.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: May I have leave to dispense with the reading of the motions?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,931 and 4,981.

[*Text*]

ABORIGINAL RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF TRADE

Question No. 4,931—**Mr. Anguish:**

Is the Department of National Revenue taking any steps to ensure that Canadian Indians can enjoy freedom of trade with their American counterparts across the border, which is a basic aboriginal right guaranteed in the new Canadian Constitution?

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): The Department of National Revenue, Customs and Excise is responsible for the day-to-day administration of various legislative provisions which regulate the movement of persons and goods into and out of Canada. In the case of goods, the Customs Tariff Act, Excise Act and Excise Tax Act provide the statutory basis under which rates of duty and other taxes are established and assessed. The provisions of these acts fall under the purview of the Department of Finance, while the administration of them remains a Customs responsibility.

There are no special or unique provisions in Customs legislation which apply specifically to North American Indians. However, in response to representations from Indian groups, Customs is currently participating in discussions with Finance regarding the possibility of introducing new tariff provisions dealing with personal exemptions for Indians returning to Canada and the importation of Indian handicrafts.

For several years now, Customs has been addressing Indian concerns on an ongoing basis through departmental representation at Indian conferences and meetings, task force participation, and by special training programs for Customs personnel.

CMHC BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Question No. 4,981—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What is the composition of the Board of Directors of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and what is the address and occupation of each individual?

2. What is the compensation and what are all the benefits paid to the chairperson, directors, president and vice-presidents of the Corporation?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): I am informed by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation as follows:

1. Current members of the CMHC Board of Directors, including occupations and business addresses are shown on the list below.

2. Up to June 30, 1983, directors will be paid $159 per day while attending Board meetings; as of July 1, 1983, the fee will be $166. Salaries for the Acting President and Vice-Presidents of CMHC range from $55,978 to $88,610.

In addition to regular CMHC benefits for which the Corporation's share is valued at $8,800 to $10,000 per individual, the Acting President and Vice-Presidents are eligible for the following: a leased car, considered a taxable benefit to the employee under the Income Tax Act, is provided on request; business club memberships paid by the Corporation on request (five official are in receipt of these benefits for a total of $4,495 in 1983); one Vice-President was offered a preferential rate second mortgage as temporary financing when he relocated to Ottawa; and senior officials who are employees of CMHC can voluntarily participate in a deferred compensation plan. This is more of a service than a benefit per se since the Corporation does not contribute to this plan, and except for a minimal amount of bookkeeping, no costs are incurred.

Members of the Board of Directors

Appointee	Occupation and Business Address
Mr. Raymond J. Boivin	Acting President and Senior Vice-President, Program Operations Canada Mortgage & Housing Corporation Montreal Road OTTAWA, Ont., K1A 0P7
Mr. Gérard L. Veilleux	Secretary to the Cabinet for Federal/Provincial Relations and Deputy Clerk of the Privy Council Post Office Building 59 Sparks Street, Room 309 OTTAWA, Ont.
Mr. Jean T. Fournier	Assistant Deputy Minister Federal/Provincial Relations and Social Policy Branch Department of Finance 26th Floor North, Place Bell Canada 160 Elgin Street OTTAWA, Ont., K1A 0G5
Mr. Frank J. Callaghan	President D. B. & J. (1971) Inc. P.O. Box 188 CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I., C1A 7K5
Mrs. Christine D. McKee	University Ombudsman University Centre, Rooms 111/111A University of Manitoba Fort Garry WINNIPEG, Man., R3T 2N2

Business of the House

Mr. R. Jacques Plante	President Perspective Travail Inc. 2 Place Québec, Suite 340 QUEBEC, P.Q., G1R 2B5
Mrs. Sylvia J. Sutherland	TV-RADIO Broadcaster CHEX Television Television Road PETERBOROUGH, Ont., K9J 6Z9

Vacancies: Chairman
President
British Columbia representative

[*English*]

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to ask for information with respect to Question No. 5,038 placed on the Order Paper on September 21 of this year, over two months ago. This question happens to be a starred question. The information in response to it is rather important in determining certain actions this House might take with respect to matters before it. I wonder if the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher) could be any more helpful than his colleague, the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans). Perhaps he may be able to enlighten me as to when I will get an answer to this question.

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I shall be quite happy to refer the matter to my colleague, the President of the Privy Council.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall all notices of motions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISPOSITION OF BILL C-96

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Orders of the Day, I have had discussions with the House Leader for the Opposition, the Hon. Member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski), the House Leader for the New Democratic Party and my own House Leader. I think that if we had a motion to put Bill C-96 on Business of the Day and to complete all stages today it would be found acceptable to the House.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, those discussions have indeed been held. I still need to have an opportunity to finalize my consultations. We are having a House Leaders' meeting tomorrow morning. It will be raised there.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There does not appear to be unanimous consent to proceed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall all orders listed under Private Members' Public Bills preceding Order No. 50 be allowed to stand by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

DIVORCE ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING ALIMONY AND MAINTENANCE ORDERS

The House resumed from Tuesday, February 10, 1981, consideration of the motion of Mr. Huntington that Bill C-250, to amend the Divorce Act (alimony and maintenance orders) be read the second time and be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo-Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, allow me to read the first sentence of the explanatory notes that accompany this Bill just to inform Members of what is contained here in substance. I quote:

> The purpose of this Bill is to propose a scheme . . . whereby maintenance and other money orders made pursuant to the Divorce Act could be enforced by the courts making the orders.

The initiative before us today is not a stranger to this House, the subject having first been discussed here in 1972. The Hon. Barney Danson, before he became a Minister of the Crown, placed this Bill, then Bill C-377, on the Order Paper in the Twenty-ninth Parliament. In the second session of the Thirtieth Parliament, the principle was carried forth by the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) in Bill C-203, later in the third session as Bill C-302 and then yet another time in the fourth session as Bill C-350.

I had the honour of carrying on the battle on behalf of the Hon. Member for Capilano in the Thirty-first Parliament when the Hon. Member was a Cabinet Minister. I prepared for the debate on the Bill, but I was requested to allow the Bill to remain in the draw because the then Minister of Justice

assured me that the Government was vitally interested in the issue and was going to take action on it. Unfortunately, because of the short life of that Government, this did not occur.

In this Parliament the Hon. Member for Capilano once again submitted the Bill, this time as Bill C-250. It came up for debate on February 10, 1981 and was talked out by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice, also the former Member for Broadview-Greenwood, and the Hon. Member for Montreal-Mercier, the present Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport (Mrs. Hervieux-Payette). It is interesting that the Liberal and NDP Members who profess to care so much about suffering have seen fit to impede the passage of this legislation.

One notes that the present Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport, the same Member who talked out Bill C-250 in 1981, put a similar Bill, C-364, on the Order Paper. Ironically, she thought so highly of the Bill before us today that she incorporated two of its clauses, clauses 15 and 15.1, into her Bill. When her Bill C-364 came up for debate on March 23 of this year, the Member had the good fortune of having an amendment adopted that referred the subject matter of the Bill to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. What has happened since then, according to what I can ascertain, is noting. What is the use of having the subject matter of Bills referred to committee if nothing is to happen? It is a farce.

I should add too that on October 15, 1979 another Liberal Member, the Hon. Member for York South-Weston (Mrs. Appolloni) moved a Standing Order 43 requesting that the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs consider an immediate review of the history of default and consider the advisability of instituting public means of enforcement. This also resulted in no action.

On February 25, 1983, the Conservative Member for Vancouver Centre (Mrs. Carney) raised this issue under Standing Order 21, thereby demonstrating her support for the principle of enforcing maintenance orders.

For over eight years, the Hon. Member for Capilano has been attempting to have this legislation approved by the House. He deserves the praise of all Members for his tenacity in this long struggle. I have briefly outlined the sad history of a number of initiatives that have come before this House in an attempt to enforce maintenance payments to divorced spouses. Everyone appears to agree that there is injustice and indignity being perpetrated on divorced spouses by a system which tolerates default in maintenance and support payments. I have talked to many Hon. Members in the House who belong to all Parties and have found no one who is against the substance of this legislation.

• (1530)

The Law Reform Commission reports that as many as 75 per cent of maintenance payments are not being made to deserted or divorced spouses and their children. That is a national disgrace and a black mark upon a court system which brings down maintenance orders and then allows them to go unpaid. It is a shameful situation and one which obviously begs for correction.

This correction must be made here in the House, and the fact that this legislation has been stalled and stonewalled for 11 years is a clear indication of how desperately we require the reform of this institution. That this legislation, which is so clearly and urgently needed, has been tangled in a political and bureaucratic web for over ten years should shame every Member of the House. Perhaps there is hope for this Bill today because the powers that be have now seen fit to allow it to be debated for a second time in Parliament.

The subject of family law has been under continual study in the country for years and improvements have been slow in coming. There is no doubt that the passage of the Bill C-38 on June 18, 1982, by the House was a step in the right direction. That legislation now permits the garnishment of salaries paid to federal employees for court order payments. However, that is only a very small part of the answer to the ongoing and growing problem of unpaid maintenance orders.

With divorce rates continuing to reach new highs according to every published set of statistics, it is urgent, it is mandatory that the matter before us here today be properly addressed. If nothing else, surely we have an obligation to the children who are innocently caught up in the stressful and tragic experience of broken marriages and homes.

Another point to consider in this debate is the submission made by the Hon. Member for Montreal-Mercier in defence of Bill C-364. She stated, and I quote from *Hansard* of March 23, 1983:

> —hundreds of millions of dollars are still being paid through the welfare system because the spouse has moved to another Province and cannot be reached.

This point has also been mentioned in every speech concerning this Bill that has been made by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Capilano. One would think that this fact alone would spur Governments to action, seeing how hungry they are for revenue these days.

I could go on and list more reasons why this legislation should be adopted. It has all been said far too many times before. Surely Government Members can see the need for this legislation. The Hon. Member for Capilano, when debating this same Bill on February 10, 1981, over two years ago, stated:

> My hope is that the Government will see fit to have the Bill withdrawn and send its subject matter to committee where we can bring in the experts of the land and where we could probably start debate on an amendment to Section 15 of the Divorce Act, as is outlined in the Bill.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, that hope must be the same hope of any reasonable, compassionate and conscientious Member of Parliament.

Hon. Roger Simmons (Burin-St. George's): Mr. Speaker, I would first like to commend the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) for taking the initiative to bring this Bill before the House. I submit that in doing so, he does a service to all of us who are concerned about this issue and especially

to the many victims of the inadequacies of the current enforcement of maintenance and custody orders relating to divorce. I would also like to draw to the attention of the House the remarks that have just been made by the Hon. Member for Cariboo-Chilcotin (Mr. Greenaway). He encapsulated very well and quite graphically, I thought, the gravity of the problem which this Bill seeks to address.

The enforcement of financial support orders continues to be one of the major problem areas in family law in the country. Indeed, it is a problem not only in this country but in other jurisdictions as well. Jurisdictions both here in Canada at the provincial and federal levels as well as jurisdictions outside of the country are seeking to develop new and more effective methods of enforcing these monetary obligations in an attempt to promote the welfare of the family and respect for the legal system.

The current process for enforcing maintenance orders obtained pursuant to divorce is uniform across Canada and is found in Sections 14 and 15 of the Divorce Act. Section 14 reads as follows:

A decree of divorce granted under this Act or an order made under Sections 10 or 11 has legal effect throughout Canada.

Section 15 reads as follows:

An order made under Sections 10 or 11 by any court may be registered in any other superior court in Canada and may be enforced in like manner as an order of that superior court or in such other manner as is provided for by any rules of court or regulations made under Section 19.

By virtue of these sections of the Divorce Act, each maintenance creditor, in whichever Province of Canada he or she may live, under Section 10 interim maintenance order under the Divorce Act, wherever in Canada that order is made, automatically has available to him or her all superior court remedies of every Province for enforcement. These include, for example, the remedy of garnishment proceedings. It is worth noting that today, in the last half hour, the House took an action on the first reading of a Bill relating to garnishment of wages, a Bill standing in the name of the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada (Mr. MacGuigan). Other such remedies include equitable receivership, examination as a judgment debtor, attachment of debts and bank accounts, seizure of personal property, execution against land and proceedings for commital.

In addition, in most Provinces of the country, provincial legislation permits the filing of superior court maintenance orders in provincial Family Courts to make available the enforcement procedures of that court. These procedures include traditional show cause hearings whereby the defaulting debtor must explain his default or face imprisonment on summary conviction and continuing attachment of wages.

Indirectly in this way, maintenance orders made pursuant to the Divorce Act in a superior court of one Province may be enforced by the Family Court of either that Province or of any other Province in the country. Enforcement by the provincial Family Courts is becoming increasingly more productive through the development of automatic systems of enforcement under which enforcement is processed by the court with money being paid directly into court to the benefit of the dependent family members.

In certain Provinces, orders made for maintenance upon a divorce are programmed into a computerized monetary system within the Province. In some Provinces, the superior court maintenance orders may also be filed in small claims courts so that summary enforcement mechanisms which are peculiar to these courts, such as judgment summonses and summary garnishments, may be used.

● (1540)

Enforcement procedures under the Divorce Act nevertheless have not been without some difficulties. A number of proposals have been suggested for changes to the Divorce Act to improve enforcement of orders. One of these proposals is to use the Federal Court of Canada as an enforcement mechanism. Maintenance orders differ from other civil judgments in that they tend to create continuing liability based on the means of the debtor and the needs of the creditor, and are subject to variation because of the circumstances of the parties may change. It is suggested that new Federal Court rules could provide for garnishment orders which would effect collection and minimize cost and effort for the creditor while, at the same time, avoiding any injustice to the debtor. Like most garnishment orders, the order could be obtained *ex parte* and payment could be made directly to the creditor. This is not unlike the proposal contained in the Bill before us now which has been put down by the Hon. Member for Capilano. Both of these concepts are being studied within Government with a view to determining their implications.

Mr. Speaker, much of the difficulty in enforcement of maintenance orders arises as a result of inability to locate the delinquent debtor. The current Divorce Act does not deal with the problems relating to the tracing of a person in order to obtain or enforce a maintenance order. The only federal law which partly deals with support and enforcement of custody orders is the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act. That Act provides that provincial laws will apply to procedures taken under the Act. There is a specific provision indicating that where any inconsistency or conflict exists between a provincial garnishment law and any Act or regulation of the Parliament of Canada, the federal law will prevail. Therefore, in proceedings against federal employees, provisions in federal laws, such as income tax laws, unemployment insurance, or the Canada Pension Plan, that secure the confidentiality of records will prevail over tracing provisions of any provincial garnishment law.

Certain Provinces have passed legislation requiring their government offices to release address particulars or information which could lead to the determination of the whereabouts of those debtors. The federal Government is now canvassing a number of options for development of a tracing mechanism within the federal data bank system. Federal statutes, such as the Income Tax Act and the Unemployment Insurance Act, which prohibit access to federal data banks, are being reviewed with a view to possible amendments. The Government is also

interested in exploring with the provincial Governments the possibility of a central agency which might have a national computerized system for tracing such individuals. There is a suggestion that such a tracing system involving release of information raises questions of invasion of privacy. And so they do. The issue, Mr. Speaker, simply stated is; when should the public interest protecting information supplied to the federal Government yield to the public interest in ensuring compliance of maintainance orders?

The current Access to Information Act which has recently passed in Parliament does allow all members of the public access to Government materials requested by them. But it specifically does not permit disclosure of personal information. Address and employment particulars are, of course, of this nature. In addition, the Privacy Act prohibits the disclosure and use of all personal information, including address particulars, under the control of a Government institution, without the consent of the individual to whom it relates. The policy of the Privacy Act is to protect the confidentiality of information given by individuals. This policy is implemented by prohibiting release of information concerning an individual, except where it is specifically authorized as an exception to the general rule.

In this context, the Government is now proceeding to consult human rights and other interest groups across Canada regarding ways to balance enforcement of maintenance and custody orders with protection of privacy. The results of these consultations will contribute largely to the establishment of a federal position on the release of information.

The concerns covered in this particular Bill, Mr. Speaker, are concerns which have been the concerns of several jurisdictions in Canada for many years. In 1981, a federal-provincial committee was established on the enforcement of maintenance and custody orders. That committee had a twofold mandate. Its first mandate was to canvas the existing range of enforcement remedies across the country. Flowing from that, it was to identify and suggest to Government means of improvement of enforcement. That committee did a fair amount of work under the aegis of the Attorney General of Canada (Mr. MacGuigan) and the Attorneys General of the ten Provinces. It submitted a report which identified three areas for action. These were areas within provincial jurisdiction, federal jurisdiction and areas that have some joint federal and provincial jurisdictional connotations. The committee was asked to look at the third category again. The attorneys general themselves have also looked at it. I understand that the results of the work of that committee are now at the point where the various jurisdictions are contemplating what can be done in a regulatory and legislative way at the provincial levels, the federal level and jointly, as the case may be, to effect something nearer a resolution to the problem that we are talking about this afternoon.

I believe everybody in this House, Mr. Speaker, is very sympathetic to the concerns which are embodied in this Bill. At the same time, if the proposals contained in this Bill are legislated they would have certain implications. It is for that reason that I would support the fullest possible discussion and airing of the concerns that are involved. At the same time, I would not want to see this Bill come to a vote this afternoon. The many matters relating to enforcement of maintenance and custody orders are under active review by the federal-provincial committee to which I previously made reference. It is only fair that we not in any way short circuit the very good work which is being done by the Attorneys General and their respective staffs across this country.

The problem is one that begs solution. The gentleman for Cariboo-Chilcotin used words like "delaying and stonewalling over a 10 or 11 year period". It is a good phrase, but I do not think it appllies in this situation. I do not think anyone in this country, barring the few people who are keeping their whereabouts secret to avoid the enforcement of those maintenance orders, wants to stonewall this particular issue. I find that many people in every jurisdiction would like to find a solution to the problem. I find that many people would like the legislators and those who write the regulations to find an effective way to ensure more complete enforcement of those maintenance and custody orders. I do not believe it is a fair suggestion that anyone has been stonewalling. As soon as we talk about stonewalling we must say why we think they are stonewalling and what purpose, what motive, can be served.

● (1550)

Mr. Greenaway: Indifference.

Mr. Simmons: The Hon. Member for Cariboo-Chilcotin says "indifference".

Mr. Huntington: And apathy.

Mr. Simmons: These are possible motives. I do not believe they are realistic under the circumstances because so many of us, as legislators and as individuals, are affected by the inadequacies of the present system. I believe that there is indifference and apathy about many things in this country. I do not believe this is an issue about which there is indifference. There is a concern by Attorneys General to find a solution, not a half solution which will create more problems than it solves.

Mr. Huntington: Tell us about those problems.

Mr. Simmons: I will tell the Hon. Member for Capilano about the problems. I mentioned a moment ago the problem of squaring the requirements of privacy considerations with the requirements for information to better enforce those maintenance orders. That is one of the problems. If the Hon. Member has a short answer to that problem, he ought to give it to the House. There are concerns on both sides and somewhere we have to strike a balance.

I have given an undertaking this afternoon on behalf of the Government that once the issue has been fully canvassed—and it is being canvassed pretty actively right now—this Government will indicate to the House its position on that particular issue. If the Hon. Member is asking if all the problems are solved, the answer is, clearly, no. If he is asking, do we support the spirit of what he is proposing, the answer is an unqualified

yes. If he is asking if there is apathy, the answer is no. If he is asking if there is indifference, the answer is, categorically, no. It has nothing to do with indifference or with apathy. I know it is easy to characterize it in that particular way, but it serves no useful purpose. This is not an issue which ought to have any partisan connotations. It is an issue which affects many of us as legislators and many of us and our friends as individuals. I believe there is a willingness to get on with the job, but let us get on with the job in the right direction. Let us not create more problems than we solve by a half-baked solution. I am not suggesting that the gentleman—

Mr. Huntington: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think I would like to caution the Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons). When he says it is a half-baked solution, I would like him to know that two lawyers in the Parliamentary Counsel's office worked for over three weeks, night and day, and a Family Court lawyer in Vancouver worked for some six months, putting this issue into a form which would allow—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Chair has heard the Hon. Member for Capilano. However, this is hardly a point of order. It is a contribution to debate. The Hon. Member for Burin-St. George's has one minute left.

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, had my good friend from Capilano listened, not only to my second to last sentence but to my last one as well, he would have heard in my last sentence, when he was drafting his point of order, that I am not suggesting this Bill is a half-baked solution. I do not for a moment suggest that. In my opening remarks I commended him for allowing the House to air this particular issue again. I know the Hon. Member is very committed to this issue. I am very committed to this issue as well. The Hon. Member does not have the waterfront fenced off on this particular issue. It is an issue we are all concerned about, and the sooner we express our concern in a non-partisan fashion, the better we will serve the victims of the present inadequacies of the system.

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased this afternoon to take part in this debate on maintenance. It is an extremely important matter and one which the women's movement of Canada has been concerned about for years, and on which it has been making proposals.

Bill C-250 which is before us today is one solution to the problem, but it is a solution which shows the constraints on a private Member's Bill. This is a matter in which we need more than a Private Member's Bill, clearly, but it certainly lays before us the problem and does give us an opportunity to address it, so I welcome that opportunity and I commend the Hon. Member for giving us at least one reasonable solution to the problem.

The object is the automatic enforcement of maintenance orders, fast and efficient enforcement without costly and prolonged effort on the part of the dependent spouse who needs the money. Overwhelmingly, that is a woman with dependent children who is in desperate need. The facts are only too well known. Back in 1971-1972, an Ontario study showed that only 58 per cent of maintenance orders were paid. Since then, the figures have become even worse. A Calgary study more recently showed that 85 per cent of maintenance orders were in default to some degree or other. Of these orders, 50 per cent were in substantial default. Current estimates over-all show that 75 per cent of maintenance orders are in default to some degree or other. Overwhelmingly, maintenance orders are not being respected. We know that this means large numbers of mainly women and children living below the poverty line.

At the same time, we know that improved methods of enforcement do work. Manitoba has instituted a system of automatic enforcement with a computer as back-up. In the first ten months of operation, the enforcement of maintenance orders was improved by 70 per cent. I believe this is an extremely interesting figure which shows this kind of improvement. That was in 1980. And we can expect further improvement as the system has more time to evolve. Quebec has improved its system of enforcement of maintenance orders as well.

I believe this puts a different face on the contention in previous debates on the subject that the reason that so many maintenance orders were not respected was a lack of money on the part of the person against whom the order was issued. The then Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice on the last day this Bill was debated actually said that in 50 per cent of the cases there simply was not any money to collect. Clearly this is false. A 70 per cent improvement shows there is a lot of money out there which is not being collected because there has not been the will to do it and the mechanisms have not been put in place. When the Parliamentary Secretary made that remark, he had no evidence. It was just an excuse for complacency, and we have had more examples of that complacency this afternoon on the part of the previous speaker.

We know that on average, women earn 60 per cent of what men do for full-time work. A woman raising children is more likely to be working only part-time and earning even less than 60 per cent. Therefore, if maintenance orders are not paid, this puts an enormous burden on people who have much less opportunity to bring home the income to pay for the family. The male breadwinner in the situation has a far better opportunity and certainly has the obligation to pay that maintenance money.

Let me comment specifically on what is wrong with the Bill before us this afternoon. Bill C-250 would keep the enforcement of maintenance orders at the level of superior courts. Unfortunately, the superior courts of the Provinces are the worst courts to have this responsibility because their procedures are cumbersome, there is a long waiting list and the costs are higher. It is faster and much less costly for maintenance orders to be dealt with at the provincial Family Court level.

● (1600)

This Bill at least puts the impetus where it should be, that it is up to the court to act, not the individual. The Law Reform

Commission in its paper on enforcement of maintenance orders back in 1976 said that the courts must in future assume the leading role in the enforcement of maintenance orders in Canada. Nothing is more obvious than that the traditional methods of enforcing judgment debts are singularly ineffective when it comes to maintenance orders. That was a number of years ago and we have not had adequate action since.

We have to ask the question: is going the Superior Court route the best way? I suggest not. We must have consultation with the Provinces and agreement on how to handle enforcement of maintenance orders. This is not something to be imposed by Parliament on the Provinces. Unilateral action by the federal Parliament is not good federalism. Further, there would be confusion in areas, such as Saskatchewan and Hamilton, where there are unified Family Courts. There divorces are handled not by a Superior Court but by a unified Family Court and it makes sense to continue those provisions. I suggest that better provisions for handling this matter have been proposed by the federal-provincial Committee on the Enforcement of Maintenance and Custody Orders in Canada. Just last summer this committee made a large number of recommendations for federal and provincial, and in some cases joint, action. I want to go over some of those which are relevant to our subject this afternoon.

One recommendation is to amend Section 15 of the Divorce Act to enable ancillary maintenance and custody orders to be registered in any court designated by the Provinces in addition to or instead of the Superior Court. This would give much greater flexibility, lower costs and much greater access. It would permit direct, one step registration of federal orders in Family Courts without the need to register in a Superior Court or use the reciprocal provincial legislation. Once registered, the order would have the same effect as if it had been issued by that court originally. That is a very practical solution and one I certainly commend.

This same committee made a number of other recommendations which are worth citing here. The introduction of a computerized system for monitoring maintenance payments as opposed to a manual system was suggested. A lot of our problem here is simply technological. We have the technology to solve much of the problem, which Manitoba and Quebec have shown. This means state-initiated enforcement, not individual initiated. We also need prompt enforcement without requiring the person to return to court to re-litigate. It should be understood that once the order is issued, it can be treated and enforced as any other court order without the requirement of the person returning to seek further enforcement measures.

Other recommendations would require provincial and federal bodies to release information required to locate persons defaulting on maintenance payments or, for that matter, in custody matters. Clearly, this is a very important matter and it should be pursued.

The previous speaker gave the excuse that there are issues of privacy at stake and he mused as to what the answer was. Is there a short answer? I suggest there is. Privacy is important but not more important than the sustenance of a family. Privacy is not more important than having an adequate amount of food on the table and the ability to pay the rent. We have too often taken the view that the person who earns the income in a family somehow has the right to spend it himself. This is clearly inappropriate. When a couple start a family there is, if not a written contract, an implied contract that the person who does not go into the labour force but looks after the children has a claim on maintenance. We simply cannot allow the breadwinner to stand on his high-horse and say, "Privacy about my financial affairs is more important that your having food on the table". There is an implied responsibility for maintenance, and that should be respected.

Another measure we need is to abolish the one-year time limit on maintenance orders. There should not be any limit. Sometimes defaults go on for a very long time and the courts have not allowed people to collect for maintenance which is more than one year overdue. There may be some instances when full recovery would be unfair and these could be looked after, but there is no reason to have an arbitrary limit on maintenance defaults.

There should be the opportunity for changes in orders to be made by a court other than the court which issued the order. This could be done in cases of mutual consent. If one party leaves the Province, there may be very good reasons for allowing another court to alter the arrangement. Legislation is also required to permit lump sum maintenance payments. This has been thrown into some ambiguity as a result of a recent court case, and we need to make it clear that in some cases this would be a very effective solution to a family's problem and we should be able to facilitate this. We need greater flexibility and we need the legislation to facilitate it.

We need legislation to provide access to other moneys of the defaulter, for example, income tax refunds, unemployment insurance and pension benefits. These are all part of the regular wage or salary, either a deferred wage or a payment in the case of unemployment insurance which is like a wage. Clearly the same principle holds, that the people dependent on the breadwinner have a real, legitimate claim on that money. Right now our laws forbid access.

Together the federal and provincial Governments must develop uniform divorce rules under the Divorce Act for the enforcement of maintenance and custody orders. We need federal-provincial co-operation to work out a flexible and efficient system.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) has indicated he will be bringing in a new divorce Act. We have some indication as to what will be in it from a report released this summer regarding no-fault divorce. This is relevant to the issue of maintenance because it is partly as a result of the adversial system which couples must go through in getting a divorce that maintenance payments are not made. One spouse must sue the other for divorce, lay blame, and this means the other spouse has to reply and find blame on the other side. In other words, our current laws on divorce create a climate of hostility and acrimony, and clearly this does not facilitate practical measures for the ongoing support of the children. The parents need

to be able to work together to bring about a settlement which will be good for the entire family. Thus divorce reform in the direction of no-fault divorce would be a considerable step toward getting maintenance payments actually paid on time.

I do not want to say that I am in agreement with all aspects of the proposals the Minister indicated in the case of divorce reform, but the general lines are certainly very good and healthy ones and would certainly be relevant to the subject before us this afternoon.

Before closing I would like to mention another loophole, that is the garnishment of wages of federal Public Servants. This was passed recently but, as we found out all too sadly, there were a number of loopholes. Members of Parliament, Senators and staff on the Hill were exempted, and it is not clear as to the coverage of judges. Thus I welcome the introduction of a Bill by the Minister of Justice today to close those loopholes. I will certainly support the amendments that he is proposing.

● (1610)

I wish to make a few comments on the remarks made by the previous speaker. They do reflect some complacency. This matter has been before us for a very long time and the Hon. Member said there was no instance of stonewalling. He wondered why this issue was raised, and we heard some remarks to the effect that there was a lack of purpose in aggressively pursuing constructive proposals to improve the enforcement of maintenance orders.

I suggest that if the Hon. Member is correct and it has simply taken some time to address this, and that the provincial Attorneys General and federal authorities are working on it, the test of the sincerity of the federal Government will be if it brings in its own legislation promptly which better meets the needs of families. It should be doing this very promptly.

A Government Bill on this issue is needed since a Private Member's Bill cannot address all of the matters that come before us. However, we cannot wait year after year for this is not the solution and many of the problems could be regulated very quickly. It is not necessary, for instance, to make a false issue of the problem of privacy. Therefore, the test of sincerity is new legislation. While the Divorce Act must be part of it, we must see follow-up measures to the proposals of the federal-provincial Committee on Maintenance and Custody. We must have the Government's response to these very concrete proposals which were made and we need legislation along those lines. Federal-provincial agreements are necessary, including dates and times, so that we can proceed with this promptly.

In closing I say that I certainly support the intent of this Bill. If the Government is going to talk it out, I would challenge it to be very clear in its indication as to what better legislation it will bring in in its place, and when.

Mr. Jim Schroder (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate. I believe that the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. MacDonald) very clearly stated the reasons for this Bill. Its intent is laudable and the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) is again to be congratulated for giving us an opportunity to debate this Bill. However, I suggest that a Government Bill which gives strong legislation and achieves what everyone this afternoon has suggested should be the intent of such legislation will eventually be part of the Government's Bill.

Enforcement of maintenance and custody orders both prior to and upon divorce has traditionally been perceived as falling within the general rubric of property and civil rights; subjects which, as a matter of constitutional law, are determined by provincial Governments and legislatures. While Parliament, under constitutional authority for marriage and divorce, has passed laws governing the award of support and custody orders, both pending the divorce hearing and upon the granting of a decree, these orders once awarded are enforced by the courts within each Province. Section 15 of the Divorce Act is authority for this proposition and states as follows:

> An order made under Section 10 or 11 by any court may be registered in any other superior court in Canada and may be enforced in like manner as an order of that superior court or in such other manner as is provided for by any rules of court or regulations made under Section 19.

As there have been no such regulations enacted by the Governor in Council pursuant to Section 19, the rules of court in each Province provide for the registration and enforcement of orders made under the Divorce Act. The role of the federal Government, as a result, remains largely a facilitative one, assisting in the enforcement of orders as far as it is able to do so with respect to matters within federal jurisdiction.

It has been estimated that approximately 75 per cent of maintenance orders in Canada are not enforced. This poses a considerable problem for financially dependent family members and creates disrespect for the administration of justice. In addition, because separated and divorced spouses are extremely mobile, difficulties arise with respect to enforcement of these orders across interprovincial boundaries. The federal Government has undertaken a review of a number of initiatives designed to improve the enforcement of maintenance orders in Canada.

One proposal which has been advanced is to amend the Divorce Act by adding a provision that specifically provides for garnishment orders. This proposal is rather akin to that set out in the Private Members' Bill. The Bill of the Hon. Member for Capilano suggests that the wages and salaries of Public Servants should be subject to garnishment. This is a proposition with which the Government has agreed for some time and it introduced legislation in Parliament in May, 1978 to meet the problem. On March 11 of this year, Part I of the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act came into force. This Act permits, under provincial law, the garnishment or attachment of wages of federal employees for the purpose of enforcing civil orders and judgments including maintenance orders. Part II of the Act, when in force, will permit the diversion of superannuation benefits of retired federal employees for the purpose of enforcing family support orders although not to satisfy ordinary debts.

The justification under law for the old immunity was founded on the ancient concept of the Royal Prerogative which holds that since a court cannot make a binding order against Her Majesty's moneys and properties, a garnishment order may not be made in respect of a debt due by the Crown to a third person. As a consequence of this immunity of the Crown's purse, the salaries of civil servants and others who receive payment from the Crown have traditionally been exempt from garnishment or attachment. One of the most serious effects of this has been in the enforcement of maintenance orders where it has been very difficult until now to require a federal public servant to pay family support in cases of desertion, separation or divorce.

Most of the Provinces have now enacted legislation enabling the salaries of civil servants to be garnisheed. These legislative initiatives have received wide support and will assist in the enforcement of maintenance orders against those who receive their pay or benefits from the federal or provincial Crown.

The procedure under the federal law is designed to generate effective results as quickly as possible. If a person is owed family support payments and has a valid and enforceable family support order from a Canadian court, there are two possible ways in which the Act can assist. If the spouse or a former spouse owing the payment is a federal employee, the Act allows his or her salary to be garnisheed. To effect a garnishee, the person must have obtained a valid court order to judgment ordering the employee to pay money for family support or another type of debt. The person must ensure that the court order or judgment can be enforced under provincial laws. The next step is to send a notice of intent to the Department of Justice or one of its agents, as set out in the regulations. The notice includes the employee's name, employing department, place of work and other information that will locate him. There is then only a 30-day waiting period after which an application may be made to the court to have a garnishee summons issued, presuming, of course, the person is employed. The garnishment order is served by registered mail for personal service at the same place as the original notice of intent. The federal Government pays the money into court and the court will then make the appropriate payments. If the spouse or former spouse receives a pension from the federal Government, the Act may allow a portion of that pension to be taken. However, the Act does not apply to all federal pensions. For example, it does not affect veterans' pensions, old age security, Canada Pension Plan benefits or disability allowances. It also does not apply to unemployment insurance benefits or income tax refunds. To get a pension diversion the person must also have obtained a valid family support order from a Canadian court and ensure that it is enforceable under provincial law.

● (1620)

Another proposal which has recently been studied by the Government is of especial interest in the context of the Hon. Member for Capilano's Bill relating to variations of a divorce maintenance order.

Alimony and Maintenance

Currently, Section 11(2) of the Divorce Act reads as follows:

An order made pursuant to this Section may be varied from time to time or rescinded by the court that made the order if it thinks it is fit and just to do so having regard tro the conduct of the parties since the making of the order or any change in the condition, means or other circumstances of either of them.

Section 11(2) has been interpreted so as to prevent variation of a maintenance order by any court other than the originating court. Due to the mobility of the Canadian population, particularly after divorce, this interpretation has caused considerable difficulty for the applicant seeking a variation. It requires returning to the previous Province of residence, often entailing lengthy trips with attendant cost and delay. If the section could be amended or at least clarified, considerable savings in terms of time and money for both the applicant and the family members could be realized.

I hope I have added something to the debate which indicates there is need for further study before this Bill is enacted.

Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I like the basic thrust of the amendments. One of the propositions that I put forward is that what we are talking about here is money. It struck me that what we should be looking to and asking the Ministers of Justice for the federal and provincial Governments to do is to establish a federal-provincial revolving fund. All payments made under Family Court decisions, whether they are made in British Columbia or Ontario, should be paid into a revolving fund. Where an individual is delinquent in making payments—in most cases it is his payments rather than hers—then it would be the court that would go after the individual who was delinquent. But the woman looking after herself and her children would not have to be waiting and wondering about filing judgment summonses, show cause summonses, getting a new court order or getting an amendment of an order. She would have the assurance that the money would be coming in on a regular monthly or weekly basis, according to whatever the terms of the particular divorce decree were.

In dealing with this matter as I did in my own law practice, I found that the vast majority of individuals required to pay do, in fact, pay. It is those few who abscond or leave a particular jurisdiction who do not make their payments. In order to get those payments you have to get another Province to recognize your court order. Then you have to get a judgment summons issued. The court makes an order that the person shall pay. Then, if they do not pay, the individual comes up on a show cause summons. All of this sounds very simple but it can take months to get this kind of an operation rolling.

It strikes me that what we are looking at here is to assure a person who already has a court order, who is entitled to rely on that court order, that he or she will be receiving funds on a regular scheduled basis. They cannot do that at the present time. Why should Ministers of Justice, federal and provincial, not get together, set up this fund and have the people know they are going to have regular payments coming in to them? If there is an application made to vary a court order, that can be done. If an individual is laid off and cannot keep up the

payments, an application can be made to the court to vary the order as it is done at the present time. But the person who is suffering will not be suffering if we have a federal-provincial fund that will say to the deserted wife or the deserted wife and children, or the person who has not been economically deserted until there is a missed payment, that the individual can now rely on the court order, that a cheque will be issued on a regular basis.

This procedure would also give the opportunity to have people hired by the court or hired by whatever Crown corporation to follow an individual and make certain that individual does keep up his payments.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. Shall all orders listed under Notices of Motions preceding Order No. 95 be allowed to stand by unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

● (1630)

[*Translation*]

MUNICIPAL GRANTS ACT, 1980

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2(2)(F)

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of amending Section 2.(2)(*f*) of the Municipal Grants Act, 1980, in order to include paragraphs 3 and 4 of Schedule II dealing with docks, wharves, piers, piles, dolphins, floats, breakwaters, retaining walls, jetties and drydocks which should be taken into account in the determination of grants to be paid to municipalities in lieu of taxes.

He said: Mr. Speaker, as you just indicated, I have tabled a motion for the purpose of amending Bill C-4 which was passed by the House on July 15, 1980. The purpose of this motion is to amend, and this may seem somewhat complicated, Section 2(2)(*f*) in order to include paragraphs 3 and 4 of Schedule II, and so forth. The House will recall that at the beginning of this session, on July 15, 1980, as I said earlier, a Bill was passed, with the unanimous consent of all Parties of this House, and I think that is very important, a Bill known as the Municipal Grants Act, the official title being: An Act respecting grants to municipalities, provinces and other bodies exercising functions of local government that levy real property taxes.

This Bill, of course, dealt with the problem of relations that exist or ought to exist between the Government of Canada and Quebec municipalities. The issue has been raised several times in recent months by PQ politicians who touched on various questions which, I feel, should be analyzed in the light of the motion I have tabled which concerns more specifically the inclusion, in the determination of grants in lieu of taxes for instance, in the riding of Lévis, of dry docks that belong to the federal Government, and in Lauzon, of dry docks located within the area occupied by Davie Shipbuilding, a company that is well-known in the Quebec City area.

In adopting Bill C-4, the Government of Canada saw itself as a taxpayer with the same obligations as all citizens of this country. The Bill is an important piece of legislation for the Government because it sets the conditions under which the Government determines the grants to be paid to municipalities in return for the benefits it enjoys at the local level. Through this legislation, the Canadian Government has agreed to act as a responsible citizen who understands that the services he receives must be paid for by all residents of a municipality, since otherwise municipal costs are not shared equitably.

It is in the interests of senior levels of Government to ensure that municipal and urban structures are sufficiently sound for municipalities to fulfil their role adequately. Our Constitution recognizes the exclusive authority of the Provinces to legislate with respect to municipal institutions and on other matters of a local and private nature. A municipality owes its existence to the province, it has no inherent jurisdiction and it can only exercise such functions and powers as may have been delegated by the province. The Canadian Government acknowledges those characteristics of the Canadian Constitution.

Section 125 of that Constitution prescribes that Crown property is not liable to taxation. That section notwithstanding, over the years the higher levels of both federal and provincial Governments grew to the extent that they account for a sizeable share of landed property. At the municipal level, taxation geared to benefits received improves the quality of local democratic life and the efficiency of services, in short it makes the local Governments more stable and more responsible. One must admit that, with respect to most municipal services, it is difficult, if not impossible, to put an exact cost on services rendered to a given citizen. In Lauzon, for instance, it is difficult to identify the cost of services rendered by the city to the Canadian Government with respect to drydocks, for example.

A tax load sharing mechanism based on a fair index of benefits received in the form of unspecified collective services must be used. Traditionally, it has been considered that the real value of taxable landed property is indeed a fair index of benefits received. The recording of the real value is done on the basis of the same concept, the concept of market value which is the basic value used for many decades in real estate assessment and which has often been generally accepted in the field of jurisprudence in Quebec and in the other Canadian provinces. Tax equity calls for the integrity of the tax basis

and each owner of landed property belongs to a local community and benefits from available services. It is only fair therefore that he should pay his share of the costs calculated on the basis of the sharing index which has been accepted.

In that context, any exception to the rule under which the real value of landed property is assessed distorts cost sharing and is unfair to the other ratepayers. Understandably, many exceptions have already been accepted, either because of tradition or jurisprudence. For instance, exceptions are made with respect to mines, oil fields and, in certain cases, highway corridors.

Such particular situations result in changes to the distribution of real costs and in the preferential treatment of certain ratepayers at the expense of others. For constitutional considerations, the higher levels of Governments do not look upon themselves as being ordinary ratepayers, but that should not be an excuse to disregard the general rules under which the costs of municipal services is shared among landed property owners.

When I say higher levels of Governments, I do include both the Government of Quebec—I happen to represent a Quebec riding—and the Government of Canada. I think that neither level of Government can teach us a lesson in that respect. They too have to consider themselves as being full-fledged ratepayers, but they have not always done so, although in recent years particularly, as a result of Bill C-4, they have shown good will.

• (1640)

Schedule II of Bill C-4 includes drydocks, among other things, which means that the value of that real property cannot be a factor when assessing the value to determine the grant to be paid to the municipality involved. According to generally accepted real estate assessment principles, it seems that such structures or facilities should be included in the books of the municipality which expects to collect money from owners of landed property. In the case of the City of Lauzon, the inclusion of Lorne and Champlain drydocks changes the calculations altogether. For instance, in the City of Lauzon, on the basis of the data provided and of the 1982 rates, the properties belonging to the Government of Canada should be assessed at some $22 million. According to the 1982 rates, the assessment in this one city should be $22 million.

But, if the drydocks are excluded, the assessment of these properties would be ten times smaller. The fact is that drydocks are of great value and also that there are not many drydocks which belong to the Government of Canada. I agree that this is a local and specific case, but following representations by officials of the City of Lauzon, we felt it was quite proper for us to move this motion, so that the government understand that although this legislation was adopted by all the parties in the House, there might be cases where exemptions would prove detrimental to the people of a city in particular.

I hope that the leaders and members of all parties will take note of the exemption which I referred to as far as drydocks are concerned.

When raising the problem of grants paid in lieu of taxes to municipalities, I think that it is difficult for us not to point out the position of the Quebec government. It cannot be overlooked since we want to assess the attitude of the Government of Canada compared with that of the Quebec government towards the municipalities. It would be advisable for the purposes of this debate to show for example what the intervention of the Quebec and Ottawa governments means in the case of the City of Lauzon. We have heard lately the star performers of the PQ government systematically spread rumours among the Canadian people saying that the government of Canada does not always act like a good taxpayer. I admit that, in this case, there may be minor difficulties but when you want to accuse a neighbour, you have to be faultless. The Quebec government is often like the pot calling the kettle black.

Let me give an example. In the same City of Lauzon, the municipal taxation system put into effect by the Quebec government meant a loss of revenue of $235,132. And this is due to the assessment of buildings and properties belonging to the Quebec government such as the schools, the CEGEP and the social affairs buildings. According to the figures provided to us, an amount of $235,132 which would normally have been paid to the taxpayers of the City of Lauzon in the past years was not paid because of the Quebec legislation.

Recently, another bill was tabled in the National Assembly. I refer to Bill 38, also dealing with grants paid to municipalities and more particularly grants coming from the federal government. The ostensible purpose of Bill 38 as restated by Mr. Lévesque during the weekend, is to prevent municipalities from accepting any federal grant. But, strangely enough, the first lines of the bill make it quite clear that federal grants in lieu of taxes are not covered by this bill.

There are two ways for the federal Government to help municipalities. In the case of taxes, the Quebec Government says that Ottawa can make grants in lieu of taxes. In the case of other subsidies, for instance to create jobs, the Quebec Government says: "No, you cannot accept subsidies; if you do, there will be certain penalties, such as reductions in the amounts that we owe you under the Quebec taxation system." This would mean for instance that, in the case of the City of Lauzon—and I shall come back to that later as I have a very good example in this regard—if this city had directly or indirectly, at the discretion of the Quebec Government, accepted any amount, such as $100,000, from the federal Government for a job-creation program, next year, the Quebec Government might decide that these $100,000 would be subtracted from the amount of taxes payable to the municipality of Lauzon, because the province does not want the Government of Canada to be in contact with the municipalities.

As a matter of fact, I learned a few days ago that the Canadian Government had granted to the Lauzon Skiing Centre the amount of $100,000 to provide ski lifts, snow-making machines and lights so that the skiers of the Lauzon region could practice their sport over a longer period, in the evenings, and also in somewhat better conditions. However, officials of the Quebec Department of Municipal Affairs, and Mr. Léonard, as well as the officials of the Lévis region very likely got in touch with the Quebec Government, an investigation was launched and we shall probably never be able to give to the Lauzon Skiing Centre the $100,000 we had announced. In fact, we shall probably have to get this money back because it has been decided that Bill 38, which has not yet been passed, still applies. Because of this, yesterday, or rather Monday, Mr. Léonard told the owners of the skiing centre that they would have to look somewhere else and could not count on these $100,000. Under the circumstances, I can understand why the mayor, the councillors and the officials of the City of Lauzon have said no, because this would disrupt their budget for next year as they were given a very clear warning: "If you receive one cent from the federal Government, it will be taken away or there will be an attempt to take it away some other way". I do not think that anyone administering a budget at a local level such as a municipality, can hold on if someone tells him that, in six months, X dollars may be deducted from the amount that municipality would have otherwise received under the taxation system.

We have to look at the whole context. What I am asking today is that Bill C-4 be amended so that we may include dry docks when calculating the amount of grants in lieu of taxes in the future. I know that this would meet a very local need, but I believe that it would show that the Canadian Government is an even better citizen than the Quebec Government, which can only complain even though it is much more often at fault than the Canadian Government, and I am sure that, in this case, this amendment would be useful to the officials of the City of lauzon, who are extremely important officials in our democracy and if they have all the money they need to administer their municipality, they can certainly be more independent towards the present Quebec Government and resist its efforts to take away their autonomy. In view of the circumstances, I therefore ask this House to support my motion.

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I want to take advantage of this opportunity to make a few comments on the motion tabled by the Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde). We are of course well aware of the fact that the federal Government ought to behave like a good citizen and pay taxes according to the properties it owns in various areas in our country, not only in Lauzon but across Canada. I quite agree with the principle of the recommendation made by the Member for Lévis today. I shall comment later on some remarks which had no connection with his actual recommendation. The fact remains that facilities similar or identical to those in Lauzon also exist, for instance, in Selkirk, Manitoba and Esquimalt, British Columbia. I think the Member for Lévis will agree that his proposal should have extended beyond his riding and included all facilities similar to the ones he wishes to protect, and the municipalities, and I think that if the Government is going to do something for a municipality to correct a situation where the federal presence is not paying a reasonable amount of taxes, I think it should do the same for any municipality with similar facilities across Canada. I think that logic and the law oblige us to speak for all municipalities that might be concerned by this recommendation, namely, the federal Government should pay a normal amount of taxes.

• (1650)

The House is aware that since 1980, Bill C-4 has been providing such protection and ensures that municipalities receive grants in lieu of taxes. The federal Government uses the word grants, and I must object very strenuously when the Member for Lévis makes a comparison between the Government of Quebec and the federal Government in connection with the grants the federal Government is prepared to pay in the riding of Lévis or other municipalities, and I am still referring to certain facilities, and when he makes a comparison between grants and draws or infers certain conclusions with respect to Quebec Bill 38 which has not yet been adopted. Just the same, where the Canadian Government is concerned, there is no need for Quebec to say that the Canadian Government pays its taxes, that it behaves like a good citizen and that it subsidizes the people of Quebec. The grant we are discussing here is nothing but a property tax paid by the Canadian Government. Then this is not the kind of grant often referred to by Quebec, namely for employment programs, programs that can generate work for community services. At this stage, I have serious reservations with respect to the Hon. Member for Lévis, namely that on both sides there is a lack of adjustments with regard to the agreements and a lack of co-operation, and I understand that Quebec is once again in the process of negotiating possible agreements with the Canadian government, and I would appreciate it if the Canadian government were to respond as quickly as possible, and if Quebec were to do its share also in seeking solutions that would of course be acceptable to the Quebecers, who are Canadians as much as you and I, Mr. Speaker.

In the circumstances, I feel that the Hon. Member for Lévis has very poorly substantiated his point when he simply suggested that his proposal could be held as evidence that the Canadian government is a better citizen than Quebec. I do not think this could impress many of us here, Mr. Speaker. That is not the issue. The Hon. Member for Lévis is making a suggestion. He is advising the Government, his own Government in the first place, to pay its taxes to the City of Lévis. Nothing could be more legitimate. Although I have nothing to do with the constituency of Lévis, I agree that of course the Canadian Government should pay its taxes to the City of

Lévis. The legislation excluded the dry docks two years ago, nearly three years ago. The Hon. Member for Lévis is a Government Member, so let it be known to the people of the constituency of Lévis that we of the Progressive Conservative Party, are not preventing the City of Lévis from receiving increased taxes. Therefore, I say right now, on behalf of my party, that we are not going to prevent the City of Lauzon from collecting extra taxes in respect of federal facilities that seem to have been ignored or excluded in good faith.

An Hon. Member: This was agreed upon unanimously.

Mr. La Salle: It was agreed upon unanimously, but the dry docks are not included in the—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please! The Hon. Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) has the floor. He should not be interrupted.

Mr. La Salle: You are absolutely right, Mr. Speaker. I did listen religiously and respectfully when the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde) was speaking. Yes, I listened to him. He is asking his Government, which means—and it is important that the voters in Lévis should know about it—that for the past three years, he has been, I would assume, making representations to this Minister, the Ministers involved, the Cabinet, but to no avail, so today he has to resort to this procedure which enables us to put forward motions and proposals under the heading of Private Bills. Has the Hon. Member for Lévis failed to influence his own Government into supporting such a change? If his Minister were to come in this House and introduce such a measure, we would say yes, the same way we are saying yes today to the Hon. Member for Lévis. But the Hon. Member for Lévis knows one thing, and this is important and rather sly in this case, as I say, the Hon. Member for Lévis knows one thing: he is going to make his point, he is going to take this opportunity to blame the Quebec Government for not being as good a citizen as the Canadian Government. This is not very relevant to the principle he his advocating today. One thing he knows, there is a good chance that his own colleagues will kill his motion today by talking it out in the House of Commons. You know the system.

So the Hon. Member for Lévis would very much like to tell his constituents: I asked very strongly for extra taxes for the City of Lévis, but the House of Commons said no. It will not be the House of Commons, it will be his own Government who will block that, his colleagues with whom he has been working for some years now. And that is important, for the House should not mislead the people of the Lévis riding, or of any riding for that matter. We know the system. Indeed we do share the concerns of the Hon. Member for Lévis, and we want the city of Lauzon as well as other municipalities with similar or identical facilities to receive additional taxes, I mean, grants. However, we are quite aware that this is not the best way to raise this issue. We, the opposition have no other choice when the government is adamant than introducing private bills to let the public know that we really want the government to heed our proposals. Although he would not admit it, the Hon. Member for Lévis knows that he will have to confess to his constituents his miserable failure at his own caucus and before the Cabinet. He is moving this motion in the House today to convince his constituents that he strongly and honestly defends their position, knowing as well as I do—dare I be presumptuous too—that his own colleagues will kill his motion. I should like his Lévis constituents to know that the Progressive Conservative Party supports the principle he has put forward. The Liberal Party alone will have to assume the responsibility for denying the request of the Hon. Member who knew what was coming the very moment he stood up in the House today, Mr. Speaker.

So, we support his motion. We understand his strategy, and hope that the Government will be in favour of grants in lieu of the taxes which the Government of Canada is paying on its properties in various municipalities throughout Canada. Once again, I want to speak for those municipalities which are in the same situation as Lauzon, and I would be most pleased if the Government's answer was positive, but I have grave doubts on that score. I want to say at the outset that we on this side, Mr. Speaker—and I will not go any further, but I could not sit down without upbraiding the Hon. Member for Lévis for playing petty politics at the expense of the Quebec provincial Government about a matter which is essentially a federal one and for neglecting to make a distinction between grants which are a kind of federal tax payable to municipalities and grants which may be paid to municipalities under programs established by the federal Government in the area of job creation, industrial incentives or development. There is quite a difference! One should not mix up apples and oranges, Mr. Speaker, either in this Parliament or elsewhere.

The question under consideration today concerns the federal Government. The Quebec Government has nothing whatsoever to do with it. It is not involved. However, has the federal Government carried out its duty? Does the federal Government meet the qualification of good citizen mentioned a moment ago by the Hon. Member for Lévis? If that is not the case, if the federal Government is considered a bad citizen by the Hon. Member for Lévis, then the Hon. Member should do his duty by bringing pressure to bear on his colleagues who are in office for the time being. As for us, hopefully, Mr. Speaker, in a few months down the road we will be able to prove that the federal Government behaves as a good citizen towards every municipality in Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to enter this debate. The Private Member's motion which is before us today is a good motion even though it is very limited in its impact other than within

the riding of the Hon. Member who proposed the motion. However, it does have merit.

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the motion basically proposes that the federal Government be required to pay taxes as they affect certain docks, wharves, piers, piles, dolphins—I am not sure why dolphins are on the list but they are there—floats, breakwaters, retaining walls, jetties and drydocks. This motion is an attempt to point out a limitation contained within the Municipal Grants Act which was passed by the House on July 15, 1980.

In effect, the motion indicates that there are certain federal works and federal Government properties within local municipalities for which the federal Government does not have to pay taxes. Presumably, if the land upon which these works were situated were to be occupied by other works not owned by the federal Government, then the owners of those works would have to pay taxes. This is only one very small limitation but a very real limitation contained within the Municipal Grants Act and there are other limitations within that Act.

The most fundamental limitation within the Municipal Grants Act is that the Act operates on the basis of the principles of a grant system. In other words, when the federal Government pays taxes to a municipality, it is not really paying taxes but is making a grant to the local municipality.

When this legislation was passed by the House in 1980, the Canadian Federation of Municipalities criticized it on the basis of the need of municipalities across the country for a taxation system rather than a grant system. In other words, the Federation felt that when the federal Government finds itself situated within a municipality, it would have to pay local taxes and be subject to the local authority without being above that authority and paying for its presence there by way of a grant system.

While I welcome this Private Member's motion which attempts to make some positive changes to this legislation, what is needed is a complete overhaul of the Municipal Grants Act. We need to have a Municipal Grants Act, Mr. Speaker, that recognizes that when the federal Government is within a municipality, it is a taxpayer like any one else and should not have special privileges or be able to exempt itself from the taxes which would have to be paid by any other citizen.

● (1700)

Another weakness of the Municipal Grants Act which needs to be pointed out is that the federal Government exempts itself from commercial taxes within a local riding. If a private entrepreneur were to locate within a municipality, he would have to pay commercial taxes. The federal Government has exempted itself from the local taxation, when it locates within a municipality. In 1980 the dollars involved were something like $75 million across Canada. It is a significant amount of money.

Mr. Evans: We pay grants in lieu of taxes.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, the Member across the way says that the federal Government pays grants in lieu of taxes. Certainly it does, but it continues to exempt itself from certain aspects of taxation. One of the aspects that it exempts itself from is the commercial tax. Prince Edward Island is the only Province in the country in which they pay that commercial tax. That is because they have a special regime there which does not apply to other Provinces. That situation continues.

Mr. Evans: Whoever heard of one Government taxing another?

Mr. Keeper: The Member across the way, Mr. Speaker, raises the question whether one Government should tax another Government. We should look at it from the point of view of the local municipalities. The local municipalities cannot afford to give up a part of their tax base just because the federal Government occupies that land.

Mr. Fisher: You are just using a lot of semantics here.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, I hear a lot of noise from across the way, which is fair ball. I wish hon. Members would listen for a while; perhaps they would then bring about some improvements in the legislation which they have before this House.

It is time for the federal Government to recognize that it is subject to the local municipal authority and to the taxes that are passed by the local authority, and that it cannot arbitrarily continue to exempt itself from those taxes. This continues to this day in terms of commercial taxes, in spite of the noise across the way.

With regard to the Municipal Grants Act in total, I would like to make the point that when this Act came before this House in 1980, there were a few witnesses who came to Ottawa to testify with regard to the shortcomings of the Act. There is quite a contrast between the way this legislation was treated in this House and the way similar legislation was treated in the Quebec House. In the Quebec legislature the "députés" took the time to do extensive consultations with municipalities and all those affected by the legislation. That just did not happen in this House to the same extent. It is really important, if we are going to have legislation which is going to be meaningful to people who are affected by the legislation, that people be involved fully in the development of that legislation. One of the major shortcomings of this legislation, which continues on the books of the federal House, is that it was developed with very little participation from the citizens who are affected by it.

The Private Member's motion which is before us today is a good motion. It will bring about some improvement in the Municipal Grants Act and, therefore, is worthy of support. I wonder why it is a Private Member's motion rather than a Government motion. The Member who brought the motion forward is a member for the Government caucus and we would hope that he would get the support of his colleagues in order to bring about changes that would make a positive financial contribution to his riding.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am surprised that a Member of the Government cannot get the support of his colleagues for such a good amendment. Why are the Liberal Members not supporting these measures? The people in Lévis want to know.

[*English*]

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a very short and positive report on the uses in my own city of the program that we are discussing today. In 1983, the City of Mississauga and the region of Peel will receive over $5 million in grants in lieu of taxes from the federal Government. I am very pleased with that participation by the federal Government in my municipality. It represents great co-operation between the two levels of Government. The city and the federal Government in my area have co-operated on a broad range of different activities. The funding represents the close binding and the intelligent use of taxpayers' money which my citizens expect from all of us.

The $5 million will be split between the City of Mississauga, the regional government of Peel, and the Peel region Board of Education. The money is calculated and comes from both the industrial and residential levies that are normally applied across the municipality. It represents a payment in lieu of property taxes and it will go to both the municipality and the educational system. The federal properties in my city are extensive. I draw the Member's attention to the Toronto International Airport which is the largest aviation facility in Canada. We also have the Gateway postal station which is the largest postal facility in Canada. As the Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde) pointed out, we have a small harbours branch in Mississauga, in Port Credit, where the small harbours officials act as both—

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is not usual to hear this outline of the number of credits when we are talking about Schedule A of the Municipal Grants Act which definitely excludes certain things. Airports are not excluded. It is Schedule A we are talking about. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member is talking beyond the meaning of this particular motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not believe the Hon. Member has a point of order. If the Hon. Member chooses to enter into the debate and reply to the argument of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fisher), it is perfectly in order for him to do so, but I hardly believe it is a point of order.

Mr. Fisher: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your guidance on this matter. I think the Hon. Member's intervention was quite rude. He has a hard time drawing a straight line let alone a straight line of thought. I do not think he is one to tell me what is relevant.

I was mentioning that the federal Government has acted in our city to provide parks through the small harbours branch of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and has helped the yacht club to set up its facilities on some of our lands at the mouth of the Credit River.

I think it is appropriate at this time for me to thank the City of Mississauga and the region of Peel on behalf of the federal civil servants and the people of Canada. Our city provides outstanding services to these federal facilities and we are grateful for the help that the municipality provides. It is also appropriate for me to say at this time that the city and the region have indeed given us good service for the money through the work of their outstanding staff. The social services, engineering services and the other services in those two Governments are regularly providing our officials with close liaison and close advice. As a result, we are able to avoid friction between the two Governments. We are able to combine the facilities and give an extra impact for our tax dollars. The regional and city councils send along representations and advice to me on a regular basis, which I appreciate. I receive specific advice about taxpayers' specific problems from municipal departments.

• (1710)

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the $5 million which the people of Canada are investing in Mississauga annually is money well spent. My local government is certainly helping us to maintain high levels of service, helping out by giving us good advice for the improvement of our activities in that city.

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, the intervention I made was merely to keep the Hon. Member from Mississauga north, south, east or west within the ambit of this particular motion. This motion is specifically directed toward, I would say, an amendment to Schedule II of what was known in this particular Parliament as Bill C-4.

I am in favour of this motion which has been put forward by the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde) and I want him to know it. I feel he should have spoken to the hon. gentleman from Mississauga and put him straight. That Hon. Member was just taking the occasion to praise the Government for having contributed largely to his constituency, and that is what I was objecting to, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. Member for Lévis was worried that the Government is not contributing because of the provisions of this law. I agree with him. I believe it would be useful just to remind ourselves what is in the law with which the Hon. Member disagrees. It was passed by the House of Commons on July 15, 1980. In its definition it talks about federal property, because federal property comes up in that section where the Minister may make a grant in respect of federal property.

In the definitions section there is a list of things which it does not include, and these are the exceptions with which the Hon. Member for Lévis was taking issue, and I agree with him. "Federal property" does not include any structure, work, machinery or equipment included in Schedule II. Schedule II is very important. It applies directly to my riding as well because, as the Hon. Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) mentioned, Esquimalt does have drydocks and a naval installa-

tion. There are other parts of my constituency, however, whose municipality does not receive grants in lieu of taxes.

The exclusions under Schedule II are worth putting on the record. First, canal structures. What about Smiths Falls? Right in the middle of Smiths Falls there is a canal. Does the municipality derive any grant for that? It does not, because canal structures—falls and locks—are excluded. Second, conveyor belts, conveyance systems and so on; third, docks, wharves, piers, piles, dolphins, floats and so on, which are specifically mentioned in this motion, along with drydocks, gasoline pumps and gun butts; there is a range in my riding for practising. I am sure the municipality covering that area, which has been blocked off by the federal Government for that particular practice range, does not receive a grant in lieu of taxes.

The list goes on. It goes on to include monuments, penitentiary walls and fencing, pole lines, transmission lines, light standards and so on, reservoirs, storage tanks, roads, sidewalks, aircraft runways, snowsheds, tunnels, bridges, water mains and sewer mains. These are matters over which the municipality has some jurisdiction. The municipality cannot derive taxes from those works as if there were private houses built on them, for example. This is federal property. It has a purpose certainly, and there is provision in the law for grants to reach the municipalities in lieu of the taxes they might otherwise gather for these areas.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I question, as did my friend, the Hon. Member for Joliette, the Hon. Member raising this issue in the House when he could just as easily have raised it in caucus with even more success. He obviously had some television time in view. Therefore, I question the motives of the Hon. Member, although I do not question the substance of his motion. I believe we will not know, until just at the last moment before this debate runs out, whether this has been a planted motion—and it could be—or perhaps it is just an expression of frustration on the part of the Hon. Member who really wants to have this matter resolved for his own community. We will see if it is talked out.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak on the motion introduced by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Lévis (Mr. Gourde). First of all, I believe that everyone will agree that he should be congratulated for his excellent job in defending the interests of his constituents. In spite of what the Hon. Member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) said, I believe that without the support, effective work and devotion of the Hon. Member for Lévis, a contract of $120 million for the CN Marine ferry would perhaps not have been granted as quickly as it was.

In addition, I do not agree with the Hon. Member for Joliette about the opinions expressed by my colleague for Lévis on Quebec Bill 38 because, just like the Hon. Member for Joliette, my colleague for Lévis is a Quebecer, and as the representative of his constituents, he is entitled to oppose a motion or a Bill introduced by the Quebec Government which robs of job opportunities men and women in his constituency. Indeed, the City of Lévis is losing a grant of $100,000 to create jobs in Lauzon. I therefore believe that my colleague must be congratulated. He was elected to protect the interests of his constituents and I think that he is doing a great job.

I also want to say that I do not understand the attitude of the NDP Members when they ask the Canadian Government to be a good citizen, which it already is,—and I know that for a fact—and when they say that Ottawa should pay property taxes like any other citizen. As for the Members of the Progressive Conservative Party, I do not understand them either. They formed the Government and did not introduce legislation in this regard, and in all the provinces with a Conservative of NDP Government, there are no policies as generous as those of the federal Government towards municipalities.

As for Quebec, having been a Member of the National Assembly in that province, I believe that it is important to recall that the Parti Québécois has exchanged one tax, namely property taxes, for the sales tax which used to belong to the municipalities. This means that the Quebec Government did not have to use supplementary funds to give to the municipalities. It simply took back the sales taxes paid to municipalities, and in exchange, it paid them what are call property taxes. On the other hand, the Quebec Government also makes exceptions to its own laws. I understand that the City of Montreal does not receive property taxes on the Olympic Stadium. Heaven knows that Montrealers have paid a lot of money for that stadium and not only Montrealers, but all Quebecers benefit from it. I therefore believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Joliette, who is losing control, was wrong to blame my colleague for doing his job.

Mr. La Salle: Do your own!

Mr. Malépart: Do not worry, I do my work. If my colleague who was minister during the short period when his party was in power had looked after the matter, it could perhaps have been implemented.

Mr. Speaker, more specifically about the motion, some of our colleagues have mentioned that the motion of the Hon. Member for Lévis deals only with one area or location. It should be pointed out that the exemption provided in the bill does not apply, as stated earlier, solely to the Lévis or Lauzon shipyard. It also refers to monuments, wharves, breakwaters, locks, drydocks, storage tanks, bridges, dams, walls, penitentiary gates, paving and production equipment since the provinces do not pay property taxes any more than the federal government does. It effectively restricts grants to lands and buildings.

• (1720)

Mr. Speaker, exemptions for such works were maintained in the 1980 legislation which was unanimously passed by the House because they generate a very low demand for local services and because they do not provide shelter. We know that local services are related to individuals and are provided for workers. However, a structure such as a breakwater hardly needs local services, if any. It should be mentioned that grants for some kinds of structures such as locks, landing strips, basins and breakwaters, would be very costly and I do not think that my colleagues as well as the members of the parties opposite would like the government of Canada to increase taxes in order to pay grants to municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is advisable to consider amendments as a whole instead of dealing only with part of a legislation providing grants in lieu of taxes. I think it is important to remind the House that the Government of Canada has paid $400 million to municipalities elsewhere in Canada and $80 million to Quebec municipalities in lieu of taxes.

Following the consultations—there were indeed consultations concerning this bill, contrary to what one of our colleagues claimed earlier—the matter was examined by a Parliamentary Committee. Various municipalities, as well as provincial governments and organizations, came and expressed their views, and the Minister of Public Works finally announced that at the request of a number of municipalities, a committee chaired by Mr. Jacques Roy would look into grants to municipalities. This committee would act as an appeal board if a problem arose between a municipality and the Government of Canada in connection with a particular project.

I think it is important to remind the House of the reason which prompted the Government of Canada to introduce this bill in 1980. It was simply to behave as a good and responsible government. If we figure out the amount of taxes paid by the Government—I gave some figures earlier, $400 million in Canada and $80 million in the Province of Quebec—if we include the cost of indirect taxes paid by the Government for the floor space it leases in privately owned buildings throughout the country, and if we take into account the economic fallout in a municipality, a province or a region when the Government builds an airport or introduces a new service, I think it is important to keep all those benefits in mind. I was a member of the parliamentary committee on the Bill, and I recall that none of the people of the region where Dorval or Mirabel airport is located said: If you do not pay real estate taxes like everybody else, you can have your airport. They knew, of course, that all Canadian Government investments would have significant economic fallout in the municipality. And when the Government pays—with the provincial Government when it comes to education—50 per cent of health costs, it includes as well the real estate taxes which the Government of Quebec gives to the municipalities, but we know that the Government of Quebec did not pay 100 per cent of the real estate taxes on behalf of school commissions and hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I think I ought to repeat my opening remarks and congratulate the Hon. Member for Lévis for defending the interests of his constituents. In my opinion, it is quite normal that each Member should seek to get more money for the taxpayers of his riding. I referred earlier to only one case, the CN Marine ferry, which brought in additional funds and made it possible to create jobs. I repeat, even though the Hon. Member for Joliette was not happy with Bill 38 in Quebec, that I share his view that both levels of government should find solutions to allow for job creation. However, I think it was really the duty of the Hon. Member for Lévis to further as he seemed fit the interests of his constituents, to the same extent that we let the Hon. Member for Joliette defend his own constituents the way he deems appropriate.

It is also important to remember that the setting up of a committee to examine grants to municipalities as announced yesterday by the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. LeBlanc) was indeed the result of a decision. That decision was made further to the recommendations submitted by a task force chaired by Mr. Pollack and it will be remembered that the Pollack Committee was established as a result of representations made by various groups, including the municipalities, the Provinces and the federal Government, requesting that a panel be set up to reconsider decisions that will be made as to the assessed value of specific buildings in specific areas or municipalities, where a municipality would decide on a certain assessment value and where the Government would come up with a different one. Before the decision was made by the Minister, municipalities had no recourse. As a good citizen, the Government has assumed its responsibilities in that area.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Pursuant to Standing Order 25(2), it is my duty to interrupt proceedings.

[*English*]

Shall all items listed under Private Members' Notices of Motions preceding item No. 22 be allowed to stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

EXCISE TAX

REMISSION OF TAX ON BUILDING MATERIALS IN DISASTER AREAS

The House resumed from Monday, January 19, 1981, consideration of the motion of Mr. Halliday:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of remitting the excise tax levied on building materials used in the course of repairing and/or replacing building and other losses as a result of major natural disasters so deemed by provincial authorities.

Mr. Walter McLean (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to resume debate on the motion tabled by my col-

league and neighbour, the Hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday). In doing so, I support the fundamental principle in the motion, that of the collective response of our communities to human need, and, in specific cases, to emergency situations.

As Members of the House and the public will recall, the motion arises out of the situation of August 7, 1979, when disaster struck southwestern Ontario in the form of two tornadoes. The result was a loss of some $13.5 million, of which only $5.7 was covered by insurance, leaving a shortfall for the community to cover of some $7.8 million.

The federal riding of Waterloo adjoins Oxford and I know a great number of the citizens, particularly out of Wilmot Township, Wellesley and other areas, gave of their time voluntarily, led by the example of the Mennonite tradition of self-help and community input, in the repair and restoration of the communities affected by this particular disaster.

• (1730)

The motion before the House is not binding but calls upon the Government to give consideration to the fact that it will be seen to be identifying with the best aspirations of our communities—to assist one another and to rebuild. One would have thought that the Hon. Member for Kent (Mr. Bossy) would have wished to have been here because that kind of initiative, even if the Government feels there is another alternative, not only affects this area but other areas as well. I believe the Member for Kent would agree that this has caused a community trauma.

The motion before us focuses on the excise tax of 5 per cent on building materials. However, since this motion deals with the ethics or morality of taking tax from people who have fallen victim to natural disasters, I suggest that the motion is not locked into considering that as the best vehicle. If there are other suggestions, as has been suggested by Members opposite during informal discussions and in previous debate, this would be a signal to those caught in this sort of circumstance.

I am pleased to encourage positive consideration of this motion by the House and I support my colleague for Oxford (Mr. Halliday). The root question in this motion is the role of the Government in protecting people from those things from which they cannot protect themselves, particularly when there is not adequate protection to encourage the best instincts for sharing and self-help across the communities.

Members of the House will be aware that the Government of Canada does have a disaster relief program in place but in most cases it is insufficient and attains a low level of recognition among most Canadians. I believe it is apparent that the rebate as proposed in the motion would not pose a technical problem vis-à-vis federal and provincial jurisdiction. The federal Government already gives rebates in relation to schools and hospitals, so that technically this could be done.

If this is not the particular way to give the signal, I think the subject could be opened up for discussion. As I understand the remarks made in the debate earlier, the Government's position is that the administrative problems for this proposal would be considerable and it would therefore not wish—as we would not wish—more paperwork or burden of this kind to be put on the taxpayers.

The problem is that the tax as proposed would be assessed on the value of goods shipped by the manufacturer of the building materials. By the time these goods pass through the hands of wholesalers and retailers for their ultimate use, the tax would have long since been paid and become imbedded in the price of the materials. For this reason, the Government maintains that it is difficult to ascertain how the refund can be made or to determine the amount that should be refunded.

Instead of a tax refund, it suggests that expenditure programs are preferable. Again, we could debate this in terms of philosophy but it could be noted that many expenditure programs are more costly and administratively complex than tax rebates.

The philosophical question to be raised and addressed is what is wiser in terms of community help than leaving resources in the hands of the people, that they finally understand what their priority needs are and be in the best position to address their time and energy in that area. If these needs are not appropriately addressed, there is a sharing of the responsibility with the people so that all the blame does not fall on the Government's shoulders if remedies do not fully meet their expectations.

Therefore, I view the motion in front of us as one which involves providing incentives by the best motivation in our community, which is caring and accepting responsibility for our community and its life. I see it as a motion which seeks to undergird citizenship and the best sense of citizenship by using the resources that are available, giving oneself to others who are in need and having a sense of pride.

I also compare this motion to others which have been before the House in terms of being an affirmation of voluntary action. Some weeks ago, a Bill which I presented to the House, C-233 in support of the voluntary sector, called upon the Government to give signals to those who were prepared to give of themselves in and through voluntary groups. This is another illustration of the importance and the signal of that motivation.

With this in mind, and since there is a division of opinion within the Government as to how best to do this, I would like to move, and I encourage Members of the House to consider, the following motion in order that the substance and purpose of the motion presented by the Hon. Member for Oxford could be considered in the context of the Government's discussion paper on charitable activity. This is in relation to the discussions about the give and take tax proposals which are an incentive. It may be that there is another incentive method that could be applied in certain circumstances like this.

Therefore I would move:

That the motion be withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

I believe the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) is prepared to second this motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Such a motion at this stage would need the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I presume it would need unanimous consent to be debated, or would it need unanimous consent to be passed?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It would need unanimous consent to be presented to the House at this time for debate.

Mr. Fisher: Then I would certainly agree with that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Hovdebo: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Unanimous consent usually requires the courtesy of asking the third Party in the House for unanimous consent. This was not done. Under those circumstances I am very loth to give unanimous consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There does not appear to be unanimous consent. Certainly it is the understanding of the Chair that such a motion could not be put without unanimous consent. Is the Hon. Member for Prince Albert standing his ground and refusing unanimous consent or has he had second thoughts?

Mr. Hovdebo: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on this motion and I was quite willing to speak in favour of it. I just required the courtesy of being asked for unanimous consent in a case like this. That consent was not asked for and I was just making that point. I will give the unanimous consent provided I am given the opportunity to speak to the motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is asking for unanimous consent. The Chair obviously cannot be responsible for private negotiations that might or might not have taken place. But in this case there is unanimous consent for the Hon. Member for Waterloo (Mr. MacLean), seconded by the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), to move that the motion be withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday) for bringing forward this motion. In doing so he has opened up the whole area of the treatment of disasters in the country as well as another area which may be more important, namely the whole issue of tax concessions.

From reading the Member's motion and listening to the debate so far, I recognize that he did not intend to be too confining in his motion. The Hon. Member made the suggestion that it related to buildings and would only extend to repair and replacement of buildings. He did so by having the relief attached only to the excise tax levied on building materials. That makes it a very narrow approach and, as are many taxes and remission of taxes, it would also be regressive in that often the person most able to pay would benefit the most from this remission—the individual who may not have needed the help. Granted, most natural disasters will do the greatest damage to the most expensive houses, if you wish, but that does not mean the owner should get the most help.

• (1740)

Possibly to overcome that criticism the remission should be taxable, but Members earlier in this debate, particularly on the Government side, indicated that such a process of even having a remission of taxes would be bureaucratically very difficult. Of course, if you were to have it taxable as well you would increase the bureaucracy. It might then be easier and more worth while to give a straight grant to people affected by a disaster.

Therefore, I would give general support to the principle of giving relief to disaster victims, particularly victims not covered in some other way. I would wish to have the Government study the methods—and the motion before us right at the moment does exactly that—to attempt to make them as progressive as possible.

We could spend a lot of time looking at disaster procedures in the country. They are fairly well documented. The processes of EMP and EMR and so on have been well covered. I imagine most Members who have been involved in community emergency treatment of disasters know well what goes on. Those procedures seem fairly adequate after an agreement is reached between a Province and the federal Government.

It is also possible that the suggestion made by the Hon. Member for Oxford (Mr. Halliday), which is remission of taxes, would help the quality and even the extent of the replacement that was necessary under this kind of disaster requirement.

However, if you look at the history of disaster relief in Canada, there are some amazing incongruities when the Government makes an attempt to provide an over-all answer to a requirement. I could give you a number of examples, Mr. Speaker. We only have a few more minutes and I am sure there are other Members who wish to speak. I believe the Hon. Member for Oxford is able to speak under these circumstances.

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Hovdebo: Therefore I will go through this as quickly as possible. Right now in our present estimates we are talking about giving $6.9 million of relief to farmers who had apple trees frozen in Ontario and Quebec in the last year. The requirement is very heavy but worth while, the $6.9 million being used to restore orchards. Those same farmers could have frost damage every year for ten years which kills the fruit and yet never get any disaster relief unless their incomes fall below a certain level. Two years ago we had a very heavy drought in Saskatchewan which affected the quantity of feed for farmers' cattle. Many farmers were paid disaster relief. In my particular area one farmer living on one side of the road got $5,000 worth of help but the fellow living across the road who experienced exactly the same kind of disaster got no help.

There are a variety of things that can happen to so-called disaster funds. Those are things that should be looked at.

As I said earlier, the Hon. Member has opened up a very large can of worms in talking about the remission of taxes, tax credits or deferral of taxes. This whole area has traditionally been used for corporate welfare for which the Government does not have to account. It has been used through the years as a way in which the Government has been able to give a reward to its friends without having to account for that reward. For example, the CPR, a great friend of both the Liberals and the Conservatives, now owes Canada $1.4 billion in deferred taxes which the CPR never expects to have to pay, nor do Governments expect to collect. Maybe the type of remission considered here would spread this largesse a little more broadly and fairly. Do we really want to get into this kind of practice that is very repressive and has not worked particularly well in the past?

We support the relief in principle. We also support referring the motion to committee. However, we would be very cautious about the method used to give relief, particularly the method suggested in this motion.

Mr. Bruce Halliday (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, first of all I thank the Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Hovdebo) for giving us unanimous consent to allow me to discuss briefly again this particular motion of mine that was raised almost four years ago. I should say for the Hon. Member's benefit that I assume he would want to give unanimous support because his colleague, the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Mrs. Mitchell), who I am pleased to say is here today, spoke in favour of this motion in 1980. I thought he would naturally be in support of her.

I want also to express my appreciation to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean), who as he said is a neighbour of mine. I am particularly pleased he was able to approach this Bill today with his usual empathy, sympathy and understanding for the human aspects of government and the need for us to concentrate more on that aspect of government. The people in Oxford, as well as the people in Waterloo, will recognize the fact that he is very much in support of this motion. We hope the Government will come around to accepting the motion this afternoon as far as referring it to the committee is concerned.

● (1750)

On January 19, 1981, this matter was first before the House. I am disappointed that the Hon. Member for Kent (Mr. Bossy) is unable to be present this afternoon. His area suffered a tornado last spring at Reese's Corners, a very small community which was virtually destroyed. I am sure the people of that area would have the same concern for this kind of motion as the people of Oxford. The community of Oxford Centre was badly demolished as well in that tornado. This past summer it raised several thousands of dollars locally which were sent over to the riding of the Hon. Member for Kent to help the people in Reese's Corners. If the Hon. Member had been present, I am sure he would have acknowledged that support from fellow tornado victims.

In addition, I emphasize my concerns for the moral and ethical issues involved. Governments are somewhat slow to appreciate these issues. They take the expedient way of dealing with such matters and find excuses for not doing something which should be more properly done for a moral and ethical point of view.

As the Hon. Member for Waterloo (Mr. McLean) said a few moments ago, there is the issue of Governments seeking revenues from people who, through no fault of their own, suffer severely from natural disasters. I find it to be a very distasteful situation for the Government to find itself in and should not allow itself to be guilty of accepting tax revenues from such persons.

Also the Hon. Member for Waterloo said that over $3 million was raised in my constituency from private individuals as well as from individuals outside the constituency. People came from far and wide to give money quite freely. In particular, people from the Mennonite communities in Wilmot and Wellesley Townships came by the hundreds into Oxford to work without pay to help the victims. For them to see the Government reap profits from that disaster, especially when they gave freely of their own labour, bothers me somewhat. I wish it would bother the Government more so that it would take some action in support of my motion.

I would like to leave some time this afternoon for the motion to be referred to committee, if at all possible. However, I would like to refer to some of the comments made in the previous debate by the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans). I am very pleased to see the Hon. Member for the riding in which I live in Ottawa present today. I was very pleased with his comments as reported on page 6333 of *Hansard* where he said:

> —but it certainly goes without saying that the Hon. Member has our whole support in his concern for disaster assistance.

Of course, he was referring to myself. Then, as reported on page 6334 of *Hansard*, he went on to say:

> As a result, it would certainly seem to me that we should be looking at much more generous and larger funds to be paid to the disaster victims, and whether there should be included in that particular package of funds which goes to an individual something that could be called a refund of the tax.

I was pleased to hear that, but he concluded his speech by suggesting that the Government could not support it. Given the present political climate and his desire to have the support of all his constituents, hopefully he has changed his mind somewhat. Obviously he was philosophically in support of the motion, yet for some purely technical reasons he could not support it. I appreciate the fact that there are some technical problems. The Hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fisher) with whom I spoke earlier today also appreciates the fact that there are some technical problems which can be overcome, one way or another, if indeed we are in philosophical agreement on this.

Finally, the last reference I want to make is to the comments of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard). Unfortu-

nately he is not present in the Chamber at the moment, but his Parliamentary Secretary, in the person of the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre, is here. As reported on page 10494 of *Hansard* for June 11, 1981, I asked the President of the Privy Council some questions regarding disaster aid. In reply to my question concerning whether or not there should be some involvement from the private sector, he agreed and said:

> Should the individual and the private sector become more involved? I fully agree with his suggestion—

He went on to say:

> —we are quite willing to consult the private sector—

I would like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary who will speak next whether any Government action has been taken. To the best of my knowledge, no such action has been taken along those lines. It is disappointing that we have not had the benefit of input from the private sector, especially from people such as those in Oxford who have had first-hand experience at overcoming disaster problems.

I would like to close my remarks with a one and a half line quotation which I used in my original presentation of this motion on January 19, 1981, when I quoted Edmund Burke. When he was giving his second speech respecting conciliation with America, Edmund Burke said:

> It is not what a lawyer tells me I may do; but what humanity, reason and justice tell me I ought to do.

The Government philosophically agrees with us; it knows what ought to be done. I challenge the Government to allow the motion to be referred to committee where it can be discussed further and possibly result in putting some humanity into the affairs of Government.

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, before I begin my speech, I would like to pay tribute to the previous speakers who have obviously worked hard on this matter. I also want to compliment the Hon. Member for Lambton-Middlesex (Mr. Ferguson). Last spring his riding experienced a tornado. I believe three townships in that area were very seriously affected. He told me that local people made outstanding contributions as volunteers. They contributed to the rebuilding of their neighbours' homes, farms and facilities. He has asked me to refer specifically to the outstanding work that was done by the Mennonite relief organizations. People came by the busload from all over southern Ontario to his riding and worked very hard to improve and restore the local economy. I pay tribute to the Hon. Member and all those dedicated volunteers in his riding who helped to restore the local situation.

This is a familiar topic and one which has been discussed widely in the House; it is an approach which has been discussed widely. The previous speaker referred to a stirring quotation from Edmund Burke. It is a handy quotation, a very emotional one which makes it difficult for the next speaker to rise and say that he has serious reservations. Unfortunately I do have serious reservations.

We have a system now that rebates people in disaster areas for the costs they incur. There is a formula for that. We make payments to rebate people who have experienced disasters. The formula recognizes the primary responsibility of the Province, but as soon as costs rise above a certain level—I think it is $1 per capita of the provincial population—we become involved. As the costs increase beyond that level, our involvement becomes deeper.

It is important to note that under these rebates we also rebate the cost of the federal sales tax. To answer his concern about the morality, we are not keeping federal sales tax; we are rebating it when we become involved in disaster relief. Hopefully that will settle the issue in the Hon. Member's mind.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being six o'clock p.m., the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at eleven o'clock a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 24, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1110)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed from Friday, November 19, 1982 consideration of the motion of Mr. Gray that Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Financial Administration Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would just like to mention that there is an agreement among the House Leaders to deal with all stages of this Bill today. Therefore, the motion should be amended and the reference be to send the Bill to the Committee of the Whole, not to the Standing Committee. I want to put on record that all the necessary consent should be sought in due time, but it will be given to allow this Bill to get through all stages today.

Mr. Yurko: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like to ask the House Leader for some clarification in connection with the procedure that he is now proposing. Is he suggesting that, as a result of a meeting between himself and two Party House Leaders, the procedure can now be changed without putting the matter before the House for unanimous consent? Or are we proceeding as the Orders of the Day state so that I might have a chance to speak on the Bill if I wish to do so? I would like to have the House Leader clarify these points I have put before the House.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, the consent is only to allow the Bill to be dealt with through all stages today. There is no doubt that if the Hon. Member seeks the floor and the Speaker wants to recognize him, he will be allowed to speak during the next few hours available for debate. Debate is not limited to one speaker per Party.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, we have agreed to put the Bill through all stages today. If we are to do so, I think the Bill should be in Committee of the Whole before one o'clock. I would think we could have something like two speeches, if the Hon. Member for Edmonton East wants to take his 20 minutes. I would certainly appreciate a few minutes at second reading before we go to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, the agreement we made was not specific as to how long debate would last at second reading and in Committee of the Whole. I think we should let debate go on and we shall see what happens later. There was no firm deal as to the number of speakers at second reading, for example.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat troubled in getting ready for the debate today. There are a substantial number of amendments to this Bill that we have to get through in Committee of the Whole. Was there a breakdown in the proceedings? Why were the amendments not published in the Order Paper? How are we going to handle this? Are they going to be read into the record? Are they going to be handled one at a time as we proceed in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, while debate is going on at second reading, we might consider a reasonable approach to dealing with the numerous amendments when we reach Committee of the Whole stage. I will speak with the President of the Treasury Board. I have a meeting with the House Leaders in 15 minutes. If we can be useful, fine. The agreement was that we dispose of the Bill today in the House of Commons. If we have the time to deal with all the amendments, fine. If we do not have the time, they will have to be voted on very quickly.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader sets forth with accuracy the fact that there has been agreement to pass the Bill through all three stages today which, of course, does not prevent the Hon. Member for Edmonton East from speaking. I was unaware of any Government amendments with respect to the legislation and presumably there are such amendments. It might facilitate the matter and would certainly be a courtesy to all Members of the House if we could have copies of those amendments distributed to all Hon. Members. This has caught me somewhat by surprise.

• (1115)

Another thing I should say is that I agree with the Hon. Member for Capilano. We should try to move on to Committee of the Whole to deal with these amendments as quickly as possible and I think that that could be accomplished if we were to hold the number of speakers down to a minimum on second reading.

If I might have the attention of the Government House Leader so that he can concur, the third thing I would like to remind him of is that we agreed to deal with this Bill today. If it happens to conclude before six o'clock today, we will see the clock as being six o'clock with no intervening business after the conclusion of this business and before the six o'clock closing of business.

Mr. Pinard: Agreed.

Mr. Yurko: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I am not sure that I have full clarification in my mind as to what is going on in the House at this particular moment. The Government House Leader indicated that an agreement has been reached to make certain that the Bill passes today. I recognize that I sit as an independent and can only speak once on second reading and once on third reading, I hope.

Mr. Nielsen: But you are unlimited in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Yurko: I know that. I can speak during Committee of the Whole in terms of the number of amendments that are made, and indeed they are quite substantive. If a person were to get really interested in asking questions about these amendments, I imagine he could hold the Bill up for several hours and indeed for several days.

My point of view again, Mr. Speaker, is not that I am particularly interested in the Bill. I am interested in the procedure which goes on in the House with respect to independents who may be here in the future. There may be 20 of us in the future, I do not know. I am concerned that an agreement has been reached between the three Parties indicating that the Bill should be passed today without putting the matter by way of a vote of unanimous consent in the House. If the matter were to be put and indeed unanimous consent were to be requested, I would be prepared to give that unanimous consent without too much difficulty. However, the point I make is, how can an agreement be made in such a way that it impinges upon my rights in the House without my being party to that agreement?

As I said, if I wished to become miserable, I could certainly delay this Bill beyond the course of the day, particularly in Committee of the Whole. I simply ask again for clarification from the Government House Leader as to whether a request for unanimous consent to this agreement should be put in the House or whether he is simply prepared to go ahead, hoping that it will indeed pass in the course of the day if I do not become too mouthy, if you wish, in terms of asking questions in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Nielsen: He was asking for consent.

Mr. Yurko: If he is asking for consent, then I expect the Speaker will put the request for unanimous consent to deal with the Bill in its entirety this day to the House. If the Speaker does so, then I would certainly be prepared to give my consent.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, if you seek that consent, we are prepared to give that consent as well.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. In that case, the House has heard the proposal put forward by the Hon. President of the Privy Council to the effect that the House will deal today with all three stages of Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Financial Administration Act. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Agreed and so ordered.

When debate adjourned on Bill C-96 at a previous sitting of the House, the Hon. Member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre) had the floor. It is my understanding that there has been, shall I say, changes in responsibilities on the part of certain Hon. Members.

The Hon. Member for Calgary Centre not being available at this time, the Chair would normally recognize a Member of the New Democratic Party. However, the House may wish to give its consent to hear out the Hon. Member for Capilano who, I understand, wishes to contribute to the debate at this time.

● (1120)

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, before we do that I think, for the sake of order and our records, the Chair should put the motion once again as amended by the Government House Leader, that rather than the Bill going to the Standing Committee, it be referred at the termination of second reading to a Committee of the Whole.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Mr. Gray, seconded by Mr. Pepin, moves:

That Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Financial Administration Act, be now read a second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to a Committee of the Whole.

It is the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Just going back to the point you were making before you asked for consent to change the procedure, I would be quite delighted to hear the Hon. Member for Capilano. I know that he has a lot to offer. I think it would be appropriate to recognize him in lieu of the Member for Calgary Centre, who is not here now.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am a little confused. The Hon. Member for Calgary Centre is the Official Opposition critic for defence and I believe he is in the estimates committee. I am a little confused at your wording. You said "heard out". Are you giving me the balance of his time? Otherwise, I would just as soon go to the Hon. Member for Edmonton East and then I would like ten or 15 minutes at least.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Chair is prepared to recognize any Member who wishes to speak at this time.

I think I should explain to the House the conundrum that we are in at this stage. I understand that changes have been made in certain responsibilities. I understand the Hon. Member for Capilano is now the official spokesman for his Party. I am attempting to accommodate everyone. If the Hon. Member for Capilano wishes me to recognize another Hon. Member, I am prepared to do that as well. I will recognize whoever rises. The Hon. Member for Capilano.

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we have got through the initial procedural problem. It will not be an easy day. Just as we came into the House we were given this package of amendments which we will have to deal with through the Committee of the Whole stage. Since they are not printed in our Order Paper, I understand we will have to read them into the record.

In this Bill we are dealing with amendments to the Financial Administration Act. The call and demand for these amendments has come out of a long series of meetings and many hours of deliberation between the Auditor General and his staff, the Standing Committee on Public Accounts and the Treasury Board. These are housekeeping amendments which are probably meant to bring us out of the quill pen age, as the Comptroller General says, and up to the computer age. They are highly technical.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Lang) was good enough to meet with me as the Official Opposition critic of the Treasury Board and we spent some hours on these. I have been assured by the Comptroller General that each of these amendments is necessary. I just want to explain that the reason for all of these amendments is to take care of objections that the Office of the Auditor General has had to Bill C-96 in its printed form. These amendments have come a long way toward doing that.

At the outset, I must say that one of the matters that was not agreeable to us during the negotiation stage was Clause 3. We had problems dealing with that clause. The wording was submitted to me by the Comptroller General. I would assume that the wording as submitted to me by him, amending Clause 3 to fit with anxieties that we had, is what is in this package. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) nods yes. So that concern is covered.

• (1125)

Over the years, I suppose since Auditor General Macdonell flew the signal in March of 1976 that spending was out of control, a hard working group, including the Deputy Speaker, has worked on procedures and attitudes to try and bring the matter back under control. I stand here as a person who is very concerned at what has happened to our Government and what is going to happen to our country if somehow or other Hon. Members in this House cannot deliver themselves to a new direction and to a new attitude—and it is going to have to be an apolitical attitude—in order to bring the runaway, out of control spending of the Government of Canada under control. It is not necessarily totally the fault of the incumbent Government, but it has to accept the responsibility for what has happened to the country in the last 14 years. The matter is of crisis proportion today.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), on August 13, 1969, recognized that the behaviour of governments in Canada and in the western world was going to cause serious deprivation and problems for the poor, the sick and the elderly. I stand here to make a plea to all Members of this House of Commons, my own Party, the New Democratic Party, the Government Party and the independent, that if we are going to bring the system under control, we are going to have to change our attitudes. We in this House, as individual Members, are to blame. We are the politicians. We go to the electorate and make promises and we are proud of what we deliver back into our constituencies. There are Hon. Members who are proud of what they can gather here and deliver back. That seems to be how the people of Canada relate to politicians. They seem to accept half-truths.

I am suggesting to you, Sir, that we are at the end of that road. What we are dealing with in this Bill is just the beginning. All we are doing is dealing with the technical aspects of the Financial Administration Act, to allow for some of the new value for money concepts which we passed in our Auditor General Act and in the amendments to the Financial Administration Act which gave us the Comptroller General and will allow the central agency of the Treasury Board and the office of the Comptroller General to function and overcome the handicaps, abuses and voids which the Auditor General has been pointing out for some years now.

I do not have trouble in agreeing to the Bill. Our Party is going to support the Bill in order to get it through the House all in one day. However, I would want each element of it to be talked about and understood. It is good for Members of this House to have an understanding of what we are doing.

I rise to take time on second reading to make an appeal. We, as a western world nation, are in a catch-22 situation. I have just come from the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates, which was questioning the Secretary of the Treasury Board. I can appreciate that the President of the Treasury Board has been busy getting ready for this day in the House, but it is unfortunate that he was not in that Committee this morning because the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates is a Committee of the House dealing with policy. We examine senior Deputy Ministers, like the Secretary of the Treasury Board in the Standing Committee on Public Accounts; and in that standing committee we are apolitical and do not touch policy. However, with the nation in the dilemma in which it is today, in spite of the Prime Minister's warning back in 1969, the whole system is out of control. In spite of the Auditor General's warning in March of 1976, we are in 1983 even further out of control and something has to be done. We have to cross Party lines and cross the bridge between the politicians and the professionals who manage the federal Government system.

• (1130)

In my opinion and that of many others, if we continue this way the system will go into total collapse. Those social policies we are so proud of in Canada are going to collapse with it. Our pensions are going to collapse. We cannot get this country back on its feet creating wealth if we have a fat, careless, slothful overburden in the form of government. We can trim the federal Government, make it lean and effective, as our value for money legislation calls for. But I really fear for the people of Canada if we continue the way we are because we

are harming those who cannot look after themselves, those who are about to rely on their pensions for a modest standard of living in the twilight years of their life. It is not just Canada, Mr. Speaker. Other nations have tried, too—deliberately and too energetically, to redistribute wealth. I suggest we have gone so far in that direction that we have smothered the creation of wealth.

What we are dealing with today is a technical move which should remove a lot of the excuses the central agency gives for not being able to control the system. Guideline after guideline and regulation after regulation in the central agency are so permissive you can drive trucks through them. I plead for this House to accept responsibility for financial management and make sure tax dollars are used wisely, efficiently and effectively. But it 'aint going to happen, Sir, unless we as individual Members in this House do it.

I have to compliment most of the people in the federal bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker. The Comptroller General has put in place all the things we asked him to do. He asked for five years and that is coming forward. The new form of the Estimates is coming down and the President of the Treasury Board has requested Members to comment on the new Part IIs. All of this reorganization and proper disclosure of information we hope will allow us to overcome the extravagance we see within Government today. I put a lot of faith in the new form of Estimates and proper disclosure of honest information to hold the system to better account. But none of that is going to happen, none of the work of the federal bureaucracy will come to fruition—and I guess we have spent close to $200 million on this since I was Chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts—unless the individual Member who sits in this House representing the Canadian taxpayer changes his attitude and starts to conserve the tax resources of Canada.

The taxes paid by working people represent blood, sweat and tears. They spend the best part of their day earning their wages from which taxes are deducted. Corporations in Canada add to the value of goods. If they do not do it efficiently and effectively, they are not around for very long in this competitive world.

The energy, skill, the thought and the engineering, the professionalism which goes into creating the profits from which we draw taxes, are held in disrepute and disrespect here. Some 65 per cent of Canadians say this place is no longer relevant and they are right. This is taxation without representation. We have a Department of National Revenue which can walk right into an individual's bank account without even asking the person concerned and take money through some kind of power they have developed with the banks. There is fear among the people of this nation that the arbitrary powers of Government are out of control.

It is up to us, Mr. Speaker. If we want to continue to conduct ourselves in the historical pattern of politicians, then I suggest to every Member sitting in this Chamber that democracy is threatened and will die. It is that serious. Let me just read the concern of the Prime Minister back on August 13, 1969. He said:

> This year the debate about inflation and the search for ways to combat it have reached a new intensity. Most Canadians—whether in government, business or labour—realize that if inflation continues unchecked they will suffer personally. But some people suffer more than others. Even a modest increase in general price levels causes anguish for pensioners, wage earners with weak bargaining powers, the unemployed, persons on welfare and other who are unable to increase their incomes. Because these persons are often our lowest income earners inflation has serious implications for our goal of achieving an equitable distribution of incomes.
>
> We have chosen an approach to combat inflation which we believe can produce better long-term results for the country and for Canadians. For success, it requires your support, and this is why I am speaking to you tonight.
>
> Our fiscal and monetary policies are the first line of attack. During the past year we have taken necessary steps to place our budget in a surplus position in the 1969-70 fiscal year . . . the first actual surplus in thirteen years. This swing from a deficit of $575 million last fiscal year to a surplus this year is of great help in fighting inflation in our economy.
>
> Another important step in holding down costs of all governments in Canada was our refusal to turn over larger amounts of money to the provinces. The Federal stand, and the fruitful discussions held with the provinces before they brought in their budgets, has resulted in most provinces making successful efforts to improve or maintain budgetary balance. I hope they keep up the effort.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and myself were in the Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Estimates this morning. One of the problems we were asking about was the increase in the transfer payments to the Provinces, out of control spending and the inability of the central agency, the Treasury Board, to show any semblance of control. I happen to know that the Secretary of the Treasury Board is concerned with the looseness which exists within the system, but we politicians—and I am going to disregard political boundaries—of all stripes are the guilty ones. We do not represent our constituents in matters of supply.

Parliament came about because the King bled the people dry through taxes. That is what the Government is doing in this country and I stand here and say: Enough! Let Bill C-96 be the beginning today of a tightening up of our spending and a representation once again of the taxpayer by Members sitting in this House. If we do not do it I do not know how we are going to survive because we have smothered out the wealth-creating abilities of our land. We cannot see a way to compete with the industries that we have been generous enough to complete in the Third World.

● (1140)

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am going to sit down so that we have maximum time in Committee of the Whole to get through all the amendments we have to deal with.

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, it was only one hour ago that I became aware that we were going to debate second reading of Bill C-96. I must admit to the House that I have not had the opportunity to prepare a speech. However, I would like to indicate that almost five years ago when I was elected to this Parliament there were three major problems on my mind that, in my view, had a crisis element to them. The first was the patriation of the Constitution and an amending procedure. The second was the reform of Parliamentary institutions. The third was coming to grips with the growth of Governments in Canada, not only provincial and municipal Governments, but the federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I spent many hours preparing the first speech that I made in this House on October 11, 1979. I would like to quote a couple of paragraphs from it because I dealt with this very matter. I said then:

> A recent analysis shows the growth of governments in the free nations of the world in the 20-year period from 1955 to 1975. I will not run through all of them, but I should like to refer to a few examples. In the Netherlands the government's share of the gross national product in 20 years grew from 31.5 per cent to 54 per cent; in Sweden from 16.5 per cent to 52 per cent in 20 years; in Ireland from 28 per cent to 50 per cent; in the United Kingdom from 32.5 per cent to 45 per cent; in Germany from 30 per cent to 44 per cent; in Italy form 28 per cent to 43 per cent; in France from 33 per cent to 42 per cent;—

Over the 20-year period the Government of Canada's share grew from 25 per cent of the GNP to 40 per cent of the GNP. In 1979 the best figures I had indicated that Governments redistributed 42 per cent of the GNP of the nation. At that time I was asked what it was for the United States. I indicated that in the United States it grew from 26 per cent to 36 per cent. I also gave figures for some other nations.

That 42 per cent five years ago has now grown, in my view, Mr. Speaker, to 50 per cent of the GNP in Canada. The figures that I have before me are estimates, but the indication is that this year the three levels of Government in Canada will be taking, by way of taxation, 50 per cent of the GNP of this nation for redistribution. In this nation we now have a process where Government redistribution through the taxation system is crushing the ability of the nation to create new wealth.

If there is a problem that has to be faced in every way by every level of Government in Canada, it is to come to grips with this single most important matter in the nation. Creation of wealth must be stimulated again and can only be stimulated by reducing the take from the entrepreneurial and wealth-creating sector of the economy. If there is a point to be made in this House, it is this very point.

I am not going to dwell upon the amendments in this Bill and the additional technical amendments to it in terms of control, but they are hardly enough. I suggest very strongly that at the earliest opportunity the Government of the day should put forth a joint committee of this place and the Senate to examine this area in detail and to come forth with some concrete directions in terms of the control of the growth of Governments in Canada. The federal Government does control, to a large degree, the growth of the provincial Governments through its transfer arrangements, so there is some degree of control from here over the provincial Governments and even over the municipal Governments.

I appeared before the Joint Committee on Senate Reform and I tried to present a very strong case that the Senate should have the power to review the expenditures of Crown corporations and to limit some of the appropriations to the Crown corporations across this land. That way there would be a check, not only on this place but on the self-perpetuation and growth of Crown corporations themselves. I know how busy Ministers are. They cannot possibly review what goes on within some of these Crown corporations on a daily basis. If commitments are made in these Crown corporations, Ministers then have to accord with them. Therefore, they have to be stopped in advance rather than after the fact.

I have a Bill on the Order Paper to provide that an Act should be structured to grant Parliament the authority to place Members of parliament and Senators on the board of directors of federal Crown corporations. I received information suggesting that this is not possible because of conflicts of interest and many other reasons. As a Minister in Alberta I put elected members on Crown corporation boards and they were the watchdogs of those Crown corporations. Those elected members functioned extremely well. They put a lot of pressure on the Minister responsible to limit allocations to those Crown corporations and to see that they functioned properly. There was a second line of elected defence by putting an elected member, or in this case a Senator, on some of those Crown corporations at the board level to take note of the decisions that are made at the policy level in these Crown corporations which commit expenditures which can hardly be decreased in this House.

Speaking briefly in a general way to this Bill which deals with the regulation and control of the growth of Governments and expenditures, I am attempting to say that I do not believe for one minute that the mechanism has been found in this Bill to control the growth of government in general and to control the expenditure of the vast complexity of the federal Government. A new system must be found. I hope that the House will either set up joint committee of the House and the Senate to examine all aspects over a period of a year or two of this area of concern for the Parliament of Canada, or devise some better method than I can think of to deal with this most complex and difficult problem within the nation. Because of the very nature of the growth of technology today, expenditures and governments grow irrespective of the dictates of the political process itself.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by thanking you for the opportunity to make a few remarks on this most important matter. I hope Members of this House will put some points forward regarding a new process for control of the growth and expenditures of government.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments based on some of the things that have been said in the last little while by the Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) and the Member for Edmonton East (Mr. Yurko). No Member of Parliament could disagree with their statements that governments, federal, provincial and municipal, are large organizations and that they have grown larger in recent years. Nobody would disagree with them when they call for efficiency in government.

● (1150)

In the last few years this country, in fact every country in the western industrialized world, has experienced economic recession. It has been obvious that many large organizations, not just public organizations but private organizations, some of them the biggest companies, in the easy years of economic growth and profitability were not as efficient as they could

have been. We have seen examples of that. We have examples given to us by the Auditor General and the Comptroller General of mistakes and inefficiencies in government operations. We have seen some very glaring examples in some of our Crown corporations which have obviously not operated very efficiently. I refer for example to Canadair. Some problems were not caused by inefficiency but by mistakes in planning because of inability by the corporation concerned and the inability of others to foresee the recession. But it must be pretty obvious to Members of Parliament in the case of Canadair that if one cannot say it was inefficient, it is pretty obvious that it was slow to report its difficulties to the Government; and if Canadair did report its difficulties to the Government and asked for advice, it certainly did not report those difficulties to Parliament.

I join with Members who have spoken, the Hon. Member for Capilano and the Member from Calgary, in supporting the idea that we have to have greater efficiency and that the Government's organization needs to be changed and tightened up so that we get greater efficiency. Where I have some difficulty in following the arguments put forward by the Hon. Member for Capilano and the Member from Calgary is in their sweeping statements about government programs, that we are doing too much, that government is taking too much of the Gross National Product, that we should reduce the percentage of the Gross National Product which goes to government. Governments tax and collect revenue in the way they do, not just for the sake of taxing or for the sake of collecting revenue. Governments spend money to provide services for people, the services which people as individuals, or companies which are in business, cannot provide for themselves.

It was suggested by both Members that we should somehow reduce the transfer payments which are made to the Provinces. I think it is incumbent upon those Members of Parliament or anybody else who believes that government expenditures should be reduced, who believe that the transfer payments made by the federal Government to the provinces should be reduced, to say so. I suggest it is incumbent upon them, if they are serious and believe what they are saying and are going to be honest with other Members of Parliament and with the people of Canada, to indicate much more clearly and much more specifically than they have done today or at any other time just how transfer payments can and should be reduced.

Let us look at some of the reasons the federal Government makes transfer payments. The federal Government has paid over the years approximately 50 per cent of the cost of medicare. Are there Members here who believe we should reduce our expenditures on medicare? If so, they should say so. We have paid approximately 50 per cent of the cost of hospital services. In fact, for some of the poor Provinces like those in Atlantic Canada we have paid more than 50 per cent. Are there Members of Parliament who believe that the federal Government should reduce its share of hospital payments? If so, they should say so. Although we have changed the formula in the legislation and we have changed how we pay for it, over the years we have paid about 50 per cent of the cost of post-secondary education, the cost of providing university education for those Canadians who want to attend universities and those who want to attend community colleges. Are we doing too much? Are we training too many people in our universities and community colleges? Is it costing us too much? Can we afford it? If Members of Parliament feel that way, I believe it is incumbent upon them to say so and to tell the people.

The federal Government pays for more than 50 per cent of the cost of scientific research in this country. Canada is spending a smaller percentage of its Gross National Product on scientific research than any other country in the industrialized world. The stated objective of this Government to increase expenditure on scientific research to 1.5 per cent of the Gross National Product is several years down the road. In fact, many of the other western industrialized countries, Japan included, are already spending 2.5 per cent of their Gross National Product on scientific research. Is there any Member here who really believes we are spending too much tax money for scientific research? If we are, are we going to leave it to the private sector, which has failed up to now for reasons which I do not have time to discuss today, to attain 1.5 per cent of GNP expenditures for scientific research? If they will, how will we get our expenditures up to 2.5 per cent GNP?

We have had report after report after report about the bad state of our forests. There is a recent one from the Science Council. We had a debate on Tuesday on the whole question of our forest industry. The Science Council made a report a few months ago, the last of many reports made by various research institutes saying we are cutting down our forest at twice the rate they are being replaced. Twenty-five years down the road, unless we take some pretty drastic steps at the federal and provincial Government levels, the forest industries on which several hundred thousand people in Canada depend for a living will no longer be with us. Should we be cutting down on reforestation expenditures?

What about our fisheries? We just had the federal Liberal Government reach agreement with two provincial Conservative Governments, the Government of Nova Scotia and the Government of Newfoundland. They reached a major agreement for the restructuring of the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada which will mean a major expenditure on the part of the federal Government and the Provinces. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the fishing industry in its free enterprise form simply could not operate on a sound financial basis, for reasons which I do not have the time to discuss, nor am I expert enough to go into detail in any case.

Why did the federal Liberal Government and the two provincial Conservative Governments go into this? Because there are 60,000 or 70,000 people in Atlantic Canada who are totally dependent for a living on the fishing industry. Here you have another example of Government expenditures at the federal and provincial level.

• (1200)

Let us take agriculture as another example. Our agricultural industry is in competition with the agricultural production of

many countries. If we have been able to develop new products, it has been because Government expenditures for agricultural research have resulted in the development of new products, such as earlier maturing grains and so on. Is there a suggestion on the part of the Hon. Member for Capilano that we have been doing too much? I challenge Hon. Members who think that governments are spending too much money or are taking too much out of the Gross National Product—and many of them apparently believe that—to be honest and to indicate how governments can spend less.

I agree with those people who say that government at every level is not always as efficient as it could or should be. Also I agree with them that, with care and effort, inefficiencies can be eliminated or reduced. However, there is no evidence that savings made in those ways will have a very substantial effect upon the expenditures of governments. As the Hon. Member for Alberta East said a few moments ago, increased government expenditures are not just happening in Canada; they are happening in every country of the western world.

I would like to deal very briefly with another point mentioned by the Hon. Member for Capilano. I believe he said that he felt we had gone too far in government programs which were conceived and directed toward achieving a redistribution of wealth. The statistics do not bear out that argument at all. According to the ones prepared by Statistics Canada, the percentage of the GNP which goes to the bottom 20 per cent of Canadians—that is the 20 per cent of Canadians who have the lowest incomes—has been 4 per cent for 30 years or more. Sometimes it has been 3.9 per cent or 4.1 per cent, but it has been 4 per cent for at least 30 years. The percentage of the GNP which goes to the top 20 per cent—in other words, to the top fifth, high income earners—has been 40 per cent for the last 30 years. Sometimes it is 41 per cent or 39.5 per cent, but it has been around 40 per cent.

I hope the Hon. Member for Capilano will deal with the point I have made. How can he say that we have gone too far in our programs of redistribution when in fact increases in pension, medicare, hospital care and other good programs which have been implemented, programs supported by all Hon. Members of Parliament, have not changed income distribution in Canada?

In closing, let me indicate that I look forward to the future day when the Hon. Member for Capilano and others who believe, as he does, that governments are doing too much will tell us and the people of Canada just how they expect governments to do less, to spend less or to take a smaller percentage of the GNP than they have taken in recent years.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up the time of the House unduly, but I have been asked some very interesting questions which I think challenge the appeal I have made to all of us in the House to recognize that things are out of control. First, I say to the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) that in this fiscal year the country is facing a $31.3 billion deficit. We are spending $31.3 billion more than we are taking in in revenue. The tragedy is that 22 cents or 23 cents out of every dollar of tax by Canadians into the federal system goes into interest payments on the accumulated debt, which is now approximately $140 billion. I believe it was $134 billion and now it is around $140 billion. If we add the debt the Crown corporation sector is accumulating in borrowings from the private sector, which does not show as a national debt, I think it totals around $165 billion. The 22 cents out of the tax dollar is not on the Crown corporation debt; it is on the debt of the federal Government.

I acknowledge the correctness of what the Hon. Member for Winnipeg North said in that the transfer payments among governments have increased and escalated very severely and that they are delivering transfer payments, in terms of indexing costs, to cover programs such as medicare and all the others of which we are so proud. My point is that the nation will lose all those programs if we do not address some fundamentals.

In terms of addressing transfer payments which take up about two-thirds of our budget, I think we have to conduct a complete analysis of the competing services which the two levels of Government are delivering to the people. I was told by the late Auditor General, James Macdonell, that if we did an inventory of the competition between the federal and provincial Governments, probably in the first year we could address $5 billion of that transfer payment and, over the next three or four years, address another $5 billion. That study has not been done. It is a study that we should conduct because the survival of our system and quality of life depends on it.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make two short points. First, I suggest to the Hon. Member for Capilano that we have a very large deficit, not because we are inefficient but because we are in a recession. If instead of 11 per cent to 12 per cent unemployment we had unemployment of 5 per cent to 6 per cent, or if we had another 500,000 or 600,000 people working, they would be earning money and paying income taxes instead of drawing unemployment insurance and would be purchasing goods and services on which companies would be paying corporation taxes and sales taxes. Then our deficit would be much smaller than it is.

My second point is one I made before. I had the greatest respect for the former Auditor General, Mr. Macdonell; I sat on that committee for a while. I had great respect for his ability. Many of his suggestions and proposals to the committee and to Parliament were worth while. Some have been implemented, but he was not an expert on the services Canadians need; he was an expert accountant. He was not an expert on medicare, hospital care, unemployment insurance or welfare.

I am doubtful about this $5 billion figure which the Hon. Member for Capilano pulled out of the hat. If the polls are correct, and if in a year or two down the road we have a Conservative Government, he will have an opportunity to show us whether in fact his arguments are correct.

Let me close by saying that of course we are concerned about the deficit. The deficit would not be the problem it is if we were not in a recession and did not have 1.5 to 1.75 million

people unemployed, if these people were working rather than drawing unemployment insurance or welfare.

● (1210)

An item in today's newspaper reported the opening of a restaurant in either Calgary of Edmonton. The restaurant advertised that it would be hiring 30 to 40 people. Over 3,000 people have applied. That is proof of what some of us have been saying, that 99 per cent of the unemployed would be working if jobs were available to them.

Mr. Douglas Fisher (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I just want to follow up on the exchange that we have heard from the two extremes on the other side of the House. I listened to the comments of the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) and was struck by the fact that we always have this blinkered focus on money rather than its use. I would like to put some of his comments into prospective.

First, the deficit we are currently facing is indeed a problem for the federal Government. However, the alternative would be to put an enormous damper on our economy by shrinking that deficit. Second, the deficit represents an investment in the safety net and for the recovery projects that are helping Canadians during a slow economic period and coming out of that period. Third, he should take into account that there are some small or negligible over-all provincial deficits. Our transfers paid their bills. Therefore, we are assuming many of the provincial debts at the federal level. Finally, I would like to point out that this terrible interest burden that he sees is in fact money paid by Canadians to Canadians in the form of interest on that debt, such things as interest on Canada Savings Bonds.

Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, as the NDP Treasury Board critic, I want to put a few comments on the record concerning Bill C-96, an Act to make certain amendments, as the Minister said in his speech on November 19, to enable Treasury Board further to improve financial control and accountability in departments and governments by the Government of Canada. That is a very admirable task. However, I maintain that the improved financial control and accountability being put forward in these amendments, which I just received this morning and have not had an opportunity to consider in depth, is not good enough. I would like to talk about the principle of what is going on.

When looking at improved control and financial accountability, very often those who draft the amendments look only at the efficiency with which government operates. I do not think that is good enough. Many speakers this morning have mentioned J. J. Macdonell, the former Auditor General. I was associated with him through the Public Accounts Committee. I had many very interesting learning experiences through the contributions Mr. Macdonell made to the Public Accounts Committee and, as Auditor General, to the people of Canada.

Mr. Macdonell often stressed that there is a need to look at more than just the efficiency by which government operates. He referred to the three "E's". You have to look at economy, whether Government is getting the best bang for the buck. Quite often it does not do that. Second, you have to look at efficiency, of course, which the drafters of these amendments so often only look at. Third, you have to look at the effectiveness of what is actually happening to the people if this country through programs being delivered by the Government, Crown corporations and agencies.

The responsibility of the Government and Crown corporations is to deal in terms of our national priorities and responsibilities. If the Government has an over-all responsibility to the people of Canada, there should be some fairness to those at the top end of the economic ladder and those at the bottom. There should be some sense of fairness and equality in the distribution of wealth in this country. That does not now exist as the major responsibility for this Government, many provincial Governments, or possibly anyone who has the control of power in the federal Government today.

I can think of some real abuses of our system and the reason why there is such a need for financial control and accountability. Looking at the three "E's", economy, efficiency and effectiveness, I again go back to my experience in the Public Accounts Committee when I arrived here as a new Member of Parliament. The Committee was dealing with Atomic Energy of Canada and the heavy water plant that had been built at La Prade and never used. It was mothballed at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country.

It was also considering the heavy water plants at Glace Bay and Port Hawkesbury. AECL had come to the Public Accounts Committee and the Government of Canada asking for forgiveness of loans of, if memory serves me correctly, $186 million. The Government subsequently forgave these loans to AECL. Beyond that it provided AECL with future budgets to continue the production of heavy water. That was well because it provides jobs for people in Glace Bay and Port Hawkesbury. It is an industry that is complementary to the production of Candu reactors. When you look at that example closely, Mr. Speaker, you find there was not good regard for economy, effectiveness or efficiency. Although heavy water is still being produced at Glace Bay and Port Hawkesbury, we cannot sell any Candu reactors. If we do not sell reactors, we cannot sell the heavy water. Heavy water sales are contingent on the sale of Candu reactors except for a few minuscule gallons used for a topping off process.

Many countries which have purchased reactors from Canada have their own heavy water plants. When we sell a reactor to Romania or some other country, they want to create jobs there. Even if we were successful in selling more Candu reactors, we would still have a problem selling heavy water. Those countries interested in reactors to produce hydroelectric power are interested in having their own heavy water plants.

What is happening is that we are stockpiling heavy water. I again stress the importance of having these jobs for Canadians. However, if you took the budgets of this now useless industry in Canada year after year, plus the $186 million forgiven by the federal Government to AECL, you would find that you

could give to each of those employed in that industry $50,000, $100,000 or $200,000 and also retrain them or let them go into a business of their own in some other area.

● (1220)

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that there is not very much regard for the three E's—economy, efficiency and effectiveness. I do not say this in a partisan way, but so often the amendments made by the Government to the Financial Administration Act look only at the efficiency aspect. That is not good enough. We must look at the fairness that exists within the country. We must look at the national debt, and I personally think the national debt is a very serious problem in the country.

The national debt has been built up over a number of years. I do not know when the federal Government last had a balanced budget.

Mr. Lang: Early 1970s, just before OPEC came in.

Mr. Anguish: The Hon. Member across the floor says that it was in the early 1970s. That was almost a decade ago, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Fisher: Does that shock you? What do you want us to do, cut back? You and Capilano should get together.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

Mr. Anguish: Liberal Members are asking that we cut back. I think it is very unwise that the Hon. Member opposite with the laughing mouth would call for something like that. There is room for cutbacks within the federal Government and I have just referred to one such area as being Atomic Energy of Canada Limited. Had the Hon. Member been listening, he would know that in total there is in excess of over $1 billion wasted through that Crown corporation.

Mr. Fisher: That's your opinion.

Mr. Anguish: It is not my opinion, Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member has said, it is a fact, and if he paid attention to the public accounts of Canada, he would know that it is a fact. Anyone can look through the public accounts of Canada to substantiate what I have said here today.

Another example of what I have been speaking of is Eldorado Nuclear, a Crown corporation. That Crown corporation is one of those that wants no interference from the Government of Canada or from the Auditor General. One would think that Eldorado Nuclear belonged to the private sector. I maintain that as long as that company is a Crown corporation or a Government department or agency, it has a responsibility to the people of the country to keep in line with the national priorities and objectives of the Government. It must fit into some kind of strategy. The bottom line on the balance sheet cannot be its only motivating factor. If it were, it should go to the private sector.

Eldorado Nuclear does not belong to the private sector, Mr. Speaker, and I would not want to see it belong to the private sector because of the nature of the industry in which it is involved and the touchy situation that exists over exports of uranium. However, that is an entirely different topic and I will not go into it here today.

There could be another savings for the people of Canada through Eldorado Nuclear, Mr. Speaker. That Crown corporation once ran a uranium mine in the riding I represent at a place called Beaverlodge or, as it is better known to many people, Uranium City. In the year prior to the closing down of Uranium City and the mine at Beaverlodge, Eldorado Nuclear spent in excess of $100 billion. All of a sudden one morning, the people of Uranium City woke up and the news was that Uranium City and the Beaverlodge mine had closed down. When I was first elected to represent that area, that community consisted of over 3,000 people. It declined to a population today of about 250 people because of the "sound planning" of a Crown corporation.

I know that my time is running, short, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to say that in addition to Bill C-96, I would very much urge the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) to bring forward Crown corporation legislation which would make Crown corporations accountable to the people of Canada through Parliament, because today those Crown corporations are seemingly not responsible to anyone. When the Public Accounts Committee would like the Auditor General to do a comprehensive audit on, for instance, Eldorado Nuclear, officials of Eldorado Nuclear say: "No, we do not want to work with you". I maintain that Crown corporations have a responsibility to work with us because we do represent the people of the country. Crown corporations do have a responsibility in carrying out national priorities, objectives and strategies. I think Crown corporation legislation would go a long way toward making those agencies outside of Government departments more accountable to the people of Canada.

Before I was interrupted a few moments ago, I was about to say a few words about the national debt. I believe the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) was correct when he mentioned the figure of about $165 billion as being the amount owed by the Government of Canada. That in effect is our national debt and does take into consideration the money owed by some of the Crown corporations. The figure I have been using is not $165 billion but $166 billion, for which in some way the people of Canada are financially and ultimately responsible.

Mr. Gauthier: What about the other side of the ledger? What are the assets?

Mr. Anguish: The assets of the Government of Canada can never be determined. If the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) would pay attention to some of his own committee work, he would know that the Government cannot determine what Canada's assets are because it does not know. One of the reasons it does not know that, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government follows different accounting procedures from anyone else in the country. I have maintained in the House before, Mr. Speaker, that if any farmer, businessman or

individual kept their records and submitted their income tax returns on the basis of that kind of information, they would be sued for income tax evasion.

Mr. Huntington: They would be in jail.

Mr. Anguish: They would be in jail, Mr. Speaker, because no one else in the country can get away with the things with which the federal Government can get away. I think that that is shameful. Hon. Members across the way smile and laugh about the financial state of the country.

The late J. J. Macdonell had said on many occasions, as have others in the House, that we have lost control of the public purse. We have lost control of the public purse because we have perpetual deficit financing year after year. Among other things, the NDP has always been accused of being a Party of big spenders. However, I maintain as an individual that it would not matter who came into power. No one could do any worse than the current administration. It is trying to come to grips with the situation through some of the amendments we are dealing with today, and I admire that. However, we in the New Democratic Party believe that we can only use deficit financing when it is an investment in our future for which there will be a return either in terms of financial return or programs for the people of Canada. However, we cannot continually use deficit financing simply for the sake of deficit financing in an attempt to keep all of the voters happy and try to buy people throughout the country with their own money.

That method seems to be working, but it is getting to the point where I do not believe the Government of Canada can continue to use deficit financing to the extent it is today. I do not think we need to sacrifice many of the social programs and responsibilities which the Government has a mandate to carry out in order to achieve or at least begin to work toward balanced budgets within the country. The tax base is already there, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to point out that I was somewhat dismayed by the last budget that came down because of the share the large corporate sector paid in terms of the revenue that is derived by the Government of Canada. Back in the 1950s, the breakdown of the revenue that came to the federal Government was about 50 per cent from corporations and 50 per cent from individuals. That has decreased for the corporate sector over the years. The corporate sector now pays about 13 cents on every dollar, as opposed to 50 cents at one time, to the Government of Canada. There is some imbalance there which I believe needs to be corrected.

• (1230)

The Government of Canada will have to come to a day of reckoning with the people of Canada very soon. I do not think it will find it quite so humorous when the credit rating of this country dwindles in terms of our respect throughout the global community. The only reason we have been able to succeed and to deficit finance for so long, as far as I am personally concerned, is due to the vast resources that we have in this country. If we were like some countries in the world, the bankers would have stepped in and stopped us a long time ago. The only way there could have been success in this country without the rich resources which we have within our people and our natural resources is by revolution instead of democratically speaking out within the House of Commons and the institutions which this country has to protect democracy.

As I have said, I believe the Government must come to a day of reckoning. I think it would be much better for the Government, whether a Liberal Government or some other Government, to come to the sensible conclusion that it must do something with the financial administration of the country before the people of Canada decide for it through a general election.

I believe Canadians generally and the Government particularly, through this institution, would be much better off to entrench some power back in Parliament itself. Members of Parliament feel frustrated in the role they must play in dealing with the financial accountability of the Government of Canada. For instance, looking back on the Public Accounts Committee when it forgave the $186 million that the AECL owed the Government of Canada, I know that individual Members of Parliament or even all Members of Parliament in Opposition could not have done anything to stop that from happening if the Government wanted it to go through.

I think we must look at the role of Members of Parliament so that they can play a meaningful role on behalf of their constituents in examining the public purse, ensuring the maintenance of social programs and the over-all responsibility of providing a better distribution of wealth within the country. I hope that happens very soon.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Is the Hon. Minister rising to reply?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I am rising to speak.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): First, I will inquire if there are any questions or comments. There being none, we will proceed with debate. Before recognizing the Hon. Minister, it is my duty to inform the House at this time that if the Minister rises to speak, he will close debate on second reading, according to Standing Order 41(3).

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of very interesting comments made during this debate. It is tempting to respond to them at some length. Certainly there should be greater attention given, and perhaps this will be the case, to the very strong espousal by the spokesman for the NDP of an early move to balanced budgets. However, I hope that, perhaps on another occasion, we can explore this very interesting joining of forces with the Official Opposition.

Rather than doing so at this time, I would like to assist the House, since we are going into Committee of the Whole, by presenting to it some comments not only on the Bill itself but on the amendments which have been the subject of intensive discussion on the part of my Parliamentary Secretary and the

Opposition spokesmen. In this connection, I want to express my thanks for the courtesy and consideration given by official spokesmen for the Opposition Parties to the amendments which we have indicated we want to present.

I also want to express my thanks for the willingness of the Opposition Parties to facilitate the consideration and passage of this Bill today. Finally, I want to thank my distinguished Parliamentary Secretary, the Hon. Member for Kitchener (Mr. Lang), for his very effective work with the Opposition spokesmen which has led us to the point where we can confirm that we have had a motion indicating an agreement by all Parties to dispose of this Bill today.

As I said when I spoke to open second reading on November 19, 1982, as a result of comments and suggestions received by the Government, I would be proposing a number of changes at the committee stage. These changes would include the deletion of Sections 20.1, dealing with net voting; Section 101, dealing with interdepartmental charging; and Section 102, dealing with the charging and paying of interest. As well, there are a number of technical amendments to the wording.

As I have said, in order to facilitate study of this Bill during Committee of the Whole, I would like to take the opportunity during this stage of debate to summarize some of the provisions of the Bill since it has been a year since this debate opened and I presented its basic themes to the House. The principal objective of this Bill is to improve financial controls, accountability and disclosure to Parliament while at the same time streamlining and modernizing certain administrative procedures that have become outdated.

In particular, the Bill establishes in law the fact that only Parliament may forgive a debt recorded on the balance sheet of Canada. It provides a mechanism for the disclosure and approval of loan guarantees by Parliament. It improves accountability for and reporting on the use of appropriations by requiring disclosure in the public accounts of debts incurred but not paid year end. It strengthens controls over the respending of refunds of expenditures by restricting the types of receipts that qualify to be credited through an appropriation and subsequently respent. It provides improved authorities for the recovery of accountable advances and strengthens accountability and liability for losses of public money and public property.

The Bill also contains several changes to the borrowing sections of the Act which were recommended by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde). These changes are designed to enable the Minister of Finance and the Department of Finance to approve the administrative process associated with Government borrowing and to respond to changes in market conditions.

In addition, and of particular significance to myself as President of the Treasury Board, are the amendments to Part IV of the Act which formally recognize the role of the President of the Treasury Board with regard to the public accounts and in dealing constructively with any recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee for improving the accounting and reporting practices of the Government.

By way of illustration, I want to take a few moments to elaborate briefly on each of these objectives. Subsection 18(1) currently authorizes the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of Treasury Board, to make regulations authorizing deletion from the accounts of debts due to Her Majesty which do not exceed $5,000. Under the deletion of debt regulations, authority to delete debts from the accounts is delegated to the Minister of each department for debts that do not exceed $2,000, and to the Treasury Board on recommendation of the Minister concerned for debts between $2,000 and $5,000.

At present there is no provision for the deletion of debts over $5,000, nor is there uniform criteria for determining when a debt should be considered uncollectable and written off. In addition, action taken to collect debts varies from department to department and there are inconsistencies in the collection of various overpayments as a result of differing authorities in individual Acts.

The proposed changes to Section 18 will provide the Treasury Board with the authority to deal with debts over $5,000 and to prescribe the procedures to be followed and the criteria to be applied when writing off a debt. There will continue to be a requirement in law that debts written off during a fiscal year be reported in the public accounts for that year and, as specified in the proposed Section 18(2), parliamentary authority would be required to write off such debts as loans and investments that are recorded on the balance sheet of Canada.

Section 22 of the Act currently provides the authority to honour loan guarantees but does not provide a mechanism for parliamentary review and approval. We believe that Members of Parliament should have an opportunity to examine and approve each request for a loan guarantee. The proposed amendment to Section 22 will provide a simple mechanism for parliamentary review and approval, and should certainly deal with the concern of Hon. Members of Parliament with regard to the use of letters of comfort.

● (1240)

Several of the proposed amendments are directed at improving disclosure and accountability to Parliament for the use of appropriations. Changes to Section 30 will require that debts owing at the end of a fiscal year under a contractual arrangement, or for work performed, goods received or services rendered, be recorded in the accounts of Canada as a charge against the applicable appropriation, even though payment might not actually be made until the following year. This provision will ensure full disclosure on the public accounts of the complete use of parliamentary appropriations by requiring the recording at year end of both amounts actually paid and amounts owing.

As mentioned earlier, changes to Part IV of the Act, Sections 54, 55 and 56, will make the President of the Treasury Board responsible for tabling the public accounts and will involve the Comptroller General, through the President of the Treasury Board, in establishing in consultation with the Minister of Finance the form and content of the public accounts. These amendments will also provide the Receiver General—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. I regret to interrupt the Hon. Minister but it seems to the Chair that the Minister is anticipating the work which the Committee of the Whole should be doing possibly in a few minutes' time, or within the next hour or so. The purpose of recognizing the Minister at this stage was to give him the right to reply to comments which were made in the course of debate. The Chair has serious reservations about the propriety of the Minister's remarks in the sense that he is anticipating the amendments which would be presented at the committee stage.

In any case, the Chair will hear the Minister out. However, I would advise him to stick to the spirit of his right to reply.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your comments. What I am attempting to do is to reply to comments made by various speakers about the amendments and their desire to learn more about them. I want to say that it is not my intention to open committee stage with another speech. I hope I can have the indulgence of the House in concluding my remarks, which I have almost completed. It is my intention, in speaking at this time, to respond to what I understood to be a basic concern of Hon. Members, and that is that they would want to be aware of what shape the Bill will be in at the time it proceeds to Committee of the Whole.

If I can have the indulgence of the House I will complete my remarks in just a minute or so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Chair appreciates the Minister's attempt to be useful to the House. However, the Chair must be concerned with procedure, and the proper procedure. The Minister would have, in the normal course of events in Committee of the Whole, an opportunity to make those very statements, presumably in a few minutes' time. The spirit of the Standing Orders, in granting the Minister the right to reply, is not to go into detail, as he is now doing with his anticipated amendments. He should reserve those comments, in my opinion, for the Committee of the Whole stage. However, with the indulgence of the House, I suppose anything is possible around here.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With respect to the point raised by the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps normally all Hon. Members would welcome and understand your intervention. I believe there are some extraordinary parameters to the process and procedure at this stage, inasmuch as the very detailed and technical amendments were not available to us for study prior to today. I believe the House might perhaps be inclined to allow the Minister to complete his remarks, having noted the concern of the Chair with respect to the proper procedure at this stage of the discussion.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I want to extend our courtesy to the Minister, if he feels it is necessary to continue, in wrapping up second reading debate. However, he is going to have to explain each clause, and the amendments thereto, as we get into Committee of the Whole, and much of what he is saying right now is going to have to be repeated.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): That was precisely the concern raised by the Chair. However, there seems to be agreement. Let me state very plainly that this in no sense should be taken as a precedent, because the Standing Order is very clear as to the scope of the remarks of the Minister at this stage. I recognize the President of the Privy Council by agreement.

Mr. Gray: Unless, Mr. Speaker, there has been some change at Government House today, of which I am not aware, I have not yet become President of the Privy Council, but I assume you are recognizing me.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I apologise. The Hon. President of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Gray: To advance debate, not being able to anticipate to what extent explanations will be required with respect to each clause, I will simply say that the principal objective of the Bill is to provide better control over revenues and expenditures, and greater efficiency in the methods by which we achieve that control. I hope I would have the consent of the House to refer this Bill to Committee of the Whole for clause by clause study.

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Corbin in the chair.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order. House in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Financial Administration Act.

Shall Clause 1 carry?

On Clause 1—

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, could the President of the Treasury Board give us a brief explanation? We were involved in adjusting to the new Auditor General Act and I believe Hon. Members in the House would appreciate some comment.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I wad distracted by the work of the staff to instal the table at which officials will sit. I apologise to the Hon. Member and would ask him to restate his question.

Mr. Huntington: I am asking for the usual explanation from the President of the Treasury Board on Clause 1. I believe it has some importance. It indicates that Part VII was removed when the new Auditor General Act was proclaimed. I believe it would be good for the record of the committee if we had the explanation from the President of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the amendment to Clause 1 is to change the long title of the Financial Administration Act. The purpose is to make the long title better reflect the several purposes of the Act. That is basically the reason for this particular amendment.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we are really concerned with restating that Treasury Board is very

much concerned with the establishment and maintenance of the accounts of Canada and the financial control of Crown corporations. Is that what this does?

Mr. Gray: This would be the effect of it, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman.

Clause 1 agreed to.

On Clause 2—"*Auditor General of Canada*"

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I understand that Clause 2 is subject to an amendment, and I would ask the President of the Treasury Board to tell us why Bill C-96 is worded as it is in Clause 2. Would he be good enough to explain why it is being amended? Is he going to move the amendment, because I cannot agree that Clause 2 as it is presently worded should carry.

● (1250)

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, our deliberations in the Committee of the Whole will prove that, compared to the information I am now going to provide, I was certainly not providing detailed technical explanations of the Bill when I spoke on second reading. They were very general comments compared to the comments I am going to provide in answer to my hon. friend.

First of all, the proposed amendment in the form originally tabled is for the following purpose. Chapter 34 of the Statutes of Canada, 1976-77, the Auditor General Act, provides for the revocation of Part VII of the Financial Administration Act dealing with the Auditor General of Canada, and thus it becomes necessary to define "Auditor General" as referred to in other parts of the Financial Administration Act. The definition included in Clause 2 is to indicate that "Auditor General" means the Auditor General of Canada.

There is a proposed amendment to Clause 2(2), the purpose of which is to change the definition of money paid to Canada for a special purpose. The following wording is substituted:

"money received by Canada for a special purpose" includes all money that is paid to, received or collected by a public officer under or pursuant to a statute, trust, treaty, undertaking or contract, and is to be disbursed for a purpose specified in or pursuant to such statute, trust, treaty, undertaking or contract;

I want to propose an amendment as follows:

That subclause 2(2) of the English version of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out line 26 on page 1 and substituting the following:

"to, or received or collected by a public"

I do not know if you want me to cease speaking now, Mr. Chairman, while you put the amendment, or whether you will permit me to go on and state the object of the amendment. I want to be very scrupulous with respect to procedure. Perhaps I can say that the object of the amendment is to extend the definition of money paid to Canada for a special purpose to include money received or collected by a public officer. The object is to have a technical improvement in wording.

There are other amendments to the Act.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order. The Chair would like first of all to dispose of the first amendment proposed by the Minister.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister give a few examples of how the addition of the word "or" extends the definition?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the purpose of the amendment is to indicate that moneys may be received by or paid to a public officer even though he does not formally collect it. For example, a prisoner entering an institution has to place any funds with which he enters the institution into the hands of a public officer who holds it for him during the period of his incarceration. This is an example of the kind of situation this change in wording is intended to address.

Mr. Huntington: I do not want to belabour this, Mr. Chairman. There has to be a reason for it. Clause 2(2) reads:

"money received by Canada for a special purpose" includes all money that is paid to, received or collected by a public officer under or pursuant to a statute—

The amendment adds the word "or" Does that mean moneys received by prison officials from people who are incarcerated can be put into a special account so that it can be paid without interfering with the accounts of Canada? Is that all the word "or" does?

Mr. Gray: As I understand it, funds received by public officers in those circumstances are held in trust by the public officers until the term of imprisonment is over. To repeat what I said before, the amendment is designed to recognize the fact that moneys come into the hands of public officers which are not formally paid to them. They take possession of the money in ways which do not indicate or suggest formal payment. With respect to prisoners, the moneys they bring into prison are shown as liabilities on Canada's balance sheet.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I have to ask again how does the amendment make such a significant difference? The original wording said "paid to, received or collected". My problem is with the language.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, the distinguished Opposition spokesman and I share a similar difficulty. I am told the word "or" was added on the advice of legal draftsmen. Advisers to the Department of Justice said it was necessary in order to cover the kinds of situations I outlined. Perhaps had he and I been dealing with this on our own we would not have done this, but we are acting on the advice of counsel in the Department of Justice with respect to the drafting of this Bill.

Mr. Huntington: I am still having difficulty, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to hold the Bill up, but it is just that I am really trying to understand the significance of the change. I do not trust draftsmen of legislation because they can mangle the language I was educated in quicker than anyone else. I get very worried when I see an amendment adding the word "or". I have read this five or six or seven times and tried to understand the significance. Does it make the accounting

easier? Does it make it easier to return the goods received from, say, a prisoner by a public officer? Does it avoid an intensive amount of detail in the accounts of Canada? Why has it been amended?

Mr. Gray: As I understand it, this amendment is not being made for accounting reasons but for legal reasons. That is to say, and I am venturing my own view on the matter, technically it could be argued that if this word "or" was not placed in the Act, moneys which public officers took control of in circumstances of the kind I outlined, that is to say a prisoner coming into a penal institution and having funds in their possession taken over by public officers, whould not be handled in the same way as moneys paid voluntarily to a public officer. This may be a rather fine point but this is my understanding of the distinction which was not covered in the Act as originally presented and which we are now advised should be dealt with by the addition of the word "or". We are dealing with two sets of circumstances which are definitely different although it may not appear to be that different on the surface.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order. It being one o'clock p.m. it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to consider the Bill later this day.

Progress reported.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*Translation*]

POLITICAL PARTIES

INVITATION TO CONTRIBUTE TO PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY'S FINANCING CAMPAIGN—REGRETS OF MR. GOURD IN DECLINING TO PARTICIPATE

Mr. Robert Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau): Mr. Speaker, I am rising in the House today to repeat, in the same terms, what the Member for Bow River (Mr. Taylor) said upon receiving a letter from Senator Davey inviting him to attend a dinner on December 13 in honour of our Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). Now imagine, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party is in need of funds, and I have the privilege of being asked to take part in its fund-raising campaign.

I am enraged, furious, indignant, fuming, incensed, boiling, maddened, irritated, galled, defiled, annoyed, smeared, chafed, rasped, triturated, abrased, furcated, defiled, stained, soiled, blemished, stunned, bewildered, puzzled, befuddled, confounded, mystified, perplexed, baffled, baited, devilled, lured, decoyed, vulgarized, debased, and insulted.

Mr. Speaker, this letter made me disconsolate, inconsolable, unconsolable, comfortless, forlorn, heartsick, soul sick, heartsore, heartbroken and dejected, and I coughed and wheezed, and so forth. Mr. Speaker, as a Liberal in more ways than one, I make donations to charitable organizations, but the Progressive Conservative Party will not get a cent from me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

[*English*]

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE

CALL FOR EXTENSION OF CANADIAN JURISDICTION TO CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, the then Minister of State for Finance, on the 29th of June, 1983, tabled a notice of a Ways and Means Motion to apply the customs and excise jurisdiction of Canada to the Continental Shelf of Canada. He went on to indicate that amendments to legislation affected would be introduced accordingly. This and many other similar motions are even yet left on the table.

Shipbuilding and repair represents a major industry in both the national and the provincial contexts. The federal Government's initiative, after much encouragement by the shipbuilding and repair industry, is consistent with its policy of extending Canada's offshore jurisdiction beyond the current 12 mile territorial limit. The increase in resource exploration and the development on Canada's Continental Shelf beyond that 12 mile limit, a more uniform application of existing rates of duty on shops under the Customs Tariff, and the necessity to introduce a greater degree of equity and fairness into the shipbuilding industry, make the introduction of these amendments an early necessity. As this industry has been held in check by so many other measures, will the Minister of Finance respond in this instance by introducing the necessary legislation before the end of this session?

* * *

[*Translation*]

EDUCATION

CONSEQUENCES OF PROVINCE OF QUEBEC'S INTENTION TO PUBLISH HISTORY BOOK ELIMINATING WORD "CANADA"

Mr. Raymond Savard (Verdun-Saint Paul): Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the distinguished French newspaper *Le Monde* published an article which said that the Quebec Department of Education was planning to publish a textbook on the history of

Quebec from which the word Canada would practically be eliminated. After failing to convince Quebecers in the May 1980 referendum that its option was the right one, and after giving up on Quebec's senior citizens who, according to Mr. Lévesque, are an obstacle to Quebec's independence, the Quebec Government now wants to take advantage of the minds of young Quebecers in their formative years. This promises to be the most systematic destruction of Canadian history this country has ever known within its own borders. The Quebec Department of Education is becoming an instrument of political propaganda through which intolerance, ignorance and obscurantism will be fed to young Quebecers during their history classes. The history of Canada is an affirmation of the harmonious co-existence of two founding peoples and affords living proof that cultural minorities can develop free of any restraint on Canadian soil. In a world where interdependence is increasing every day, understanding and respect for the past is a sign of a country's high degree of civilization. Mr. Speaker, the PQ Government is about to plunge Quebec youth into the abyss of ignorance.

* * *

[*English*]

POLITICAL PARTIES

WORK OF LIBERAL PARTY REFORM COMMITTEE

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our Party I want to indicate grave concern that the Reform Committee of the Liberal Party has once again delayed its report. A party described by its hard working, party splitting, leadership hunting President as "still in the Mackenzie King era", must move more quickly. The report describes the Liberal Party as "tired, arrogant, self serving, self satisfied, and irrelevant in some parts of the country." Mr. Speaker, that is not new. Canadians have known that for years. What is new is the revelation that there are some parts of the country where they are not that way. There could be as many as six ridings.

Fortunately there is a saviour on the horizon. It is not the Minister of Energy (Mr. Chrétien), who is behind one of the curtains looking for delegates. It is not the white knight from Bay Street who quit in 1975. It is not the hapless ex-Minister of Finance whose 1981 budget destroyed the Canadian economy. No, it is the Liberal party President, the shy and retiring Iona, who says:

> I've done a great deal of work on my economics knowledge. I can hold my own with all of them.

Who could not hold their own with all of them, in a Party that created 12 per cent unemployment, 13 per cent inflation, and 22 per cent interest rates?

In closing, we want to urge the Reform Committee to move quickly so they can continue the dissension in the Liberal Party.

S.O. 21

MEDICAL CARE

CONTRACT TO PROVIDE INFORMATION SERVICE FOR PROPOSED CANADA HEALTH ACT

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): In the Ottawa *Citizen* this morning it is reported that a Supply and Services bulletin on recent contracts carries a $100,000 item for a company called Nunavut Communications Inc., a contract to provide advisory information and creative services related to the development of a communications plan covering the Canada Health Act.

I want to tell the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) that if she really wants to get a Canada Health Act through this House, what she should really do is bring a Bill before this House which will strengthen and enforce the five basic principles of medicare, that will address the problems of extra billing and user fees. She should not, before we even see a Bill in this House, be contracting out presumably for the kind of advertising campaign we were treated to during the constitutional debate. Are we going to see Canada geese flying to Liberal tunes once again, or are we going to see a decent piece of legislation that Members of Parliament will feel good enough about to sell in this country? That is what the Minister of National Health and Welfare should be doing, not spending money on Liberal patronage to a company owned by someone who used to be in the Prime Minister's Office. She should be bringing forth a decent Bill.

* * *

AIRPORTS

CHATHAM CITY AIRPORT, ONT.

Mr. Maurice Bossy (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw to the attention of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) once again the urgent need for a solution to a dangerous situation that exists at the City of Chatham Airport, located within my constituency of Kent.

Three years ago Chatham City Council attempted to purchase or expropriate land adjoining the airport to allow for an extension of the runway. A dispute regarding the legality of zoning bylaws erupted with one land owner who, unable to reach a satisfactory agreement with City Council, constructed a grain silo and hog barn on his property, but directly within the flight path of any approaching or departing aircraft. These obstructions have limited the use of the airport to small aircraft, effectively cancelling the only air passenger service there operated by Pem-Air. The presence of these buildings has therefore created a very serious safety problem.

● (1410)

Though the Department of Transport has been involved from the beginning of the situation, it remains far from being rectified. I urge the Minister to speed up the process of reaching a conclusion to this matter, and to consider seriously introducing pertinent zoning legislation. The provincial Gov-

ernment of Ontario has placed a direct responsibility on the federal Government for this action. We should not wait until a tragic accident occurs before taking action to prevent situations similar to the one at Chatham airport from occurring across the country.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

FUNDING OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW PROGRAM

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by an article which appeared in *The Citizen* concerning the environmental assessment and review process. I was astonished to find out that, as a result of eight internal evaluations of Government Ministries, the Government's plan has been starved for funds and knowingly deprived of effective leadership—in sum, dealt a body blow to its effectiveness.

The plan is supposed to ensure that every federal activity, from $25,000 annual maintenance operations to multi-billion dollar megaprojects, is checked for potential ecological harm. Under two cabinet directives this was to be carried out. We have just discovered that this is not the case. How can the Government, and especially the Ministry of the Environment, go about touting ecological concerns when the Government does not even enforce its own program assessments?

* * *

NATIONAL REVENUE

DEPARTMENT'S TREATMENT OF FARMERS

Mr. Gerry St. Germain (Mission-Port Moody): Mr. Speaker, with my experience in agriculture I know the danger of loose hobby farm laws, but surely there is a greater danger in going to the other extreme and beating into the dirt the poorest farmers who are struggling to survive.

Farmers across Canada, especially those who are trying to save their farms by working at other jobs, and those who are trying to build farms by the same method, are being subjected to continued harassment through vicious interpretations of outdated Section 31 of the Income Tax Act by Revenue Canada. I have seen blueberry farmers, livestock producers, cattle ranchers, and every type of farmer across Canada being subjected to persecution.

Many of those who are being audited and having their taxes increased are farmers pure and simple; their entire life is farming. Valiantly they take other employment to get through a hard time, getting up at three o'clock or four o'clock in the morning to do their farm work, and then going to outside jobs, only to return to finish their farming duties. Is it fair that people who cannot afford to fight back be overtaxed to pay the country's deficit brought about through the incompetence of the Government opposite?

The over zealous interpretation of Section 31 virtually destroys the opportunity of many Canadians to start farms. Farming is a tough, unforgiving business. The country needs farmers and the food they produce. The position of Revenue Canada in this matter ignores not only equity but contravenes the rights of all Canadians.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

MINES AND MINING

LAY-OFFS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA COAL MINES

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1981, Senator Bud Olson, Minister of State for Economic Development, confirmed the federal Government's commitment to participate in the development of the Northeast British Columbia coal block. The federal and provincial Government of British Columbia have poured billions of dollars into this new venture in northeastern British Columbia, which is supplying export coal to the same markets that are presently supplied by the coal mines in southeastern British Columbia. At present, 300 workers have been laid off at Westar Mines in Sparwood, British Columbia, and 1,100 workers have just received notice from Fording Coal of a three-week lay-off prior to Christmas, and a further one-month lay-off in July.

The federal Government has a responsibility to investigate immediately the program which was outlined by the New Democratic Party in September, when we requested that western coal producing Provinces be given the opportunity to supply central Canada's coal requirements. It is imperative that the Canadian Government take immediate steps to meet with producers and consumers to work out an agreement which would ensure not only employment for thousands of workers but also make a major contribution in cleaning up our environment. Western Canadian coal has a sulphur content well below that of American coal which is being used at the present time in central Canada.

If immediate steps are not taken to secure these Canadian markets as they become available, coal mines in southeastern British Columbia will have no one to blame but the federal Government for causing their economic disaster. The Government has promoted—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

THE ECONOMY

REQUEST FOR EARLY INTRODUCTION OF BUDGET

Mr. Tom McMillan (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Statistics Canada has just released its latest index of leading economic indicators. That index supports the growing concern of reputable economists across the country that the current economic recovery is stalling and that it will almost certainly falter in the new year. I would like to ask the Minister this question. Given that employment dropped by 25,000 in October, that the housing construction sector remains appallingly weak, and that retail sales have been falling in real terms since June, is the Government considering very seriously indeed the desirability of an early budget to deal with these growing signs of weakness in the economic recovery?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, I am considering bringing down a budget some time between February and June of 1984. I have not as yet decided on a particular time to do so. I am watching the evolution of the economic recovery and will advise in due time as to the advisability of an early budget or a later budget.

So that my hon. friend will not be unduly concerned, I would like to draw his attention to another statement made by Statistics Canada which came out, not yesterday but this morning. That statement does not refer to the leading economic indicators in August but to industrial production in September. It indicated that seasonally adjusted industrial production increased by a very strong 1.8 per cent in September following an upward revised figure of a 1.1 per cent increase in industrial production in August. While Statistics Canada had come up with only a 0.4 per cent increase in August, it revised its figures and arrived at a 1.1 per cent increase, almost a 300 per cent increase in the figure first issued by Statistics Canada.

I might also point out to the Hon. Member a review of the ten major forecasters which was published very recently in the latest issue of *The Financial Post*. That review indicates that growth for 1983 was 3 per cent, and growth for 1984 is forecast to be 4.5 per cent by ten major forecasters.

CANADIAN UNEMPLOYMENT COMPARED WITH UNITED STATES FIGURES

Mr. Tom McMillan (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is also directed to the Minister of Finance. He can derive whatever satisfaction he wishes out of the statistics to which he has referred. But is he also aware of the fact that there are one-quarter of a million fewer Canadians working today than when the recession began? Is he aware of the fact that, by contrast, there are a million more Americans working today than when the United States entered its recession? Do not these facts, rather than his own, clearly indicate to the Government that our economic recovery has a long way to go to match the Minister's expectations and the performance of the American economy? I would therefore ask the Minister again if these facts do not demonstrate the need for an early budget to deal with the faltering economy and, in particular, with the weakness in the economic recovery.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend could also refer to the fact that Canada created 350,000 jobs in the last year, a proportionately larger number than any other industrial country. I might also refer my hon. friend to the most recent issue of the British publication, *Euromoney*, which has studied 93 countries around the world. *Euromoney* indicates that the country with the largest economic turnaround of any single country of those 93 is Canada.

REQUEST FOR NEW JOB-CREATION MEASURES

Mr. Tom McMillan (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, the Minister can lull himself into a false sense of satisfaction by reading statistics that may have been prepared by *Euromoney*. The fact is that the Bank of Commerce, the Royal Bank, and Dominion Securities, to name just three institutions, are all quoted in today's press as saying that the economy is drifting, without enough strength to sustain the current recovery into 1984. Since virtually all the economic indicators prove them right, does the Minister not agree with those economists right here in Canada, not those from outside the country, that the economy is "at a major decision point for policy makers"?

• (1420)

In light of that, will he assure the House that the Throne Speech coming up in a week or two will contain real job-creation measures and not band-aid approaches, so that the million or so unemployed can get off welfare, unemployment insurance, and Government make-work programs, and find real jobs in the private sector?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we do not have to wait for the next Throne Speech. I may remind the hon. gentleman that in the last budget brought down in April of this year, the main focus was on job creation in the private sector, and that the majority of the jobs created this year as a result of the Government's economic and fiscal policies were created in the private sector. I am referring to permanent, steady jobs and not just temporary employment. In addition, the private sector has been instrumental in helping to make the direct job creation programs for which my colleague, the Minister of Employment and Immigration, is responsible, increasingly successful.

We therefore have a situation in which the private sector has been able to create a large number of jobs this year and will continue to do so next year.

As far as the Throne Speech is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will have to be patient, and I hope we shall be

able to start the debate on the Throne Speech a few weeks from now.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES—REQUEST FOR GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. The Minister will know that the major part of the growth in this country this year took place in the first two quarters. Since then, the economy has been stalled. His budget was on April 19 and it accomplished nothing to make this country grow, improve its economy, or to get us out of a recession.

The fact is that the recovery is stalled. What new initiative does the Minister have in mind that would turn the country around and get it growing again? Or is the fact of the matter as set out by Alfred Apps, reported in *Maclean's* this week, that the Government's advisers say that no amount of new government initiative will do anything. If that is the case, when will he suggest to the Prime Minister that he call an election?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I think the person who is probably the most stalled in this House is the Hon. Member. He is reported as having said that it would take 15 years for the Conservatives to bring some recovery to the economy. We will do that in less time and a lot faster than he would. I suspect he was referring to the time it would take them to get back into office.

If the Hon. Member wants to talk about figures, again I would like to refer him to Statistics Canada figures, not for the first two quarters but for September. The figures for the month of September, which is the third quarter of this year, indicate that industrial production went up by 1.8 per cent. That is in a single month, September. The month of August has also been revised upwards by Statistics Canada, to 1.1 per cent from 0.4 per cent. Therefore, the economic recovery, far from faltering, is proceeding very well indeed. All the forecasters foresee that for this year Canada will have a rate of growth that compares very favourably with the rate of growth in the United States, which is the fastest growing economy in the world, along with Canada.

INTEREST RATE LEVELS

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about some statistics of today. Interest rates today have gone up for the fourth straight week in a row. Let us talk about the cost of money. Every forecaster and economist is saying that we have to get interest rates down. What is happening is that interest rates continue to rise as Governments borrow 75 per cent of the money available in the marketplace. What action does the Government intend to take to get interest rates down and start the economy growing?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I remind my hon. friend that the prime rate in Canada is at the same level as that in the United States at the present time. The rates for bonds, after 15 years, are lower than they are in the United States. Consumer loans can be obtained presently at a rate equivalent to the rates that were prevalent over the last 25 years. Mortgage rates for consumers, at 10.25 per cent, are as low as they have been for several years. Therefore I would like my hon. friend to look at the facts on the interest rate side and realize that Canadian monetary policy has been the right one.

We have depressed interest rates as much as we could, and in effect the average Canadian is now getting rates, whether on the mortgage side or on the consumer loans side, which compare with rates which have not been in existence for years and years.

* * *

FINANCE

REPORTED CONSIDERATION OF EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP SCHEME

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Well placed government sources today, as indicated in *The Globe and Mail*, are reporting that the Minister of Finance and his Department are preparing a scheme which would see new tax breaks for corporations in an effort to encourage them to implement employee stock ownership programs. Are the Minister and his Department considering such a scheme? Will he confirm that this scheme is being developed now?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker. There will be, I am sure, a number of speculative stories written about the contents of an eventual budget. I can tell my hon. friend that I have not even decided on the broad framework of the next budget, let alone decided on particular proposals. I remind the Hon. Member, however, that in my Department, and in many other Departments of Government, as the budget is being considered several months down the line, every year those Departments are called upon to carry out a review of their plans, and a lot of studies on many subjects are carried out. I would suggest to my hon. friend that there will be 30 or 40 different questions which will be examined. I might retain one, two, or three suggestions in the end, when the budget time comes. My hon. friend, again, will have to wait until the budget is released to know exactly which suggestions I have kept.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, I have a follow-up question to the Minister of Finance. I believe he has admitted he is considering this proposal, and while we in the New Democratic Party are in full agreement with a policy which would see meaningful worker participation in management decision-making, and worker ownership, we certainly are very hesitant about the scheme which has been presented, which really does not appear to be much more than a back door for wage controls and a threat to free collective bargaining. Will the Minister indicate, if he is not considering

this scheme, if he is saying this will not be something which he introduces in the budget in the springtime?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying any such thing. What I am saying is that I will not comment on press speculation about any particular items in the budget. This is not the last opportunity which my hon. friend will have to ask me to comment on speculative stories. There will be a number of them.

As to what will or will not be in the budget, my friend will have to wait. If he checks the speeches I have made over the last several months, he will see I have indicated how important it is to improve labour-management relations in this country, and that the burden in that regard is not only on labour but that management has a big role to play in this regard also. Labour, management, and government should be ready to look at new initiatives and examine ways, many ways, whereby the general state of labour-management relations could be improved.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Kamloops-Shuswap on a supplementary question. The Hon. Member could avoid long preambles.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will avoid a long preamble by asking the Minister of Finance a simple question.

PARTICIPATION OF WORKERS IN MANAGEMENT

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): In the Minister's consideration of ways and means of improving the labour-management atmosphere, would he agree that simply providing an opportunity for employees to hold a handful of shares in a company would really do very little in terms of any real participation of workers in their work place?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I have invited business and labour to examine ways of improving labour relations in this country. I made it clear that both employers and employees had a responsibility in this respect. I am personally looking at a number of ways in which we could facilitate and improve labour relations in this country, and I shall probably have a chance to discuss this matter with my provincial counterparts as well. As far as the Hon. Member's specific comment is concerned, I shall take it as a comment based on a proposal that is still hypothetical.

* * *

● (1430)

[*English*]

SHIPBUILDING

REPORTED SHORTAGE OF MARINE ENGINEERING TECHNICIANS

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister responsible for employment and immigration I will address my question to his seatmate, the Minister of Defence. The Minister must be aware that in the Department of Employment and Immigration there is a program called the Critical Skills Training Program, the purpose of which is to identify those sectors in industry which are going to require specially trained personnel in the future, such as the shipbuilding program which now finds itself short of 250 marine engineering technicians. Did the Minister's Department inform the Department of Employment and Immigration that it would require at least 250 marine engineering technicians? After all, the program has been in the works for at least three years.

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, that question was raised this morning in the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. Commodore Healey, the project manager, said the story was inaccurate. There is no shortage of 250 marine engineers. Active recruitment is going ahead. Saint John is meeting with some difficulties, and hopefully they will be short term. He also indicated it is hoped that all of the marine engineers required for the Canadian patrol frigate program will be found in Canada, except for certain specialized marine engineers.

Mr. Corbett: Mr. Speaker, that is a preposterous response but not surprising coming from this Government, particularly this Minister. The fact is there is a shortage and it was obviously not identified by the Department of National Defence which had responsibility for ensuring those people were available.

POSSIBLE DELAY IN CONSTRUCTION OF PATROL FRIGATES

Mr. Bob Corbett (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister how long it is anticipated that this project will be held up. The workers concerned are going to go without jobs because of the incompetence of the Government which will find foreign workers to come in and take those jobs which should be designated for Canadians.

Hon. J.-J. Blais (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I would rather the hon. gentleman had been at the committee this morning to address that specific question. We dealt with that question, and assurances were forthcoming to the effect that the marine engineers would be found in Canada. If the hon. gentleman wants to discuss the matter with either the project manager, or Saint John shipbuilding in his own area, he would see that, while there are some temporary difficulties, the problem will be resolved.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that when we selected this process for building six new frigates by identifying a Canadian contractor, we knew there would have to be special efforts in order to build a Canadian team. We accepted that risk and are meeting the expectations. We will have to work a bit more assiduously, and I hope the hon. gentleman will give us his co-operation just as the hon. gentleman from Esquimalt-Saanich offered to do this morning, in order to resolve the issue.

Oral Questions

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

THE CASE OF DONALD MARSHALL—RESPONSIBILITY FOR HELP IN MEETING LEGAL EXPENSES

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice who has taken a position on behalf of the Government which I can only describe as heartless and mean-spirited with respect to the plight of Donald Marshall, the Mic-Mac Indian from Nova Scotia.

The Minister will know that the Government of Canada, on behalf of all Canadians, signed an international covenant on civil and political rights which provides, among other things, that:

> When a person has by a final decision been convicted of a criminal offence and when subsequently his conviction has been reversed or he has been pardoned on the ground that a new or newly discovered fact shows conclusively that there has been a miscarriage of justice, the person who has suffered punishment . . . shall be compensated—

There is a federal responsibility in this matter and the Minister cannot weasel out by attempting to place it on the shoulders of provincial jurisdiction, since he funds provincial legal aid. How can he now deny assistance to Donald Marshall?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is surely aware that international agreements, whatever their validity or application, do not change the constitutional and legal situation in our country. We have many examples where the Provinces have given us authority to agree to certain things internationally and the federal Government takes its international obligations, yet within Canada the obligation rests on the Provinces. I take that to be almost too obvious to state, but in this situation it is worth stating.

The Government of Ontario seems to be assuming its responsibilities in similar matters. It is prosecuting studies in this area with great assiduity and I see no reason why other Provinces cannot also assume their responsibilities.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, the question I asked deals with a sense of compassion. The Minister demonstrates that neither he nor his Government has one iota of compassion with respect to a very tragic situation where a man spent 11 years incarcerated, under a federal law, with respect to an alleged murder. In view of the fact that the Minister indicated his sympathy, which does not cost him or the Government anything, what steps has he taken to manifest that sympathy? Has he at least called the Attorney General of Nova Scotia and used his good offices to make sure there is compensation? Has he offered any amount of money at all in conjunction with the Province of Nova Scotia?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, indeed I have spoken to the new Attorney General of Nova Scotia on this matter. I tried to use, as the hon. gentleman puts it, my good offices to have the Province assume its responsibilities. The hon. gentleman says this is a federal law, and so it is, as is everything in the criminal law. But as it happens it is enforced by provincial or municipal police, in this case the police of the City of Sydney, Nova Scotia. They fall under the jurisdiction of the Province, and the case was prosecuted by a provincial prosecutor. That should make it clear enough there was no aspect of federal involvement whatsoever in the unfolding of this case.

* * *

ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROL BOARD

GUIDELINES GOVERNING EXPOSURE OF WOMEN TO IONIZED RADIATION

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy who will know that the Atomic Energy Control Board is in the process of issuing new guidelines for worker exposure to ionized radiation. Perhaps the most important change is a drastic increase for women workers, from the present level of one REM, to five REM, to current level for men. Would the Minister not agree this form of sexual equality only increases the risk of cancer for women, and deformities in their unborn children?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this problem. I will look into it and report to the Hon. Member.

REQUEST THAT BOARD HOLD PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, at the same time will the Minister look into the fact that the AECB will not hold open hearings to discuss these new levels of exposure but is, instead, holding hearings behind closed doors? Will he not agree that, in an age where we have public hearings on rail line abandonment, and on radio and television licences, new levels of exposure for workers can only be decided after open public hearings?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think the Board is operating under the laws of this Parliament. I will check if there is provision for public hearings, but I know it is operating within the laws and the mandate given it by the House of Commons.

* * *

NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS

MUTUAL BALANCED FORCE REDUCTION TALKS

Mr. Paul E. McRae (Thunder Bay-Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. Among the many people whom the Prime Minister consulted with in depth before embarking on his peace mission was U.S. General Bernard Rogers, Supreme Commander of NATO. Apparently General Rogers supports the Prime Minister in his efforts. I

quote, "He and I agree on the objectives of arms reduction for all forces."

• (1440)

Has the Acting Prime Minister's Department given special study to the Mutual Balanced Force Reduction talks and how those talks can be beefed up? This is one of the areas apparently that General Rogers noted strongly, and the Prime Minister, in one of his four points. Would the Minister give some indication whether the Department has studied this and whether or not new suggestions for these kinds of talks will be forthcoming?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that the MBFR talks be given renewed impetus has become a part of the Prime Minister's peace initiative. General Rogers has frequently made the point that the imbalance which presently exists in conventional arms in Europe has effectively lowered the nuclear threshold. Presumably one deals with this in two ways. One way would be to increase the level of conventional forces on the side of the NATO allies. That would be the last resort. An effort at the MBFR to attempt a mutual reduction of conventional forces would be much better. The Prime Minister has already conveyed to other NATO leaders his hope that an effort would be undertaken in 1984 to give additional impetus to the MBFR talks. These talks have been going on for ten years. There is a little movement recently, but much more movement should be possible. The Prime Minister is attempting to bring that about.

* * *

FINANCE

LEVEL OF INTEREST RATES

Mr. G. M. Gurbin (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. For many months, when interest rates and inflation were very high, the Minister of Finance suggested that we should be looking at the real interest rates. Is the Minister of Finance aware that under current conditions, with interest rates at the levels they are at, and inflation at the level it is at, in fact his economic policy has not improved the real interest rates that Canadians face?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): I would be pleased to draw to my hon. friend's attention the fact that real interest rates in Canada at the present time, and for the last several months, have been lower than in the United States. I would also like to draw to his attention the fact that consumer loans are as low as they have been for the last 25 years. Mortgages, which are at 10.25 per cent for one year, are as low as they have been for several years. Canadian citizens can now get loans on the market at rates that compare to the best rates they have had in several years.

Real interest rates are still high. I have made comments in that regard, both in the United States and in Canada and at various international conferences. Most industrial countries are pressing the United States to take steps to reduce real interest rates. The fact is that in Canada we have now real interest rates that are lower than those in the United States.

EFFECT OF GOVERNMENT'S POLICIES

Mr. G. M. Gurbin (Bruce-Grey): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is also directed to the Minister of Finance. The Member for Mississauga mentioned a critical factor in Canadian interest rates as compared to American interest rates. Since the Canadian Government is borrowing 75 per cent of available funds from Canadian banks, will the Minister explain to the House and to the Canadian people what will happen to our interest rates when the demand for capital is high enough and the crunch comes? Will not the economic policy of the Government, and continually high budgetary deficits, put pressures on the Canadian economy which will slow, if not stop, our economic recovery?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I can tell my hon. friend what is happening at the present time. There is no crunch. As a matter of fact the banks have surplus funds available for lending. This is why citizens can get comparatively low rates on loans from the banks at the present time. There is a concern that eventually down the line there will be a problem of crowding out of private sector borrowing, but this will not happen in 1983 and not likely in 1984. The issue is indeed an issue of concern for subsequent years.

I have already announced steps that we are taking to bring the federal deficit down and to reduce the call on the market by the federal Government, and I hope by provincial Governments also. There is no reason to believe that the problem that my hon. friend is worried about will arise. We can take steps to avoid that problem. No one is considering the problem as a serious one, either this year or next year.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

THE CASE OF HUGH HAMBLETON—REPORTED OFFER OF IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Solicitor General my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. A Canadian, Hugh Hambleton, was tried and convicted a year ago in Britain on charges of spying on behalf of the KGB. Has the Acting Prime Minister any comments to make on the evidence that came out at the British trial to the effect that, in April of 1980, Hambleton was offered immunity from prosecution by the Canadian authorities on the condition that he would co-operate with the Canadians in determining the exact nature of his contact and connections with the KGB?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, I have no further comment to make today on that point.

Oral Questions

EMPLOYMENT WITH CIDA IN PERU AND HAITI

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I would like to ask a question more within the domain of the Acting Prime Minister in his capacity as Secretary of State for External Affairs. Earlier in his service in Canada Mr. Hambleton was selected by CIDA to head a team in Peru and later in Haiti. In light of the fact that Mr. Hambleton had no experience whatsoever in Canadian government service, and particularly in CIDA, can the Minister say why he was selected to head the CIDA team in Peru on his first appointment abroad, and later in Haiti?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: This question should be placed on the Order Paper.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Oh no!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the Minister cares to, he can comment, but it involves a level of detail that is normally the kind of thing requested on the Order Paper.

The Hon. Member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke.

* * *

NATIONAL RESOURCES

OWNERSHIP OF COAL LANDS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Fifty thousand acres of rich coal lands in southeastern British Columbia have been released from the terms of the Crowsnest agreement. The Province of British Columbia has always maintained it has ownership of this land. Will the Minister agree to arrange a meeting immediately with the Province of British Columbia to resolve the ownership of these rich coal lands?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have not received any communication from the Minister of Resources of the Province of British Columbia on this matter. It is a problem that is being reviewed in my own Department. If we have to talk with the Government of British Columbia, we will talk with them. These lands belong to the federal Crown, as has been the case since the time the deal was made with the railway.

REQUEST FOR FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, there is exploratory drilling for oil going on in this area at the present time. Will the Minister enter into discussions with the Province of British Columbia which will lead to a plan for the management and development of these coal lands, regarding leasing policy, taxation agreements, and environmental impact management?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): In my judgment there is no great urgency with that problem at this time. There are a lot of coal mining operations in Canada at this time. They are all in a surplus position. There is no great urgency to develop new mines at this time. We have a lot of time to resolve these difficulties. I do not think it is a very urgent problem.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

PURCHASE OF RUSSIAN TRACTORS—REPORTED ENCOURAGEMENT BY MINISTER AND OFFICIALS

Hon. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, if I can get his attention. Is the Minister aware of the fact that the Minister of State responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, Senator Argue in the other place, plus certain officials of the Canadian Wheat Board, are travelling across western Canada making speeches and delivering information encouraging Canadian farmers to purchase Russian tractors and combines? Are they citing government policy? If so, how does this action fit in with the Government's program of "Buy Canadian"?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the Hon. Member's allegation.

ROLE OF RUSSIAN AUTHORITIES

Hon. John Wise (Elgin): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the Minister, through you, that in fact this is very accurate information. It is reported, and the Senator and the Commissioners have not denied it. Will the Minister clarify the fact that the Minister and the Commissioners of the Canadian Wheat Board say they are doing this at the request of the Russians? Since when did the Canadian Government take its domestic purchasing policy from the U.S.S.R.?

• (1450)

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the Hon. Member, I am not aware that the Senator was expressing these comments. Obviously, based on the Hon. Member's representation, I will have a discussion with the Senator.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Burlington.

Mr. Kempling: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs but I see she has disappeared. Perhaps I can catch her later.

IMMIGRATION

POLISH IMMIGRANTS' HUNGER STRIKE

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It deals with the Polish hunger strikers in Toronto. Can the Minister give any encouragement to these brave people that his efforts in appealing to the Polish authorities are having some effect, because it is getting very cold and very damp on the Toronto waterfront?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I know the interest of the Hon. Member in this question. It is a question in which I have been quite interested myself. We have made representations to the Polish authorities. They have responded to six of the cases. It is true there are four outstanding cases that have not been dealt with yet. We intend to continue our efforts.

The Hon. Member asks me whether I have any hope. I draw on my knowledge that the Polish authorities have been co-operative in family reunification cases in the past, and I trust they will continue that practice and give relief or clearance to the four outstanding cases. We are continuing our efforts. Just recently I again asked our officials in the Warsaw embassy to make further representation to the Polish authorities.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—FAMILIES OF CANADIAN NATIONALS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It has to do with a number of Canadians of Grenadian descent who are continuing to be somewhat tormented by the absence of knowledge of their families on the island of Grenada. Can the Minister indicate whether or not any effort is being made to assist these people in determining the present state of their families?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the Hon. Member that there has been a special effort, but if there are residents of Canada of Grenadian descent who wish to be informed about their relatives, we will make an effort to provide, through our consular service, the maximum information possible. I cannot say at the moment whether anything has been done on that point yet, but I will inquire.

THE DISABLED AND THE HANDICAPPED

FUNDING SOUGHT FOR ONTARIO READING SERVICE FOR THE BLIND

Mr. Neil Young (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. As the Minister knows, the Ontario Government recently decided to terminate its funding support for a radio reading service for the blind. Would the Minister of National Health and Welfare consider, because this is such an essential service for blind Canadians, continuing to provide that financial support, and discuss this matter with the provincial Government with a view to ensuring this essential service is continued?

Hon. Monique Bégin (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I must say that we are now flooded with letters from different Provinces of the country about community services or social services which have been cut by a provincial Government. I really regret it. We do share 50 cents on the dollar in these services, but it must be, because of the constitutional division of power, at the initiative of a given Province. We cannot step in when Provinces cut services. I regret it, and I would ask Hon. Members to address their petitions to their provincial MLAs.

Miss MacDonald: Even when you cause the problem.

* * *

INCOME TAX ACT

FARMERS' SWIMMING POOLS AND PONDS—DEPARTMENT'S INSTRUCTIONS TO AUDITORS

Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo-Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Revenue. It concerns Section 31 of the Income Tax Act. After some months I have been able to obtain some pages from the Tax Operational Manual that deals with Project L. It is "Instructions to the auditors". One of the instructions reads: "Does the taxpayer have a swimming pool or a pond, and provide details?" What difference does it make whether a farmer has a swimming pool or a pond?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that particular instruction, but I shall make enquiries and I hope I will then be able to give the Hon. Member a more satisfactory answer.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

WINDSOR STEEL MILL STUDY

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. I have been attempting for two months, with direct questions to the

Minister in committees and through questions to his Department, to find out about what the Minister is doing with the study being done for a steel bar mill in Windsor in light of the fact that the balance of the industry is operating at 40 per cent of capacity?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): We are studying it, Mr. Speaker.

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, this is obviously a case that the Minister knows how to pick winners and losers. Stelco is now planning to shut down its Hilton works in Hamilton and move everything to its new plant. Does the Minister consider that Canada needs another steel bar mill in Windsor, or is it the Liberal Party that needs it?

Mr. Nielsen: Study that one.

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I thought it was the Conservative Party that was against picking winners and losers. Obviously, if the Hon. Member is recommending this particular project, or recommending against a particular project, I will have a look and take his representation into consideration.

* * *

MINES AND MINING

TAXATION STUDY

Mr. F. Oberle (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who is temporarily responsible for mines. As he knows, the mining sector is the victim of the most uncongenial economic circumstances in the world and is literally on the rocks. Fifty per cent of the mines are idle, affecting 50 per cent of the jobs. One of the problems which will severely affect the recovery of that sector is the excessive tax burden which the Government has placed on the shoulders of the resource sector, and particularly the heavy increase in so-called non-profit taxes. The Minister has ordered a study of comparisons with other jurisdictions.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member please ask his question?

Mr. Oberle: I will, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister tell the House what is the state of the study? Will it be made public? Is the study near completion? What initiatives is the Government planning to ease that burden on the industry, to permit it to breathe and to regain its former health?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think the question of taxes for every sector of the economy is regularly reviewed by the Minister of Finance when budget time comes. As far as the mining sector is concerned, different representations have been made to the Minister of Finance on this score. Basically, as the Hon. Member has stated, the problem of the mining industry is based on the low demand for products across the land and in the world market. With all of the nations entering economic recovery, normally the demand for Canadian mining products should increase.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

ALLOCATION OF GRAIN QUOTAS

Mr. Jack Murta (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport in his capacity as Minister responsible in this House to answer questions for the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. My question follows up on questions asked yesterday. I would like to know whether or not the Government is waiting until after January 1, 1984, to increase grain quotas on the Prairies so that as much grain as possible can be moved under the new freight shipping rate set down and scheduled to go into effect on January 1, 1984?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, fortunately at the same time that we were exchanging views in the House yesterday in Question Period, the Minister of State for the Wheat Board was appearing before the Saskatchewan Pool presenting a number of very imaginative and creative ideas on how we might go about changing the quota system.

Mr. Nielsen: What else?

Mr. Axworthy: I will be very pleased to send the remarks of the distinguished Senator in the other place concerning those changes in quotas to the Hon. Member, so that he might determine whether his Party would concur in such changes.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Which one are you talking about? Name names.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

RENEWAL OF SIGNS ON FEDERAL BUILDINGS

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Public Works. The Government has launched an extravagant signage renewal program for federal government buildings across Canada. The Government is going to be changing decals on cars, existing directory boards, and installing back lit signs. Why is this a priority in times of supposed restraint? The cost must be in the hundreds of millions of dollars. I might add that the former Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Member for Yukon, stopped the program because it was not necessary.

• (1500)

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member's Party had been left in office longer, I suspect it would have stopped the country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McKenzie: You have succeeded in that.

Mr. LeBlanc: If the Hon. Member does not accept that the Government of Canada should be clearly identified in the buildings it occupies across the country, I wish he would let me know. Certainly, in terms of job creation, I receive representations from companies involved in putting up signs, billboards, et cetera. They ask for more work, and I am certainly looking at trying to help them.

* * *

PETITIONS

TABLING OF REPORTS OF CLERK OF PETITIONS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petitions presented by Hon. Members on Wednesday, November 23, 1983, meet the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) on the usual point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I was not rising on the usual point of order. I wanted to ask a question, which I will not ask now, arising out of the answers given to me by the Minister of indian affairs and no northern development yesterday.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Government House Leader to outline the business for tomorrow, assuming we conclude the debate on Bill C-96 today, and the business for next week? He might indicate, if he can do so now, the date for prorogation if it is in his mind, and I imagine that it is very much so. At the same time, perhaps he could indicate his planning with respect to a new Speech from the Throne should Parliament prorogue in the near future.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will be dealing with Bill C-72 and Bill C-71. Monday will be the last allotted day. On Tuesday we will be dealing with Bill C-170 and next Wednesday will be Private Members' Business.

There has been consultation earlier today among the House Leaders. Mr. Speaker, if you were to seek unanimous consent for the following two motions, I think you would obtain it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the Hon. President of the Privy Council have unanimous consent to introduce the motions?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pinard: Therefore I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan):

That, if a division is required on any motion relating to the business of supply on Monday, November 28, 1983, the said division shall be postponed until 5.45 p.m. on Tuesday, November 29, 1983 whereupon all questions necessary for the disposal of the business of supply in the period ending December 10, 1983, shall be put forthwith and successively without further debate or amendment.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Pinard: As I indicated earlier, I have a second motion to move:

That a prorogation of this session shall have no effect on resuming consideration of all of the objections to the Electoral Boundaries Commission's reports; and,

That the objections printed in the Notice Paper on the last day of this session be printed in their same form in the first Notice Paper of the second session of this Parliament.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleausre of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Pinard: I think the Hon. Member for Yukon wanted to know when we would prorogue and when a Speech from the Throne would take place. If the Bills I have indicated previously are passed by the Senate before Wednesday at three o'clock, I think we would be in a position to prorogue in the middle of the afternoon next Wednesday. In so far as the date for the Speech from the Throne is concerned, I am not in a position to be specific today but I can give a general idea that the Speech from the Throne will be held in the week of December 5, somewhere between December 6 and December 8.

Mr. Nielsen: That is close enough, Mr. Speaker. I think we can safely predict, knowing the propensities of the Government, that it will probably be right in the middle, on December 7.

I was listening in French to the President of the Privy Council who was speaking in English, and I thought I heard him say that the business for tomorrow would be Bill C-72 rather than Bill C-172 and Bill C-71 rather than Bill C-171.

An Hon. Member: He did.

Mr. Nielsen: But because I sometimes have difficulty in following the rapidity of the Minister's English, maybe the French was a little slow in coming to me.

Point of Order—Mr. Blenkarn

POINT OF ORDER

MR. MUNRO (ESQUIMALT-SAANICH)—QUESTIONS CONCERNING MR. HAMBLETON

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my point of order arises out of Question Period. On Friday of last week, I was foreclosed on asking questions about the Canadian spy, Mr. Hambleton. Today in a ruling from the Chair, it was suggested that I put the questions on the Order Paper because they were too specific. There are already 60 questions on the Order Paper from 1980 and this man will be out of jail in a year's time. Are there that many spies in CIDA that you will have to determine which one I am talking about?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is not making a point of order.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, am I too late to put a question to the Government House Leader?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By unanimous consent of the House, is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, my question will be very brief. There has been some talk in the House on all sides about the possibility of a free vote on the testing of the Cruise missile. I would like to ask the Government House Leader whether or not he would undertake to consult with Opposition House Leaders, the Hon. Member for Yukon and the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, about the possibility of such a free vote. I am only asking him to consult; I am not asking him to agree at this time. I am also asking him whether or not he would report back to the House before the end of this session.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member reads the answer given yesterday by the Deputy Prime Minister to one of his colleagues, he will have the answer to his question.

* * *

POINT OF ORDER

MR. BLENKARN—SUGGESTED IRREGULARITY IN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I am seeking the floor at this time to respond to a point of order raised on November 17 by the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) with respect to Vote 6b of the 1983-84 Supplementary Estimates (B). I am making these comments to assist in the ruling Mr. Speaker will be making on the matter in due course.

I understand that my hon. friend's point of order was based on two contentions. The first was that the Canada Post Corporation Act contains no legislative authority for the Corporation to do the kind of things listed in Vote 6b. Therefore, he argued that Vote 6b would provide authority not present under existing legislation. Second, he argued that activities listed under Vote 6b would not result in or contribute to the losses of the Canada Post Corporation.

The Canada Post Corporation Act is not exhaustive in citing the things the Corporation may do. Section 5 of the Act authorizes the Corporation to provide products or services which are necessary or incidental to operating a postal service. All the things listed in Vote 6b are necessary or incidental to the activities which are the objects of the corporation. Section 29 of the Canada Post Corporations Act provides for a deficit appropriation item when the Corporation's income is insufficient to meet its expense. Since its inception the Corporation has invoked this provision and is expected to do so in 1983-84. Therefore, any expenditure will contribute to the deficit.

• (1510)

The Corporation could have proceeded with these projects and the costs would have been included in a lump sum appropriation under Section 29. However, the projects reflect Government initiatives in the fields of decentralization, employment and energy conservation and Vote 6b presents a disclosure of the Corporation's contribution toward these goals. Finally, I am told that there have been past instances when Crown corporations have received appropriations for activities under circumstances similar or identical to the present one.

Canada Post Corporation Vote 6c, 1982-83 Supplementary Estimates (C), had the identical vote title as that for the present Vote 6b. It also listed three of the five projects now listed under the present vote. Also Supply and Services Vote 2^c, 1981-82 Supplementary Estimates (E), provided funds to Canadian Arsenals Limited for the federal building retrofit and conversion initiative (energy conservation). Secretary of State Vote 70, 1978-79 Main Estimates provided funds to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation for the specific purpose of a host country broadcasting service for the 1978 Commonwealth Games.

On the basis of these arguments, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the item is in fact in order.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

VETERANS AFFAIRS—PRESENTATION OF FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Maurice Dupras (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of tabling, in both official languages of this country,

the First Report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

COMMUNICATIONS AND CULTURE—PRESENTATION OF SEVENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Robert Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of tabling, in both official languages, the Seventh Report of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture.

[*Editor's Note: For above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

* * *

[*English*]

PETITION

MR. FLIS—HUNGER STRIKE OF POLISH CANADIANS

Mr. Jesse P. Flis (Parkdale-High Park): Mr. Speaker, the subject of the ten Polish Canadian strikers in front of the Polish Consulate in Etobicoke was raised in Question Period again today. These ten Canadians, who are fathers and husbands, want nothing more than to see their wives and children join them in Canada. Although I am in daily contact with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) and with the Polish Embassy in Ottawa making representations on their behalf, it is still my duty to present the following petition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is doing a little more than presenting a petition. The usual format is merely a brief explanation and presentation.

Mr. Flis: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The petition merely reads: "We, the undersigned, support the hunger strikers for the release of their families from Poland". These petitions are in addition to the 1,000 signatures that I have already tabled in this House.

* * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions. Shall I dispense with the usual reading?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that you call upon any Member having a motion in his name and wishing to proceed with it to rise. Otherwise proceed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Any Member with a motion in his name wishing to rise at this point will be recognized. If there are none, we will proceed to Questions on the Order Paper.

* * *

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Order Paper Questions

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,574 and 5,233.

[*Text*]

PRESIDENCY OF CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

Question No. 4,574—**Mr. Bosley:**

1. What is the salary of Mr. Pierre Juneau as President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation?

2. What was the total salary paid to Mr. Juneau as Minister of Communications in a Liberal government?

3. For how many years and in what specific capacity did Mr. Juneau draw (a) a salary (b) benefits (c) other forms of recompense from the taxpayers and, in each case, what was the precise amount of the salary, benefits or other forms of recompense?

4. What experience in the private sector qualified Mr. Juneau for his appointment as President of the CBC?

5. As President of the CBC, on what date and under what circumstances did Mr. Juneau first meet the Prime Minister?

6. On what date and under what circumstances did Mr. Juneau first (a) work with (b) work for the Prime Minister?

7. Was the President of the CBC ever involved with the publication *Cité Libre* and, if so (a) in what capacity or capacities (b) at what period of time?

8. Was the President of the CBC (a) consulted (b) involved in any way by the government in the events leading to the invocation of the *War Measures Act* in October 1970?

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Offices of the Prime Minister and the Privy Council and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

1. For those positions to which a salary range is not attached and where the determination of salary includes consideration of assessed performance, as a matter of privacy the government does not release individual salaries. These circumstances apply in the case of Mr. Juneau, President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

2. Mr. Juneau was paid at the rate of $20,000 per annum.

3. 1949-1966: Held various positions in the National Film Board, i.e., Field Representative for the City of Montreal; Assistant Director for the Province of Quebec; Director of International Distribution; Assistant Director of the National Film Board's European Office in London; Secretary to the Board and Assistant to the Commissioner; Executive Director; Senior Assistant to the Commissioner, and Director of French Language Production. During his employment with the National Film Board, Mr. Juneau's salary was as follows:

	Salary range/annual salary
July 5, 1949	$2,580—$3,180
Dec. 1, 1950	2,904— 3,576
Jan. 1, 1951	3,636— 4,020
June 7, 1951	3,576— 4,212
July 9, 1951	4,212— 4,836
Dec. 1, 1951	4,520— 5,180
Dec. 1, 1953	4,920— 5,610
July 1, 1954	5,220— 6,120
Oct. 1, 1954	7,000— 8,000
April 1, 1956	8,000— 9,000
March 1, 1957	12,000
Oct. 1, 1958	13,000
Jan. 1, 1961	15,000
Jan. 1, 1964	17,500
Dec. 1, 1965	18,900

February, 1966: Full-time Member and Vice-Chairman of the Board of Broadcast Governors—salary $23,000.

March, 1968: Chairman of the Board of Broadcast Governors, which later became the Canadian Radio-Television Commission—salary $27,560 effective March 18, 1968. Salary ranges for Governor in Council appointees were established effective January 1, 1969, and individual salaries within those ranges were determined on the basis of assessed performance, thereby resulting in exact salaries not being released. The salary ranges within which Mr. Juneau was paid are as follows:

effective January 1, 1969—DM2 ($33,000—$37,000)

effective January 1, 1970—DM2 ($35,000—$39,000)

effective January 1, 1971—DM2 ($37,500—$42,000)

effective January 1, 1972—DM2 ($40,000—$45,000)

effective January 1, 1973—DM2 ($42,000—$49,500)

effective April 1, 1974—DM2 ($44,000—$54,000)

August, 1975: Minister of Communications—salary, see Part 2 above.

November, 1975: Special Policy Advisor to the Prime Minister—salary range $35,500—$47,500.

November, 1976: Chairman of the National Capital Commission—Salary DM1 ($41,000—$54,000); effective April 1, 1977—DMI ($43,000—$58,800).

February, 1978: Under-Secretary of State—Salary DM2 ($49,500—$65,300); effective April 1, 1978—DM2 ($51,900—$67,700); effective April 1, 1979 DM2 ($55,600—$72,400).

April, 1980: Under-Secretary of State and concurrently Deputy Minister of Communications—Salary DM2 ($60,900—$79,300).

August, 1980: Deputy Minister of Communications—DM2 ($60,900—$79,300), effective April 1, 1981—DM2 ($73,400—$86,000); effective July 1, 1982—DM2 ($82,150—$96,670).

August 1982: President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—Salary—See reply to (1) above.

Mr. Juneau's benefits and other forms of recompense were the same as those provided by his employer to other employees at the same level.

4. Mr. Juneau's entire career has been within the public sector and, as is obvious from the positions he has held (see (3) above), he has a long familiarity with communications and cultural affairs in Canada. He has also been active in a number of educational, religious, social and cultural organizations.

5. Since becoming President of the CBC, Mr. Juneau has met the Prime Minister on only one occasion, an official dinner on November 24, 1982 given by the Canadian Conference of the Arts on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the Canada Council.

6. (a) August, 1975—as Minister of Communications (b) November, 1975—as Special Policy Advisor to the Prime Minister

7. Yes, as a contributor and member of the editorial board in the early 1950s.

8. It is impossible to determine if there was any communication between the government and the President of the CBC at that time.

POST OFFICE AT PIERREFONDS, QUEBEC

Question No. 5,233—**Mr. Herbert:**

1. Was a post office constructed in Pierrefonds, Quebec and, if so, what was the cost of the (a) land (b) surveying (c) design (d) construction (e) site improvement?

2. What is the estimated value for the purpose of the assessment of a grant in lieu of municipal taxes?

3. Was any amount paid out in lieu of school commission taxes and, if so (a) on what date (b) to whom (c) what was the amount?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): 1. A Post Office was constructed in Pierrefonds, Québec in 1982. The cost of:

(a) land was $111,150, including legal fees of $1,150.

(b) surveying—nil (carried out by the department).

(c) design—$122,659

(d) construction—$1,266,700.

(e) site improvement—$208,000. This amount is included in the total construction cost.

2. The estimated value of land and building for the purposes of the 1983 grant in lieu of taxes is:

Land—$205,000

Building—$1,017,440

Total—$1,222,440

3. (a), (b) and (c) School commission grants related to this Post Office are collected by the Municipality of Pierrefonds. Total payments to Pierrefonds are expected to be finalized in early November at approximately $40,000 for 1983.

Of this amount, $11,400 was paid to Pierrefonds on 4 April and $18,600 was approved for payment on 4 October.

The school portion of Pierrefonds' grant relates to the Île de Montréal school commission whose total share of this grant would be estimated to be $1,758 with $501.03 relating to the 4 April payment, $817.47 relating to the amount approved for payment 4 October and approximately $440 relating to a final payment to be made in early November.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Evans: I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-96, to amend the Financial Administration Act—Mr. Gray—Mr. Blaker in the Chair.

The Deputy Chairman: The House again in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Financial Administration Act. My understanding is that when the House rose at one o'clock, Members were considering Clause 2. I will put the question and recognize any Members who seek the floor. Shall Clause 2 carry?

On Clause 2—"*Auditor General of Canada*"

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I was worrying about the amendment which really involves the word "or". I was seeking to find out what that did in a legal sense to the meaning of Clause 2(2). The reason I was getting from the President of the Treasury Board was that it involved the receipt of moneys and/or other properties that would go into trust from prisoners, which was used as an example.

The trouble I was having was that in the briefings that I received from Treasury Board on Bill C-96, particularly this area, Subclause (4) was the paragraph that applied to the reason given in reply to my question on the amendment proposed that would add the word "or" to Subclause (2). Perhaps the President of the Treasury Board would like to give me an explanation of the word "or", that it does to change the intent or the legal language. Is not the matter of trust for people who are incarcerated and their personal property covered in Subclause (4)?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the word "or" is to differentiate between money paid to Canada, on the one hand, and money received or collected by Canada, on the other. The Government's obligations with respect to money paid to it are sometimes different from those with respect to money received or collected. For example, the Government may merely be holding money collected in trust, but may be obligated to perform some service for money paid for a special purpose. I am also advised that this will make the English version of the Bill exactly the same as the French. I hope this will be of assistance to my hon. friend.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I thank the President of the Treasury Board very much for that explanation.

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, I have to ask you to excuse my voice today. I am wondering whether putting "or" in will facilitate or make it easier for the Department of National Revenue to take out of the bank accounts of Canadians money that it thinks belongs to the Government. This practice is, in my view, a terrible practice and is being carried out more and more frequently. There is one case which I would like to mention later today where the Department of National Revenue took $1,000 out of a man's bank account and that man did not even find out about it until several days later when the manager of the bank happened to mention it to him. The Department of National Revenue did not even have the courtesy to tell the man what had happened.

• (1520)

If this amendment will make that practice any easier, I would like to raise strenuous objections to it. As a matter of fact, I would like to raise strenuous objections to the practice of going to a bank account and taking money out without notifying the Canadian to whom the money belongs.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I understand by hon. friend's concern but his concern is related to the Income Tax Act. We are dealing here with the Financial Administration Act. The amendment for which we are seeking approval would not facilitate the kinds of activities about which my hon. friend is concerned.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, on that point, we are dealing with a definition that refers to money received by Canada for a special purpose. The President of the Treasury Board is assuring us that the extending of this definition in no way, shape or form legitimizes the practice in which Revenue Canada is now involved of automatically going to people's bank accounts without their knowledge and taking money from them. I would just like to make absolutely sure that the President of the Treasury Board is assuring us right now that the extension of this definition in no way, shape or form legitimizes that most reprehensible practice that is going on in Canada today.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to give that assurance.

I have no further comments to make on this amendment. If the committee is so disposed, I would be happy to ask it to carry this amendment and then go on to other amendments. Either fortunately or unfortunately, there are quite a few amendments before us.

The Deputy Chairman: I will put the question then. Shall Clause 2 as amended carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

Clause 2, subclause (2), agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 3 carry?

Mr. Huntington: I understant that it was recommended by the Auditor General of Canada that Clause 3 be omitted—

Mr. Forrestall: It is not Clause 3 or anywhere near it.

Mr. Huntington: It is Subclause (3). Do I undersand that the President of the Treasury Board will be deleting it, or will he be proceeding with an amendment?

Mr. Gray: Yes, I have an amendment with respect to Clause 3. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if, in order to facilitate the business of the committee, I could confirm that the amendments to Clause 2 which have been circulated to Members of the committee and are available to the Table with respect to Subclause 2(3) and Subclauses 2(4), 2(5) and 2(6) have in fact been adopted by the committee. The reason I ask this question is that we had been discussing an amendment to Subclause 2(2), the amendment containing the contentious word "or", and I would like to make sure that there is no doubt on the part of the committee that I had intended to bring before the committee amendments to Subclause 2(3) and Subclauses 2(4), 2(5) and 2(6). These were amendments regarding which there had been consultation prior to today's session, the text of the amendments having been distributed to members of the committee.

The Deputy Chairman: I am a little baffled. I have in front of me a proposed amendment. I do not know whether it has been moved or not. It is entitled Subclaue 2(3). If we are all talking about the same one, the Chair would appreciate being instructed as to whether it is the intention of the Minister to move this amendment or whether in fact he is arguing, as I think he may be, that it has somehow already been moved and passed. I do not know.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, you asked if Clause 2 carried and the committee indicated that it should carry. Just so that there is no confusion later on, I would like to make sure that all of the amendments which I intend to move before the committee have been dealt with by the committee or if I have formally to move the remaining two amendments which I have just mentioned. I am sorry that this is so technical, but I would like to make sure that the discussions my hon. friend and I and others carried out before today's sitting will be reflected in the proceedings of the committee and eventually of the House.

The Deputy Chairman: I would like to be of some assistance.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering about one thing. When you asked if Clause 2 shall carry, I, not being a lawyer, made a mistake. Clause 2 does not carry but Subclause (2) as amended of Clause 2 does carry. I think there will still be amendments to Subclause (3) and Subclause (4) of Clause 2.

The Deputy Chairman: Now I understand what has happened. I think it will require the unanimous consent of the House to undo something which has been done, and obviously there was simply an error made in the proceedings. I would request of Hon. Members that the reply to my question whether or not Clause 2 as amended shall carry be undone and that further amendments will now be debated in terms of Clause 2. I shall put the question again on Clause 2 and look for those Hon. Members who wish to enter debate. Shall Clause 2 carry?

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, not being a lawyer myself, I would appreciate it very much if Clause 2(2) as amended would be called and we could then proceed to Clause 2(3).

The Deputy Chairman: Would the Hon. Member be so kind as to repeat himself? He would like to have which clause or amendment called now?

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with Clause 2(2) and we have agreed to the amendment as moved by the President of the Treasury Board which would amend that clause to read:

—to, or received or collected by a public officer.

Could we clear that amendment as agreed before proceeding to Clause 2(3)?

The Deputy Chairman: I will put the question on Subclause 2(2).

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I think it is a question of whether or not this is the process the Chair would like to follow. It is a process which we thought would be useful in putting behind us that with which we have dealt without having to return to those points at any time. Perhaps that would be agreeable for now and throughout the entire process.

The Deputy Chairman: That is fine. I will call the subclauses as Hon. Members have indicated they want them to be debated and I can either ask if each subclause is carried after the end of each debate or I can put the question on all subclauses at the same time, whichever practice Hon. Members choose.

We are now dealing with Subclause 2(3). Shall Subclause 2(2) carry?

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Auditor General recommended the omission of Subclause (3) of Clause 2 and I would ask the President of the Treasury Board to advise if that subclause is to be omitted or if it is to be amended.

● (1530)

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I propose the following amendment to Subclause 2(3). I move:

That Bill C-96 be amended

(*a*) by striking out lines 3 to 13 on page 2;

(*b*) by renumbering Subclause (4) as Subclause (3).

I want to give a word of explanation. The proposed amendment would extend the definition of "public money", to include any money held by Canada. Circumstances can arise where

money is paid to Canada in error and such money was not public money under the old definition and so could be repaid pursuant to Section 14(3) of the Financial Administration Act.

The proposed change would make Section 14(3) inoperative and there would be no authority to repay amounts received in error.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I agree with that. We are omitting paragraph 3 and I agree with the amendment as read by the President of the Treasury Board. This means that Subclause(4) in Bill C-96 is then renumbered as Subclause(3).

Could I ask the President of the Treasury Board if the new Subclause(3), which is Subclause(4) in Bill C-96, is not the phrase reading "money received by Canada for a special purpose" in the clause that deals with funds received from prisoners, turned over in trust? I would like to clear up that misunderstanding because that was the nature of the briefing I had before today.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that we have to amend both the definition of "public money" and the definition of "money received by Canada for a special purpose". I am sorry that this is all so technical. I know that my hon. friend would want to be very careful, and I agree with that.

What we are dealing with here is an amendment to Paragraph (d) of the definition of "public money" so that it would read, "money received by Canada for a special purpose."

I gather that we are trying to make the two parts of the definition consistent. We were originally talking about part of the section for which there is an explanatory note which says "money paid to Canada for a special purpose" and we are making the words later on consistent with that.

Mr. Huntington: I do not want to belabour this point but before one o'clock the President of the Treasury Board was advising me that the amendment to paragraph 2 of Clause 2, the addition of the word "or", was to make it possible to receive funds from people, for instance, who were incarcerated in prisons. I was very confused with that explanation because in the briefings I received from Treasury Board on this part of Bill C-96, I was told that money received by Canada for a special purpose was the clause that would allow moneys received from prisoners to be put in trust, and that that whole area of confusion was cleared up with Subclause(4) of Bill C-96 amended to become Subclause(3). I just want to clear my notes and make sure that I am still continuing with an understanding of the details of the Bill.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I understand my hon. friend's concern. I am advised that what we are talking about now covers the situation we were discussing before one o'clock. Apparently more than one clause of the Bill has to be changed in order to cover the same general area.

Mr. Huntington: I understand that.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall Subclause 2(3) carry as amended?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Subclause 2(3) agreed to as amended.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: We will now be looking at a further amendment for which I ask leave for the President of the Treasury Board to put before the House.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I want to propose an amendment to Bill C-96 with respect to Clause 2. It is quite lengthy and I am wondering if there could be consent on the part of Opposition Party spokesmen for me not to read it all out. I would be quite happy to do that.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Is it acceptable that the amendment will be deemed to have been read by the Minister?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: The amendment referred to above is as follows:*]

That clause 2 of Bill C-96 be amended by adding, immediately after line 19 on page 2, the following:

"(4) The definition "valeurs" ou "titres" in section 2 of the French version of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

«valeurs» ou «titres» "*securities*"	"«valeurs» ou «titres» signifie les titres du Canada et comprend les obligations, billets, certificats de dépôt, certificats non productifs d'intérêt, débentures, bons du Trésor, billets du Trésor et toute autre valeur représentant une partie de la dette publique du Canada.»

(5) Section 2 of the said Act is further amended by adding thereto, immediately after the definition "securities", the following definition:

"treasury bill" «billet du Trésor»	" "treasury bill" means a bill issued by or on behalf of Her Majesty for the payment of a principal sum specified in the bill to a named recipient or to a bearer at a date not later than twelve months from the date of issue of the bill;"

(6) Section 2 of the said Act is further amended by adding thereto, immediately after the definition "treasury bill", the following definition:

"treasury note" «bon du Trésor»	" "treasury note" means a note issued by or on behalf of Her Majesty for the payment of a principal sum specified in the note to a named recipient or to a bearer at a date not later than twelve months from the date of issue of the note."

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I really do have empathy and feel sorry for the President of the Treasury Board. I know that he has had some surgery in his mouth and is not completely comfortable this afternoon.

I really do not want to edge him but I would like to know the intent of this amendment.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, the intent of this motion is to define certain terms that will be used later on in an amended Section 37. I would be delighted to read out all of these terms but that is the purpose. It is in order to prepare the way for amending Section 37.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is an amendment to Clause 2 immediately after line 19 on page 2. Could I ask the President of the Treasury Board to clarify this and give me its intent? I have notes here that leave me without a complete understanding of what this is.

Mr. Gray: I am happy to assist my hon. friend. I gather we are creating new Subclauses 2(4), 2(5) and 2(6). They will provide, with respect to Subclause (4), a definition in French for the term "valeurs" ou "titres".

Second, there will be a definition of "treasury bill" in the English part of the Act as well as, finally, a definition of the term "treasury note".

They would not otherwise be there in the amendment. They are necessary in order to have a properly amended Section 37.

Mr. Huntington: As I understand it, what we are doing is allowing some immediacy to the Minister of Finance who has to adjust quickly to certain market and monetary conditions and that through the process of Governor in Council orders it is very time consuming. This is to bring us up into the computer age so that the speed of decisions can be enhanced. Is that what we are trying to do with these definitions?

Mr. Gray: That will be the effect of the definitions, together with the later clause to which they apply. I thank my hon. friend for stating it in quite a succinct form for us.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall the clause as amended carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 2 as amended agreed to.

On Clause 3—*Idem*

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: With respect to Clause 3, I understand there may be an amendment.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, with respect to Clause 3 and Section 5 in it, I want to propose an amendment. The amendment has been discussed with the spokesman for the Official Opposition. Clause 3 in Bill C-96 reads:

● (1540)

3. Section 5 of the said Act is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(7) The Treasury Board may require any public officer or agent of Her Majesty to provide a department with any account, return, statement, document, report or information for the purpose of locating any person in order to collect a debt due to Her Majesty."

I am proposing an amendment which reads:

That Clause 3 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out lines 24 to 28 on page 2 and substituting the following therefor:

"to provide a department with such information from any account, return, record, statement, document or report as may be required

(*a*) to locate any person in order to collect a debt due to Her Majesty in right of Canada by that person; or

(*b*) to set-off a debt due to Her Majesty in right of Canada or a province against any sum of money that may be due or payable by Her Majesty in right of Canada."

The object of the amendment as originally submitted is to authorize the disclosure of information to Departments for the purpose of collecting or recovering amounts due to Her Majesty. The object of the amending motion I have just proposed is to clarify the intent of the provision and limit the possible wide-sweeping application of the original amendment.

I would like to thank the Hon. Member for Capilano for his counsel in this matter. The amendment which I am proposing arises out of discussions we have had with him with respect to the kinds of concerns I have mentioned and is intended to lessen if not to eliminate them.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, as I understand Clause 3, as amended—and I thank the President of the Treasury Board for co-operating with the concerns expressed by this side—any information gleaned by way of this clause, after it is amended, would still be in accordance with the Privacy Act which was passed in June, 1982 and which has been proclaimed. I understand that that safety net on the use of the information would still apply. This information would be restricted strictly to the need—as we are stating in the amendment—such as a student loan contract which has failed to be completed. It is the responsibility of the Treasury Board to make sure that the proper collection procedures have been followed. And in the case of someone who has disappeared, we are allowing it to get an address. However, all matters in terms of the Privacy Act will apply, even with this clause as amended. I would just like that assurance.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to give that assurance. The provision is intended to be in conformity with the Privacy Act and, as I understand it, the Privacy Act would prevail, in any event.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 3, as amended, carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 4 carry?

On Clause 4—*Establishment of accounts*

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, it is our intention to ask that Subclause 4(11) be deleted. I suppose it is not required

because it is actually covered in another Bill, Bill C-126, which was passed on August 4, 1982, so it is superfluous.

The Deputy Chairman: Which line was that, may I ask for the record?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the entire Clause 4 in Bill C-96.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, the President of the Treasury Board is deleting Clause 4 of Bill C-96 for the reason that Bill C-126 was passed through the House of Commons on August 4, 1982 and that Bill C-126 allows the Government to perform with the powers which this clause sought. Therefore, we agree that it can be deleted.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 4 be deleted?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 4 deleted.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 5 carry?

On Clause 5—*Report*

Mr. Taylor: Mr. Chairman, Clause 5 deals with remissions. I would like to receive a little information on remissions. How does one go about getting money back from the Government? I will just briefly cite a case where one of my constituents—a new Canadian, incidentally—filed installment payments of $1,000 in each of the quarters in 1975. One of these $1,000 installments was put on his account and then someone in the Department took it off his account and claimed they sent it back to the Mercantile Bank in Calgary. That bank claimed it never had any such letter and the Department apparently cannot find any letter sending the money back to the Mercantile Bank in Calgary.

When the Department took the $1,000 out of this person's account it left him owing just about $1,000 on his income tax. So the Department went to his account and took out $1,000. I mentioned this earlier today. As soon as my constituent found out about this, he made representations to the Calgary office, which told him it was just a computer mistake and that it would be corrected any time now. But every week he would go down and be told it was just about corrected. Then the Government removed the Department from Calgary to Winnipeg, and the first thing my constituent was told then was that it was destroying its records and closing the case.

It is terrible and inhuman to close the case when that Department knew that $1,000 was missing. All the Department can say now is that its files are destroyed. Why would a Department destroy files when a case is still in difficulties? Would the Minister advise me just how one could go about getting remission in a case like this? Because this is a very inhuman thing to do to new Canadians who came to this country, trusted the Government and now are finding—as one of their neighbours said—that this Government is almost as bad as the government of the country from which they came.

I know that the Government does not want to steal this money. However, whether someone in the Department mislaid it, whether someone took it, or whether it was returned to the Mercantile Bank in Calgary, what I am saying is that the money was received by the Department of National Revenue, and the Department of National Revenue is therefore responsible for that $1,000, which should either be credited to this person's account or returned to him.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us is for the purpose of authorizing the Treasury Board to prescribe the form in which remissions will be reported. It is intended to reduce the administrative burden associated with compiling many pages of details of remissions, thereby increasing the usefulness of the public accounts, since it is intended that each Department will report the total value of remissions in their total value, rather than reporting each transaction in excess of $1,000.

My hon. friend asks how a remission is made. I can tell him that it is done by Order in Council. It is done on the recommendation to Treasury Board of the responsible Minister. Therefore, in the kind of case my hon. friend is talking about, the Minister of National Revenue would have to make a submission to Treasury Board asking for an Order in Council authorizing the remission. I would be happy to make inquiries of the Minister of National Revenue, if you would like, in regard to the particular case and to assist in having the matter clarified.

• (1550)

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister explain just what is going to happen? There are a lot of remissions from ports and wharves. Are all of these remissions going to be held on record? Are they going to be in the public accounts or be available on the basis of access to information? Could he outline for us the mechanics involved here?

Mr. Gray: All the remission orders will be published in *The Canada Gazette* which will come out weekly. This is really to simplify what is required with respect to what is reported to the House of Commons in the Public Accounts. One can inspect *The Canada Gazette* each week and get the details of each remission order.

What will happen as a result of this amendment is that because the Treasury Board will have authority to prescribe the form in which remissions are reported, then with respect to the public accounts themselves as distinct from *The Canada Gazette* it is itended that we ask each Department to report the total number of remissions and their total value rather than each transaction in excess of $1,000. I am talking here about the public accounts.

What we are trying to do is to have the public accounts deal with this subject in a more select and meaningful way. Of course, details can be obtained under the access to information legislation and, in any event, I am told they will be published weekly in *The Canada Gazette*.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Financial Administration Act

On Clause 6—*Debt write-off regulations*

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 6 carry?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, this is a clause on which I wish to present some amendments. These are rather lengthy and I will try and make my comments in the briefest and, hopefully, simplest form possible.

The object of Subclause 6(18) is to expand the regulation-making powers concerning the writing off of debts and to remove the monetary limit. The amendment would also transfer the authority to make such regulations from the Governor in Council to the Treasury Board. The amendments I want to offer would improve the regulation-making authority and require that all write-offs of debts be recorded in the Public Accounts. The amendment as originally drafted would have given the Treasury Board authority to determine what write-offs would be reported and we have come to agree that instead of that, all write-offs should be reported in the public accounts.

As I set forth in my speech on second reading, we are clarifying procedures with respect to the resolution of debts and so on. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the following amendment to subclause 6(18) which I have just described:

That Clause 6 of Bill C-96 be amended

(*a*) by striking out lines 14 to 19 on page 3 and substituting the following:

"18. (1) Subject to subsection (2), the Treasury Board may make regulations respecting the writing off, in whole or in part, of any debt or obligation due to Her Majesty or any claim by Her Majesty, and without restricting the generality of the foregoing, may make regulations"

(*b*) by relettering paragraphs 18(1)(*b*) to (*d*) as paragraphs 18(1) to (*c*).

I also move:

That Clause 6 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out lines 39 to 41 on page 3 and substituting the following:

"(3) Debts, obligations and claims written off under this section"

The Deputy Chairman: We should take one amendment at a time for the purposes of putting the question. Therefore, shall the first amendment to Clause 6 carry?

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, what is the source of the debt we are writing off? Are we dealing with income tax payments?

Mr. Gray: I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the regulatory authority for debt deletion relates only to unrealized revenue. That is to say, relatively small amounts, 90 per cent of which relate to income taxes uncollectable through debt, bankruptcy, the person moving out of Canada, and so on. All debts recorded by the Government on the balance sheet of Canada can only be written off under this amendment with the authority of Parliament. Other uses of this provision will be where someone receives a social assistance overpayment and it would cause undue hardship if the Government were to recover the overpayment.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the amendment removes Treasury Board discretion and makes it clear that all write-offs will be reported?

Mr. Gray: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, this mentions regulations. The Minister was good enough to make available draft regulations prior to the Bill coming into the House. I compliment him on his generosity because it is a breakthrough for the Opposition function in dealing with legislation. He might note that this very technical Bill is going rather smoothly because of the courtesies extended.

I have a draft of the regulations and I am wondering how we might get those regulations into the proceedings here. Can I ask the Minister to table the regulations?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my hon. friend's comment and I would like to assist in having this information made generally available. I should say they have not been formally approved as yet. These are the regulations I intend to submit for formal approval, and I have no reason to believe they will not be accepted in that form. If there is some way perhaps they could be printed as an appendix to *Hansard*, recognizing that they have not yet received full and formal approval, I would have no objection. But I have to seek the assistance of the Chairman as to what procedures we can rely on at this point.

The Deputy Chairman: If the Hon. President of the Treasury Board wishes to table these regulations, he need only seek the consent of the house to do so.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact they are in draft form. I was wondering if they had been brought up from draft to final form.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I gather we are inhibited from bringing them into final form until the Act is approved by Parliament. But I want to assure my hon. friend that it is my

intention to submit them for formal approval in the form in which he has received them. Again I would be happy to table them formally for the information of all Hon. Members or take such other steps as are consistent with the rules of the House to make them available to members of the committee of the House.

● (1600)

The Deputy Chairman: From a procedural standpoint I cannot comment on the desirability or non-desirability of the Minister tabling regulations which are still in draft form. Procedurally he can table a draft or final copy, whatever it is he may choose, and need only seek the consent of the House to do so.

Mr. Gray: I would like to make one point which has just been brought to my attention. The draft regulations have not yet been reviewed by Justice to see if they conform to the statutory instruments legislation. I think my friend and I want to make sure that our colleagues on that committee will not have some complaint later on. Perhaps it would be better not to table them. I would have no objection to my hon. friend making them available to Members of his caucus. I would do the same for Members of my caucus.

Mr. Huntington: The point that I am raising, and not belabouring, is that as we came through these amendments and the explanations being given to me, because it is a technical subject, the draft regulations were made available to me. It is on the basis of the information that I have been given and the form in which it was presented, respecting the fact that it is in draft form only, that we are able to move through this type of legislation rather quickly. What happens if the regulations that I was given to consider are changed dramatically? I do not know. That is a point which I think I am entitled to be covered on. I would accept the regulations being gazetted or something so that they do become public and we do know what applies here.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I want to assure my hon. friend that the purpose will not be changed except that, as I have said—and I had not realized this when I first commented in response to my hon. friend's question—they have not yet been examined for the purpose of seeing if they comply with the statutory instruments law. Of course, they will be formally gazetted in order to be finally approved. I wonder if he will accept my assurance that, subject to meeting the requirements of the statutory instruments law, it is my intention to ensure that the intent and the purpose as set out in the draft will be maintained and continued?

Mr. Huntington: Of course I would be pleased to, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the first amendment proposed by the Minister to Clause 6 carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

Financial Administration Act

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the second amendment as proposed by the Minister to Clause 6 carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 6 as twice amended carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

On Clause 7—*Vote can authorize spending*

Mr. Gray: If you are calling Clause 7, Mr. Chairman, here again we are requesting that it be deleted. The reason is that the proposed amendment was intended to make it specific that Parliament could authorize the respending of revenue, something known as net voting, through the wording of the Appropriation Act. The Auditor General has recommended that this clause be dropped because of his view that in principle the practice of net voting should not be carried out. We are happy to accept the views of the Auditor General at this time and delete the provision in question.

Mr. Huntington: I will support the deletion of it although I think we should recognize that the Comptroller General thinks that it is a good management tool but that the control regime is poor. I would agreed that the clause be deleted.

The Deputy Chairman: It is moved by the Minister, and seconded by the Hon. Member for Capilano, that Clause 7 be deleted. Is that agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 7 deleted.

On Clause 8—*Authority for guarantee*

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, a word of explanation about Clause 8. The change in question is being made as a result of the Speaker's ruling on legislating through the Estimates. Section 22 of the Financial Administration Act makes reference to the authority of Parliament to authorize loan guarantees. It has been suggested that such authority must be obtained by an "Act of Parliament" other than the appropriation procedure, which should be used only to obtain funds for programs otherwise approved. Because such guarantees are financial in nature and closely relate to the process whereby funds are provided, the appropriation procedure is in fact an appropriate vehicle for obtaining the necessary parliamentary authority. It is proposed, therefore, that language be added to Section 22, which makes it explicit that such authority can be obtained through an Appropriation Act as well as other legislation. There is no further amendment here, Mr. Chairman. I am just offering an explanation for the clause which you have just called. If there are no other comments by Hon. Members I would respectfully request that the clause be carried.

Mr. Huntington: I think we are making giant steps forward here in overcoming concerns that we have debated many times

in the House in what some of us in the Opposition consider improper use of Estimates. I notice that the language is permissive. Clause 8 reads:

8. (1) Section 22 of the said Act is renumbered as subsection 22(1).

(2) Section 22 of the said Act is further amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(2) An authority referred to in subsection (1) may be contained in an *Appropriation Act*."

So the permissiveness there is that it can be obtained through an Appropriation Act as well as other legislation. I guess the permissiveness that I was concerned about, as a result of the Ministers' explaining it, gives them either one of two routes in which to go. I have no further objection.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 8 carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 8 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Before I recognize the Hon. the President of the Treasury Board I have to advise Hon. Members about the proceedings on adjournment motion which may, due to a House order made earlier, in fact come up earlier than six o'clock. I want to give Hon. Members time to know they are on the list. To do that I have to move back.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie)—Public Works—National Arts Centre—Responsibility for structural defects. (b) Request that Minister launch inquiry; The Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster)—Customs and Excise—Establishment of duty-free shops in Ontario; The Hon. Member for Erie (Mr. Fretz)—Customs and Excise—Establishment of duty-free stores in Ontario.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-96, to amend the Financial Administration Act—Mr. Gray—Mr. Blaker in the Chair.

On Clause 9—*Control of commitments*

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 9 carry. I see that there is possibly an amendment.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, the amendment as printed in the Bill before us would authorize the Treasury Board to prescribe the manner in which every Department shall control its financial commitments. The motion I intend to move would make it clear that there is to be no weakening of the legislative requirements for commitment control. Rather, the change is to permit flexibility in the choice and methodology used to achieve the objective of controlling appropriation authorities. The text is available to the Chair and Hon. Members, and if they would permit, I would not read it all out, but I would be happy to do so.

[*Editor's Note: The amendment referred to above is as follows:*]

That clause 9 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out lines 30 to 32 on page 4 and substituting the following:

Control of commitments — "25. (1) No contract or other arrangement providing for a payment shall be entered into with respect to any program for which there is an appropriation by Parliament or an item included in estimates then before the House of Commons to which the payment will be charged unless there is a sufficient unencumbered balance available out of the appropriation or item to discharge any debt that, under the contract or other arrangement, will be incurred during the fiscal year in which the contract or other arrangement is entered into.

Record of commitments — (2) The deputy head or other person charged with the administration of a program for which there is an appropriation by Parliament or an item included in estimates then before the House of Commons shall, as the Treasury Board may prescribe, establish procedures and maintain records respecting the control of financial commitments chargeable to each such appropriation or item."

Mr. Gray: Then I agree.

The Deputy Chairman: Will the amendment to Clause 9 carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 9 as amended carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed

Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.

On Clause 10—*Lapsing of appropriation*

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 10 carry?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, this clause also requires an amendment. First of all the clause as called by you would provide for the charging of debts that remain unpaid at the end of the fiscal year and would authorize the discharge of any such debt that is not in excess of the appropriation. The amending motion I want to present to the committee would make it clear that this provision is only to require that all debts incurred be recorded and does not permit payments to be made in excess of appropriation authority.

• (1610)

[*Editor's Note: The amendment referred to above is as follows:*]

That clause 10 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out lines 35 to 46 on page 4 and lines 1 to 30 on page 5 and substituting the following:

Lapsing of appropriation

"30. The balance of an appropriation granted for a fiscal year that remains unexpended at the end of the fiscal year shall lapse, except that,

(*a*) a debt incurred for work performed, goods received or services rendered prior to the end of the fiscal year or incurred under any other contractual arrangement prior to the end of the fiscal year that remains unpaid at the end of the fiscal year shall be recorded as an expenditure against the appropriation; and

(*b*) at any time during the following fiscal year, or during such shorter period as the Treasury Board may direct, a payment may be made for the purpose of discharging any debt referred to in paragraph (*a*) that is not in excess of the appropriation."

Mr. Gray: Perhaps my hon. friend would care to comment and respond, if necessary.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very good amendment to the original draft. What we are dealing with, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, is an item that has been of concern to the Auditor General for some time. We are really addressing item 15.14 in the 1982 Auditor General's Report. It is very encouraging for some of us who have been working on that committee over the years finally to see results of reports from the Standing Committee on Public Accounts to the House being acted upon. I think you can see by the technical nature of the Bill that it does take some time to get this in place, and we are making very good progress. There must be smiles on some of the faces over in the Auditor General's office.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment to Clause 10 carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

Clause 10, as amended, agreed to.

On Clause 11—*Accountable advances*

Mr. Gray: A brief word of explanation, Mr. Chairman. This amendment would expand the Treasury Board regulation-making powers concerning accountable advances and would permit recoveries to be made for moneys payable to the estate of persons to whom advances are made.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but ask the President of the Treasury Board, when he talks about advances—I just have to, it is the devil in me—whether this does not cover those $25 million advances to operations like CN Marine?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that these cover such things as travel and relocation advances to officials required because of their work and not the kinds of advances my hon. friend is talking about.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the President of the Treasury Board whether he intends to bring forward some more amendments that might tighten up the type of abuse in the type of advance that CNR made to CN Marine?

Mr. Gray: I am always ready to study and consider suggestions made by my hon. friend as well as those of the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor General, Mr. Chairman. I would be so delighted with my hon. friend's help to have this series of amendments on the books that while I would be happy to begin another set of preparations for further changes, I would have to work on that once we have this out of the way. I would be happy to consider other amendments.

Mr. Huntington: What you are watching here, Mr. Chairman, is the type of a political environment that operates in the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. Again, I have to compliment the President of the Treasury Board on providing me with a draft of proposed new regulations for this section. As a Member of the Opposition carrying on tasks that do not bring much in the way of political marks, it certainly helps one to understand and get an in-depth understanding and knowledge of how things are going to operate. I am assuming that once the legislation is through and the proposed new regulations are finalized by the Department of Justice they will be gazetted in the normal process and there is no variance really from the intent of the draft.

Mr. Gray: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 11 carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 11 agreed to.

On Clause 12—*Refunds and repayments*

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, here too we have to offer an amendment to the Bill before us. First, the amendment to the Bill before us would confine the applicability of Section 32 to such classes of refunds and repayments as the Treasury Board may designate. The object of the motion that I want to move is to specify in law rather than through Treasury Board directive

the classes of refunds and repayments that may be credited to the vote.

[*Editor's Note: The amendment referred to above is as follows:*]

That clause 12 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out lines 10 to 17 on page 6 and substituting the following:

"32. Subject to such directions as the Treasury Board may make, any amount received as a refund or repayment of an expenditure or advance or as an overpayment or a price adjustment on a payment shall be credited to the appropriation against which the expenditure or advance, or the payment, as the case may be, was charged."

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, the President of the Treasury Board and I understand it, but I am not too sure how many others in the House do. But in bringing it down to a few words, if it is owed it must be recorded. Is that what we are doing?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I am advised it is actually the reverse to my hon. friend's statement. If the Government buys a typewriter and sends it back and there is a credit for it, we have to be able to record that appropriately.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment to Clause 12 carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

Clause 12, as amended, agreed to.

On Clause 13—*The raising of loans*

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, again I want to propose an amendment. First, to explain the object of the amendment in the Bill before us, it would enable the Minister of Finance, on the authorization of the Governor in Council, to determine the effective rate of interest of securities and to reduce the amount should circumstances warrant. The amendment would also authorize the Minister to increase the rate of interest or the yield to maturity of securities.

The purpose of the motion I am going to move is to provide more flexibility in connection with the raising of money by way of loans for the issue of securities. Authorization for the Governor in Council to delegate certain matters to the Minister or his officials is provided. The changes are intended to permit the Government to tailor security issues to meet up to the moment changes in market conditions.

[*Editor's Note: The amendment referred to is as follows:*]

That clause 13 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out lines 20 to 41 on page 6 and substituting the following:

"37. Where by this or any other Act of Parliament authority is given to raise money, by or on behalf of Her Majesty, by way of loan or by the issue and sale of securities, the Governor in Council may, subject to the Act authorizing the raising of such money,

(*a*) authorize the raising of all or part of that money by the issue and sale of treasury bills or treasury notes and authorize the Minister or such officer of the Department of Finance as may be designated by the Minister,

(i) to determine the date of the issue and the date of maturity thereof, the rate of interest thereon, if any, and the dates of payment of interest, if any,

(ii) to sell any of such bills or notes for such price or prices and on such terms and conditions as the Minister from time to time considers necessary, and

(iii) subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may specify, to enter into such contracts or agreements relating to the issue and sale of those bills or notes on such terms and conditions as the Minister or such officer of the Department of Finance designated by the Minister considers necessary; or

(*b*) authorize the Minister, or such officer of the Department of Finance as may be designated by the Minister,

(i) subject to such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may specify, to enter into such contracts or agreements relating to the raising of the money on such terms and conditions as the Minister or such officer of the Department of Finance designated by the Minister considers necessary,

(ii) to raise all or part of that money by the issue and sale of securities other than treasury bills or treasury notes,

(iii) to issue and sell such securities in a principal amount not exceeding an amount authorized by the Governor in Council,

(iv) to determine the rate or rates of interest, not exceeding the maximum rate or rates of interest authorized by the Governor in Council, payable in respect of such securities,

(v) to determine the date, not later than the date authorized by the Governor in Council, on which the principal amount specified in such securities is payable, and

(vi) to sell such securities

(A) for such price or prices, not less than the minimum price or prices authorized by the Governor in Council, and

(B) on such other terms and conditions as the Minister or such officer of the Department of Finance designated by the Minister considers necessary."

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, in accepting this method of expediting technical language in a long amendment, I understand that we are giving the Minister of Finance more flexibility to act on foreign market transactions and that it is going to lead to a better, more efficient management. I have to ask through you, Mr. Chairman, if the President of the Treasury Board, who is the watchdog of the federal system for the taxpayer, has any concerns about abuses that might occur as a result of the wording in this? I have to rely totally on the very able technicians in Treasury Board. I am prepared to give the nod to this on behalf of my Party, if it is mechanics to make possible better management, but I would not want to think that I was just giving a careless nod to something which would open loopholes and be open to abuse.

● (1620)

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I do not think even the most partisan opponents of my hon. friend would try to argue that he was doing anything carelessly, especially not in this committee.

I am happy to assure him that I have not received any information, nor have I reached any conclusions, which would lead me to believe that this could lead to any abuses. In fact, it is my view that this would lead to better management of the Government's borrowing process, enabling the Government to get perhaps better terms and conditions by being able to respond quickly to market changes. Frankly, therefore it might be of some savings to taxpayers. To have this result, we have to be able to speed up the process somewhat, and this is the purpose. I think it is very much in line with the over-all

objectives of my hon. friend of getting better value for taxpayers' dollars.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

Clause, 13 as amended, agreed to.

On Clause 14—*Temporary Loans*

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, again I have to say that I will present an amendment. First of all, the amendment as originally printed would authorize the Minister of Finance to determine the effective rate of borrowings under Section 39. The motion in question, which I will move, involves changes consequential to changes to Clause 13 covering Section 37. The amendment would make Section 39 consistent with Section 37 and would permit foreign debt operations, such as the sale by auction of securities where the effective price is set after the Governor in Council has approved the other terms and conditions.

Therefore I move:

That Clause 14 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out lines 3 to 7 on page 7 and substituting the following:

"may authorize the Minister to borrow, for a period not exceeding six"

As I said, that is to be inserted in the spot indicated.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, we agree to that amendment to Section 39. As an aside, may I just say that the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West, who usually sits in front of me, fears being shown on camera and is totally embarrassed at my behaviour in dealing so amicably with the President of the Treasury Board on a piece of legislation of this simplicity.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I have a second amendment with respect to Clause 14 to move at the request of the Department of Finance. I have already indicated that the proposed new Section 39.1 would enable money to be borrowed and repaid in a currency other than that of Canada. Also it would authorize the repayment of amounts exceeding amounts authorized where they are to be repaid in foreign currencies. The amendment I want to present would clarify and improve the original wording. Therefore, I move:

That clause 14 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out lines 13 to 27 on page 7 and substituting the following:

"39.1 (1) Any amounts raised by way of loan under the authority of this or any other Act of Parliament in the currency or currencies of any country or countries may be repaid in the currency or currencies of any country or countries and securities issued under the authority of this or any other Act of Parliament in the currency or currencies of any country or countries may be made payable in the currency or currencies of any country or countries.

(2) Every Act of Parliament heretofore or hereafter passed that authorizes the borrowing or the raising of money by way of

(*a*) the loan of a specific or maximum number of dollars,

(*b*) the issue of securities for a specific or maximum number of dollars in principal amount, or

(*c*) the guaranteeing of the payment of a liability or obligation for a specific or maximum number of dollars,

shall be deemed to authorize the borrowing, in whole or in part, of an equivalent amount, the issue of securities, in whole or in part, of an equivalent principal amount or the guaranteeing, in whole or in part, of an equivalent amount in the currency of any country other than Canada, calculated in each case using the value thereof and the rate of exchange between the Canadian dollar and the currency concerned as quoted by the Bank of Canada at the opening of business on the day immediately preceding the day the money is borrowed, the proceeds from the issue of securities are received or the guarantee is given, as the case may be.

(3) For the purpose of any limitation in respect of an amount

(*a*) that may be borrowed.

(*b*) for which securities may be issued, or

(*c*) the payment of which may be guaranteed under this or any other Act of Parliament,

the principal amount borrowed or authorized to be borrowed, the principal amount of any securities previously issued or authorized to be issued or the amount guaranteed or authorized to be guaranteed, as the case may be, payable in a currency of any country other than Canada, shall be deemed to be the Canadian dollar equivalent of the value thereof, as calculated under subsection (2), regardless of any premium or discount at which the securities were sold and regardless of any premium that may be payable on early redemption."

Mr. Huntington: I understand that what we are doing is empowering the Minister of Finance to use an exchange rate at the time a loan is made or at the time it is paid. Could the President of the Treasury Board help me with that and give some clarity as to what the amendment does? Also, does it extend to the guarantee authorities of Crown corporations?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the period when the loan is made. I hope that that is the information my hon. friend is seeking.

Mr. Huntington: What we have amended it to cover is cases when the loan is made.

Mr. Gray: Yes.

Mr. Huntington: Does it apply to guarantees of loans made from Crown corporations?

Mr. Gray: I am advised that it covers the matter of guarantees of loans by Crown corporations.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

Clause 14 as amended, agreed to.

On Clause 15—

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, this clause would deem money paid to an authorization agent or deducted from salary to be money held in trust for Her Majesty for all purposes. At present, such money is deemed to be held in trust by Her Majesty for the purposes of the Bankruptcy Act and the winding up Act.

Mr. Huntington: Are we involved here with Canada Savings Bonds deductions as a first claim in trust?

Mr. Gray: Yes, that is a case which this clause would cover.

Mr. Huntington: In other words, if a corporation which has been taking payroll deductions from employees for the purchase of Canada Savings Bonds went into receivership, the Crown would have a first claim on those funds to protect the employees purchasing that Crown instrument?

Mr. Gray: That is correct.

Mr. Huntington: What has been the experience of the Government in this area? Have employees in the past either lost substantial sums of money, or has the Crown in its benevolence seen fit to make such a tragic event good?

Mr. Gray: I am unable to give an exact quantification, but I am told there have been cases in the past where the Government has had to accept liability because such funds had not been accounted for. Although I am unable to give an exact figure or an exact number of cases, we feel this has happened often enough to require this kind of amendment.

Mr. Huntington: Was there an involvement of this in the pension plan of White Motor Company?

Mr. Gray: I do not have that information, but I would be happy to seek it and provide it to my hon. friend.

Mr. Huntington: I do not think I will ask the President of the Treasury Board to do that, but I might say that what we are giving here is a protection to employees in organizations which are making payments into instruments such as Canada Savings Bonds. It is my understanding that the pension payments which the employees of white Motor Company made in the United States were lost to those employees in the collapse of that company. Therefore, it is a serious issue that we are addressing.

• (1630)

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about items that do not qualify as Government securities. I will be happy to join my hon. friend in seeking further clarification of the interesting point he has raised.

Clause 15 agreed to.

On Clause 16—*Form of register*

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, very briefly, the object of the amendment as printed in the Bill before us, and it is one requested by the Department of Finance, is something that is consequential on proposed Subclause (2). Proposed subclause (2) is to expand the meaning of the word "register".

Perhaps I can give a further word of explanation. I may have been a little too brief. This is a minor change. It is one that recognizes that we have gone from the quill pen to the computer age and that the register of Government securities may be in a photograph film form or maintained by any system, mechanical, electronic or computerized data processing.

This is what we are trying to recognize here. I gather that without this amendment the Act would not encompass the need to maintain a register of Government securities through the up to date forms of record keeping, including computer.

Clause 16 agreed to.

On Clause 17—

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, again I have to offer the following amendment:

That Clause 17 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out line 27 on page 8 and substituting the following:

"required to present fairly the".

Let me explain the purpose of the clause as it appears in the Bill before us. The motion would add certain underlined words. The motion would provide wording consistent with the Auditor General's Act, substituting the words "required to present fairly the" for the words "required to give a true and fair view".

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I understand that this brings the Bill into conformity with generally accepted audit standards, and we agree.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

Clause 17, as amended, agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: I understand that an Hon. Member may seek the floor for permission to revert to Clause 10 for a moment for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. Towers: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could have unanimous consent of the House to revert to Clause 10 for a question?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

On Clause 10—*Lapsing of appropriation*

Mr. Towers: Mr. Chairman, I was rather startled when the Minister spoke on Clause 10, the sixth paragraph of which refers to:

—in whole or in part, of an equivalent amount . . . in the currency of any country other than Canada, calculated in each case using the value thereof and the rate of exchange between the Canadian dollar and the currency concerned as quoted by the Bank of Canada at the opening of business on the day immediately preceding the day the money is borrowed, the proceeds from the issue of securities are received or the guarantee is given, as the case may be—

It goes on, in Subclause (*c*):

The principal amount borrowed or authorized to be borrowed, the principal amount of any securities previously issued or authorized to be issued or the amount guaranteed or authorized to be guaranteed, as the case may be, payable in a currency of any country other than Canada, shall be deemed to be the Canadian dollar equivalent of the value thereof as calculated under subsection (2), regardless of any premium or discount at which the securities were sold and regardless of any premium that may be payable on early redemption—

My question to the Minister is based on an experience in the Canadian Wheat Board. I apologize for being late in asking the question. In the answer to my colleague from Capilano, the Minister mentioned that this refers to Crown corporations. The experience in the Canadian Wheat Board was that the Government of Canada guaranteed a loan for the sale of grain to a foreign country. The deal was made in sterling. As a result of the devaluation of sterling at that time, the western grain producer lost millions of dollars. The cost was underwritten by the grain producer. Could the same thing happen in this case, or would the Government of Canada be responsible for any loss as a result of a devaluation in currency?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, this would not cause us as a Government to underwrite foreign exchange losses of corporations of the kind my hon. friend has mentioned. The clause

would come into play only where we have to make a calculation to determine whether the limit that Parliament has authorized to guarantee has been reached. In other words, there are occasions, as we know, when Parliament legislates a limit on the amount the federal Government can guarantee with respect to borrowings of a Crown corporation. We must have a way of making calculations as to when that limit has been reached. This is where the clause would come into play. It would not create any general obligation to underwrite exchange losses.

Mr. Towers: Mr. Chairman, if an agreement was entered into by the Canadian Wheat Board or any other Crown corporation on the basis of Canadian currency, if payment was to be made in the currency of another country and if there was a devaluation of that currency, somebody would take a loss. If the Government enters into an agreement with a Crown corporation, somebody will have to take the loss. Another illustration was the Candu sale by AECL to Argentina. At that time there was a tremendous loss because of devaluation of the Argentine currency. Therefore, could I have some clarification of that?

● (1640)

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a situation in which the Government may be called upon to honour a guarantee it has made to a Crown corporation of a loan denominated in a foreign currency. I am informed, and I do not claim any deep expertise in these matters, that if the Government is called upon to honour its guarantee and the loan is one denominated in a foreign currency, then the Government must pay that amount in that foreign currency as of the date the loan is entered into. That is my understanding of the situation and I hope I have grasped it in response to my hon. friend's question.

On Clause 18—*Submission of Public Accounts to Parliament*

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 18 carry?

Mr. Gray: Clause 18 deals with the submission of public accounts to Parliament. The amendment to Section 55(1) would substitute the President of the Treasury Board for the Minister of Finance and the amendment to Section 55(2) would have the Minister of Finance share his responsibilities for the form and content of the Public Accounts with the President of the Treasury Board.

The amendment would also take into account that fact that the Auditor General of Canada no longer certifies statements. The amendment I wish to offer would bring about a technical improvement to wording and provide a regulatory authority within which the Receiver General of Canada can issue demands for information. Therefore, I move:

That Clause 18 of Bill C-96 be amended

(*a*) by striking out lines 3 and 4 on page 9 and substituting the following:

"(iii) such of the assets and liabilities of Canada as, in the opinion of the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister, are required to show the financial position of Canada as at the termination of the"

(*b*) by striking out lines 10 to 12 on page 9 and substituting the following:

"(*d*) such other accounts and information relating to the fiscal year as are deemed necessary by the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister to present fairly the financial transactions and the financial position of Canada or as"

(*c*) by striking out line 19 on page 9 and substituting the following:

"General may, from time to time, subject to such regulations as the Treasury Board may make, send a"

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the President of the Treasury Board if this clause as amended gives greater precision to the financial statements of Canada and if the assets and liabilities are stated accurately? Does it remove the games that we have been playing whereby we have carried as assets loans we know we will not collect? Does it clean up those types of concerns of the Auditor General? Perhaps I could help the President of the Treasury Board by asking him if we could expect from the system a more accurate reporting within the financial statements of Canada as a result of the amended Clause 18.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, the amended Clause 18 gives the President of the Treasury Board a greater role to play in the compilation and submission of the public accounts than is the case at present, and it also gives him a greater role to play with respect to the form of the public accounts.

I understand that this clause is one which the Auditor General would like to see incorporated into the Act. It does not of itself eliminate the areas of difference of opinion between the Auditor General and the Government as to the form of the public accounts, but it does give us a more ready vehicle for dealing with these issues once such things as the multiyear study of the comptroller General, which is being undertaken at the request of the Public Accounts Committee, into the issues raised by the Auditor General about the form of the accounts are completed.

I must say that I found it a bit odd that at the present time, the role of the Secretary of the Treasury Board with respect to the compilation and submission of public accounts is, at least technically, not particularly formal. This amendment helps to remedy that omission and gives the President of the Treasury Board a role to play when dealing with the kinds of issues which my hon. friend has raised and which he at present technically or formally does not have.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, we on this side are very pleased to see that these powers will be granted to the President of the Treasury Board because it cleans up a whole area of no-man's land. Could I ask the incumbent President of the Treasury Board if, with his new powers, he will clean up the condition of the balance sheet of Canada? Will he address the concerns of the Public Accounts Committee and the Auditor General of Canada by removing those assets which we cannot collect from the financial statements? Will he tidy up that condition which continues to be a concern? I hope that he will be able to commit himself to that action in front of the committee now that he will have these powers.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I do not think it would be prudent for me to act on this matter until the studies requested by the Public Accounts Committee which are being carried out by the Comptroller General have been completed. One of these studies involves co-operative action with the Institute of Chartered Accountants.

As I see it, one of the problems is that, unlike for the private sector, there are no generally accepted accounting standards with respect to statements of governments. The public accounts of Canada so far have been prepared for the purpose of complying with the legislative authority conveyed by Parliament.

There are other issues to which my hon. friend is alluding. One issue to which he has not alluded is that not only would one have to consider whether certain things should not be recorded as assets but whether certain assets that are not recorded at all should now begin to be recorded in the public accounts. An example of that would be the gold reserves of the federal Government which have a value in the area of $10 billion.

This is an issue to which I am addressing myself. I hope to use that authority to help find some mutually satisfactory solutions to the issues raised by the Auditor General. However, I think it would be prudent for me to await further progress with respect to the studies which the Public Accounts Committee has requested the Comptroller General to undertake in this matter.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 18 as amended carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 18, as amended agreed to.

On Clause 19—*Auditor General of Canada eligible*

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 19 carry?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, we have an amendment here which is consequential to the amendment proposed in Clause 2(1). I wish to offer an amendment which provides a technical change in wording. I move:

That Clause 19 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out lines 32 and 33 on page 9 and substituting the following:

Auditor General of Canada eligible — "(2) Notwithstanding any other Act, the Auditor General of"

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, I am again wondering if the President of the Treasury Board could explain this consequential amendment. Just what are we doing? Could he explain that for me because I do not quite understand it?

• (1650)

Mr. Gray: I gather we are removing the words "of Canada" after the words "Auditor General" and we are removing the words "of Parliament" after the words "Act". I presume that the removal of the words "of Parliament" is being done because we are only in this Chamber talking about Acts of Parliament.

Second, with respect to the deletion of the words "of Canada", I gather that is meant to reflect a more accurate statement of the Auditor General's title.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 19 as amended carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 19, as amended, agreed to.

On Clause 20—*Bank accounts*

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I will ask the committee to agree to delete this clause. The reason is that this clause was included in Bill C-126, which was passed on August 4, 1982, regarding which there has already been some reference made.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 20 be deleted?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 20 deleted.

On Clause 21—*Proceedings where notice not complied with*

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, this clause would replace the 5 per cent interest rate in question by a rate fixed by the Minister and would clarify the provision. In Section 89, the Receiver General is able to charge interest at a rate of 5 per cent per annum on all accounts when, in the opinion of the Receiver General, public money has been withheld. This rate is not appropriate in current circumstances and could lead to a debtor deciding to let a debt stand and pay 5 per cent interest rather than to liquidate the debt to the Crown.

We are proposing to amend the section to make it more flexible so that the interest rate would be set from time to time by the Minister of Finance, with the approval of the Governor in Council, and would not be fixed by the Act.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 21 carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 21 agreed to.

On Clause 22—*Liability for loss*

Mr. Gray: The purpose of this clause would be to reduce the degree of care involved here from gross negligence to negligence. Section 91 provides for the situation where, through malfeasance, wilful neglect of duty or gross negligence, public

money that should have been collected has not been collected, and holds the person responsible to be accountable for the money in just the same manner as he would have been accountable had he actually collected and received it.

The responsible person can then be required to compensate Her Majesty under the terms of Section 89. In some cases where it has been necessary to consider taking such recovery action, lawyers of the Department of Justice handling the matter have had difficulty with the expression "negligence". This phrase, referring as it does to a high degree of carelessness, thus enables any claim of gross negligence to be disputed as to whether it was in fact gross or simple negligence.

This virtually leaves the Crown importent in negligence cases. It is proposed, on the advice of the Department of Justice, that the word "gross" be removed from the expression "gross negligence" in this section.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. Huntington: Someone else may wish to ask a question but I just have to understand this. Were we not amending Section 91.1(*b*), changing the word "authorizing" to "respecting"? Are we dealing with Clause 22?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, there is another part to Clause 22 with respect to Section 91.1. I have not come to that. I was only dealing with Section 91 itself. What we are doing with respect to the Act is repealing the current Section 91 and substituting a whole new Section 91 for it. The main purpose of that, I am told, is to change the degree of negligence which would create the obligation in question from gross negligence to simple negligence.

If members of the committee would like, there is also an amendment to Section 91.1, which I intend to amend further. Perhaps I could deal with that right now.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, you probably sense that I am rather surprised. However, none of my working papers, nor the briefing that I had, had shown that Clause 91 was going to be amended. Therefore, I have no knowledge of what the President of the Treasury Board is doing to Section 91.

I am aware of an amendment to Section 91.1. However, I am lost.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I have inadvertently caused some misunderstanding. What I am doing as we proceed to each clause of the Bill before us is to say a few words of explanation. I am not waiting to see if Members of the committee would like an explanation.

I am not dealing with Section 91.1 yet. Perhaps I should have just kept quiet.

Mr. Huntington: You are not amending Section 91?

Mr. Gray: No, I am not.

The Deputy Chairman: The Chair has a problem, however, I am on Clause 22. My understanding is that the Minister wishes to propose an amendment with relation to Clause 22 of Bill C-96 at line 8 on page 11.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, the amendment I wish to propose is to Section 91.1, found on page 11 of the Bill. Perhaps I caused some difficulty by making some comments on the part of the Bill that was not being changed. I thought it would be helpful to the committee if I said a few words about it.

Section 91.1 is there in order to authorize the Treasury Board to make regulations respecting losses of money and public property suffered by Her Majesty. I move:

That Clause 22 of Bill C-96 be amended by striking out line 8 on page 11 and substituting the following:

"(*b*) respecting the charging of losses"

The object of the motion is to make technical changes to wording on legal advice. I would be prepared to go into all of that in further detail. Perhaps I should sit down and see whether further information is desired by the committee.

Mr. Huntington: I always appreciate knowing what is in the minds of people that give legal advice. I would appreciate an explanation.

Mr. Gray: The original clause had the word "authorizing". We are being advised to change "authorizing" to "respecting".

As I said earlier in the afternoon, perhaps if my hon. friend and I were left to our own devices we would not be dealing with this. However, we have been advised to make this change.

If I may give further comments, and my hon. friend may smile at this, I am told that the philosophy of the drafting today is not to make regulations authorizing something but respecting something, because the basic law under which the regulations are made does the authorizing. If he is smiling and shaking his head, I join with him in that.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment to Clause 22 carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 22 as amended carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 22, as amended, agreed to.

On Clause 23—

• (1700)

Mr. Gray: I am not offering a further amendment to this clause. However, if the committee likes, I can say a brief word about its purpose.

Mr. Huntington: It would be appreciated.

Mr. Gray: The purpose is to widen the scope of Paragraph 92(e) to cover offences under this Act, and the regulations as well as offences under revenue laws. It would permit the report in question to be given to any superior officer. The amendment

to that portion of section 92 following Paragraph (f) would increase the maximum fine from $500 to $5,000. Paragraph 92(e) requires any person having knowledge of a fraud against any revenue law to report the information to a superior officer, but there is no requirement for reporting beyond that superior. Since the immediate superior could be the person concerned in a fraud, it is proposed that this be amended to read "any superior officer" and adds words to require further reporting in accordance with the regulations to be made under the proposed Clause 91(1).

It is also proposed that the scope of this subsection presently confined to offences under the revenue laws, be widened to include offences under the Financial Administration Act so as to cover frauds in the management and attainment of all public money as well as in the revenue collection process. Section 92 deals with offences by officers or other persons employed in the collection, management or disbursement of public money. The penalty has not been changed since the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act was passed in 1931, so we are simply updating the penalty to make it more relevant in current conditions.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said "more relevant". I guess ten times since 1931 is close to being relevant.

The thing that worries me about the trend we are getting into is the size of fines. I can understand $5,000 if it is a pretax situation. There is no deductibility in the system. I certainly do not want my remarks to be taken as defending or being sympathetic to those people who play games with the law and the tax collector. But there is a grey area on the fringe where arbitrary decisions are now being made by officers of Revenue Canada. I understand they are not going to Justice for legal interpretation any more. They will charge a person, put him in court, take him through the process and use the excuse of, well, when we do that we elicit more information. The legal process in this country today is terribly expensive. When we start rubber stamping fines of $5,000, for an awful lot of people that is $10,000 of income. I assume we are dealing with after-tax dollars and I think we have to be careful about the escalation in the size of fines which I have seen pass through this House in this last Parliament.

The people with the power in the federal Government are moving in an extremely arbitrary fashion in their interpretations. Again, I am not defending those who are guilty, but I think too many innocent people are being touched by the threat of the big stick in the hands of public servants. I sense power is being abused because there is great fear among the people given the fact that officers of Revenue Canada can enter bank accounts and remove money without the person who owns the bank account even knowing about it.

I just have to put those comments on record. I would rather see this at $2,500, which would be, on average for a person in this league, $5,000 in income. I think we are getting excessive here.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I understand my hon. friend's concerns. However, this clause does not deal with the type of situation my hon. friend has been discussing. We are dealing with a fine imposed by a court. We are dealing with a maximum figure, a fine not exceeding $5,000, so the court can impose a fine of any amount up to that figure. Most important, the provision relates only to offences carried out by employees or agents of Her Majesty, officers or other persons employed in the collection, management or disbursement of public money. We are not talking about citizens who are called to account by the Department of National Revenue. That involves another statute and another enforcement procedure. We are talking about public officials responsible for the collection, management or disbursement of public money who are not acting in a lawful manner.

My hon. friend may want to reflect on the views he has stated and he may then want to agree with me that while his comments are very important and relevant with respect to private individuals, the argument for a maximum possible $5,000 fine in the circumstances to which the clause applies may have a salutary effect in making sure people carry out their duties as public employees.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, on reflection, I will do as the Minister suggests. I have to admit that I was bootlegging in a concern I have with regards to the increasing use of arbitrary powers on the part of public servants.

Clause 23 agreed to.

On Clause 24—*Deduction and set-off*

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 24 carry?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, this amendment would merge Subsections 95(1) and (3) into the proposed Clause 95(1). It would also eliminate the need for an opinion by the Minister of Justice as to whether a person is indebted to Her Majesty, and would authorize the appropriate Minister to make deductions and set-offs. Subsection 95(2) would appear as the proposed Subclause 95(3) and Subsection 95(4) would appear as the proposed Subclause 95(2), and the proposed Subclause 95(4) is a new one.

I can give further detail but I will pause at this point to see what the wishes of my colleagues are in this regard.

Mr. Huntington: We would appreciate further detail, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, Subsection 95(1) of the Financial Administration Act authorizes the deduction or set-off of debts due the Crown against any sum of money due or payable by Her Majesty to such persons. It requires, however, that prior to exercising the set-off procedure the Department obtain an opinion from the Department of Justice that the person is indebted to Her Majesty in the specific sum and the authority of the Treasury Board to make set-off by submission to the Board.

Prior to April, 1979, an opinion concerning the amount of indebtedness of a person to Her Majesty was always provided by the legal services of the Treasury Board itself, but because of the volume, over 200 submissions per year, this responsibility was centralized with legal officers in the Department. Experience has shown that the majority of set-offs are related to the collection of money pursuant to statutes such as the Income Tax Act, the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Student Loans Act. Because of the statutory nature of such debts the amount of such debts to the Crown, whether caused by default or as the result of overpayments, are not in question and legal opinions concerning them have been based on figures provided by officers of the Department. Consequently, the Department of Justice considers that in the case of statutory debts a legal opinion concerning the amount due is not necessary.

● (1710)

Subsection 95(1) has been in effect since the Financial Administration Act came into existence in 1951. During the period the section has been in effect, a number of court cases challenging the Government's right to set off have resulted in judgments which have upheld that the Government has a common right to make set-offs. Therefore, the Department of Justice considers that the approval of the Treasury Board is superfluous and can be eliminated without detriment. This opinion is based on the judgment in the Federal Court of Appeal which stated that the only purpose of the Treasury Board approval is to provide a mechanism for the set-off of moneys.

As a result, we propose that Section 95(1) be amended to eliminate the necessity of a legal opinion concerning the amount of statutory debts. I would like to note that a legal opinion will continue to be required to establish the amount of a debt relating to non-statutory obligations, for example, contractual obligations to pay the Crown. Also, the amendment would discontinue the requirement to obtain approval of the Treasury Board prior to set-off. Under this proposal, the appropriate Minister will have the authority to require a set-off in the same manner as was recently proposed in the Income Tax Act.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 24 carry?

Mr. Huntington: Agreed.

Clause 24 agreed to.

On Clause 25—*Proof of Treasury Board records*

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, this clause is simply to add the title underlined in the amendment. That is not a new amendment I am offering now but rather the amendment printed in the Bill. The titles underlined are Deputy Secretary, Comptroller General of Canada, Deputy Comptroller General of Canada and Assistant Comptroller General of Canada. I suppose it reflects changes in organization since the Act was last amended, including the creation of the office of Comptroller General.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 25 carry?

Mr. Huntington: Agreed.

Clause 25 agreed to.

On Clause 26—*Repeal*

Mr. Huntington: I would like an explanation of this clause. I am having a little trouble with it.

Mr. Gray: I could say simply that it is consequential on the amendment proposed in Clause 22, but I will go on at greater length. Part XI, Civil Liability and Offences, contains several sections concerning action to be taken when money has not been collected or properly accounted for and offences result in losses to the Crown. Part XII, Miscellaneous, Section 96 in the Act, deals with the public officers' guarantee account which was established as an indemnity fund to compensate for losses arising from any defalcations of public officers. In recent years the wording of the various sections has led to uncertainty as to the action which should be taken and losses incurred. Furthermore, there are precise requirements for taking action and reporting losses where public officers are concerned and while no equivalent requirement exists applying to losses where other persons are concerned. This leads to the latter class of losses being largely ignored in the reporting process. A study into the subject of losses of public money and property has led to the proposal that there should be one comprehensive policy for action to be taken to cover all types of losses, whether caused by public officers or by others, and whether arising for a defalcation or otherwise.

When the Act first became effective in 1952, Section 98 created the public officers' guarantee account and authorized the transfer thereto of the balance remaining in the former Government employees' guarantee fund, which has been in place since 1936, as a means of self-insurance against losses caused by defalcation by public officers. It was funded by premiums levied on and paid from appropriation moneys in respect of all employees handling or managing public moneys. Prior to 1936, it was the practice for Departments to pay premiums on bonds of indemnity which bonded Government employees, the requirement for bonding having been established August 20, 1869. I do not think there is anybody in the House who would recall that. The sums transferred from the former fund to the public officers' guarantee account in 1952 was $657,000.

Section 98 enables the Treasury Board by regulation to levy premiums on Departments to be paid into the account. No such levies have been made during the life of the account. The amount deposited originally plus repayments and restitution made by defalcating officers have been sufficient to meet all claims authorized by the Treasury Board. The lack of any need to levy premiums on Departments over the last 25 years has removed all sense of the account as a bonding mechanism. It has had the effect of reducing the self-insurance aspect virtually to the same self-insurance situation as applies in the case of other losses such as fire losses.

We therefore submit the use of the public officers' guarantee account can be dispensed with. Consequent upon the proposal to abolish the use of the public officers' guarantee account it becomes necessary to make provisions for the disposal of any such balance as may remain in the account on the day on which the proposed amendments to the Act become effective. It is proposed that the clause be included in the Bill for a transitional provision to provide for such balance as remains in the public officers' guarantee account on the coming into force of the amended Act and such sums as may be recovered subsequently against payments made previously from the account to be credited to revenue.

I hope this will assist my hon. friend. In essence, the old Clause 98 has been replaced with the new expanded Clause 91(1) which was agreed to under Clause 22.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, if we had had that last note first we would have avoided putting the Minister through that long reading. I have an understanding of that now.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 26 carry?

Mr. Huntington: Agreed.

Clause 26 agreed to.

On Clause 27—*Interdepartmental charges*

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the committee to delete this clause. We have received legal advice that the proposed amendment is unecessary. The legal advice is that the Treasury Board already has the authority to issue policy on charging for services between government Departments.

We also want to delete the second part of Clause 27. It was intended to enable the payment of interest to suppliers on overdue accounts. It was later considered preferable to include the specific terms and conditions in the applicable contracts rather than to seek a general legislative provision. You may recall that I announced on behalf of the Government a policy to pay interest on overdue accounts some months ago. It is now in operation. It arises out of the insertion of the appropriate conditions in the contracts in question, therefore making a legislative change unnecessary.

The Deputy Chairman: The Minister moves to delete Clause 27.

Mr. Huntington: Agreed.

Clause 27 deleted.

On Clause 28—*Transitions*

Mr. Gray: Finally, Mr. Chairman, I move:

That Bill C-96 be amended by adding, immediately after line 40 on page 14, the following:

"Consequential Amendments

1976-77, c. 34 25. Section 6 of the *Auditor General Act* is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

Idem "6. The Auditor General shall examine the several financial statements required by section 55 of the *Financial Administration Act* to be included in the Public Accounts, and any other statement that the President of the Treasury Board or the Minister of Finance may present for audit and shall express his opinion as to whether they present fairly information in accordance with stated accounting policies of the federal government and on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year together with any reservations he may have." "

This is consequential in changes to Sections 54 and 55 found in Clauses 17 and 18.

The Deputy Chairman: The House has heard the amendment proposed by the Minister.

Mr. Huntington: I am wondering if we could just have a few words as to what this amendment does. Does it close out the Public Officers Guarantee Act, or have we done that? Is this closing it out, as you previously said?

• (1720)

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, yes, the first part of Clause 28 closes out the Public Officers Guarantee Act in the way I outlined perhaps at too great a length.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the amendment moved by the Minister be accepted?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Gray) agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 28, as amended, carry?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause 28, as amended, agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: The Table officers are in possession of an amendment which has not been referred to. I do not know whether it is the intention of the Minister to pursue it. The amendment relates to the Auditor General Act.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, that was the amendment to which I just referred.

The Deputy Chairman: I had not realized the Minister was putting the amendment which I have in hand which is referred to as a new clause or that he was dealing with it in Clause 28. The reason I asked whether he wanted to move that is that the Table Officers tell me the proposed amendment which deals with the Auditor General Act is not before the House and, therefore, it is out of order. However, I understand that can be cured by unanimous consent. I propose to do that. Is there unanimous consent that this amendment be placed before the House?

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Chairman, could you elaborate? The Auditor General Act is not before the House. Therefore, it cannot be amended. While we have been amending the Financial Administration Act all day, what is the difference? Could I have an explanation?

The Deputy Chairman: I would think the original Bill, the Bill before the House, did not contain a reference to the Auditor General Act. Consequently, to bring it in now by way of an amendment could be procedurally questionable. The matter could be cured if the House gives unanimous consent.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Chairman, what I am asking the committee to do is to add a clause to Bill C-96 which will have the affect of amending, as a consequence, the Auditor General Act. The purpose is to make it consistent with the Financial Administration Act to the extent that in both cases there would be reference to statements presented by the President of the Treasury Board. You will recall that earlier in the afternoon I asked that the Financial Administration Act be amended in order to confirm the role of the President of the Treasury Board in presenting and compiling the public accounts. This consequential amendment just inserts in the appropriate clause in the Auditor General Act the phrase "President of the Treasury Board" to make clear that the Auditor General's examination will cover the public accounts and any other statement that the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance shall present for audit, etc.

The Deputy Chairman: We still need the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent to bring in this amendment?

Mr. Huntington: Could I have an explanation, Mr. Chairman, before giving unanimous consent? The short title of the Act is "An Act to amend the Financial Administration Act." If that were strictly correct, do I understand it properly that it is also an Act to amend the Auditor General Act, and that would cover it?

The Deputy Chairman: A change in title will not make a difference. It is a procedural problem related to the fact that the Auditor General Act was not referred to at second reading of the first draft of the Bill. The Bill in its present shape does not refer to it. However, is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: Clause 28 as amended has been agreed to previously.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair may have a problem, or Hon. Members may have a problem. I am not sure whether the Hon. Members who are proposing to present matters in the adjournment hour are all present in the Chamber at this moment nor whether the Parliamentary Secretaries are present in order to answer. I do not have the list before me. However, under a House order made earlier we are now to call it six o'clock. My only concern is that I would not like to see Members who are on the list for the "Late Show" lose their positions.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, the two Members from our Party who are appearing in the adjournment debate tonight are present and ready to proceed. If the appropriate representatives on the part of the Government are ready, I do not think there should be any problem. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine (Mr. McKenzie), who has the first order of business, is here. The Hon. Member for Erie (Mr. Fretz), who has the third item of business, is also here. The third participant, to my recollection, is the Hon. Member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), who is a Member of the Government Party. It may be in order for us to start with the first participant, and if the Hon. Member for Algoma comes he can be placed as the third participant and bring up the rear, as it were.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It is entirely up to Hon. Members if they wish to proceed. The difficulty I am concerned is about whether or not there is a Parliamentary Secretary prepared to answer. I gather that the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans) is perhaps examining that problem now. Maybe we could give him a moment or two to see how things are going. However, I will, of course, recognize the Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine. It is his right to address the House whether or not there is someone here to give a reply.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

PUBLIC WORKS—NATIONAL ARTS CENTRE—RESPONSIBILITY FOR STRUCTURAL DEFECTS. (B) REQUEST THAT MINISTER LAUNCH INQUIRY

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine): Mr. Speaker, with the type of responses we get on the Adjournment Debate it would not be of great consequence whether or not the Parliamentary Secretary is here. It is a departmental answer which is mainly a cover-up.

On October 17, 1983, I questioned the Minister of Public Works (Mr. LeBlanc) on the structural problems of the National Arts Centre. He gave me a very incomplete answer in the House and forwarded me a letter which contained other partial information. Therefore I have a series of questions which I should like to direct to the Government or to the Parliamentary Secretary tonight with the hope of receiving some answers concerning what is happening at the National Arts Centre.

There are structural problems in the National Arts Centre. Water is leaking into the garage and maintenance shops. The source of the leakage has been found to be through the sidewalk abutting the west side of the Mackenzie King bridge, which in turn forms the roof over the mechanical room. It is leaking because of failure of the waterproofing in the expansion joint in the garage roof. Apparently responsibility for this is that of the City of Ottawa, as well as for the leaky sidewalks. The joint, which is supposed to provide give when the concrete slabs of the garage expand and contract, has been worn by vibration from OC Transpo buses running along Confederation Square. The costs are estimated to be between $285,000 and $300,000 for correction. The bridge and sidewalks are within the jurisdiction of the City of Ottawa, the National Capital Commission and the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton.

● (1730)

The Minister stated in a letter dated October 26 that it was his intention to consult with the City of Ottawa, the NCC and the Regional Municipality since the problem is in their jurisdiction. However, in an article which appeared in *The Citizen* in Ottawa on October 18, a Public Works spokesmen, Mr. Tormi Heinmaa, pointed out that the Department of Public Works wanted the Ottawa-Carleton region to pay part of the repair costs but that they were were not very responsive. He went on to indicate:

> It's between ourselves and the National Arts Centre to fund the bill.

There seems to be a little confusion here.

The Minister also stated in his letter of October 26 that he planned to consult with the City regarding these necessary repairs. However, according to *The Citizen* article of October 18, it would seem that some consultation has already taken place and that the City does not seem agreeable to funding part of these costs, as was stated. I am most interested in knowing what part of the costs is being referred to, and if the Minister was aware of the consultation which seems to have already taken place.

Has it been determined as yet who will pay for these repairs? Has the Minister made any formal request to the NCC, City of Ottawa or the Regional Municipality for payment? It was made clear by architect Alexander Topolski in a memo dated Setptember 21, 1983 to the Chief Property Manager of Public Works that if prompt action was not taken, the water penetration would cause further damage. Of course this would mean most extensive repair work and in turn would cost more money. It was further recommended that the repairs should be completed before the onset of freezing temperatures. Has the Minister seen to it that immediate remedial action be taken to ensure the cost of repairs does not expand?

The Public Works spokesman, Tormi Heinmaa, stated as well:

> Really, the workmanship in many places around the Arts Centre is not up to very good standard.

I would like the Minister or his Parliamentary Secretary to tell me why the workmanship is not up to standard. Was the building originally constructed poorly, or has it over the years been allowed to deteriorate? If the latter is the case, why has there not been regular inspections to ensure everything was maintained up to par? If the construction was poor to begin with, I believe there should be an investigation into why the workmanship was below an acceptable level. Further, it should be ascertained as to who will receive the bill for all the necessary repairs.

These are legitimate questions. I hope to receive an answer from the Government tonight as to who allowed all this sloppy workmanship at the National Arts Centre.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few details to what the Hon. Member said in his question on October 17 of this year. First of all, after a period of heavy rain last September, it was found that water was running from the ceiling of the NAC garage into the central stores and the air vents near the mechanical room.

At the request of the NAC, departmental experts immediately proceeded to investigate what caused the leak. They found that water was leaking through the sidewalk abutting the west side of the Mackenzie King bridge, which forms the roof over the NAC mechanical room.

Our Department immediately started with emergency repairs to the waterproofing of the expansion joints of the garage roof located under the sidewalk. I should point out that the entire sidewalk abutting the NAC was built fourteen years ago as part of the Mackenzie King bridge and the west side of the traffic way. Actually, the road was entirely rebuilt over the NAC garage, stores and mechanical room. Over the years, it has been very difficult to find and correct the defects, leaks and damages caused by water penetration. These problems were mainly attributed to causes such as breaks in drain pipes or the road's defective or deteriorating expansion joints and catch basins.

However, during the last two years, bus traffic has increased considerably, and it is suspected that this too has speeded up deterioration of the waterproofing membrane between the road bed and the garage roof, especially near the expansion joints in the ceiling. The sidewalk has also deteriorated as a result of normal exposure to the elements and the fact that it is constantly exposed to potential damage by increasing vehicle traffic. Furthermore, sidewalk blocks are often damaged by snow removal equipment. Together, these factors have helped create the need for maintenance and repairs. To correct the water penetration problems, our Department is now carrying out the emergency repairs I referred to earlier, at an estimated cost of about $80,000. The repairs are part of a more ambitious project now under consideration, to correct problems arising from the condition of the sidewalk along the entire south side of the NAC and the western access route towards Elgin Street, and to the north along the west side of the

building as far as the ramp at the northwest corner. Work on this project will start at the point where present repairwork is supposed to finish, which will reduce the total estimated cost by $285,000.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should point out that the NAC is responsible for maintenance and operations in the entire complex, according to the twenty-year lease currently in effect, which expires in May 1989. As the landlord, our Department provides, on demand, any professional and technical services that may be necessary. I can assure the Hon. Member that it would be useless to carry out an independent investigation of the problems at the NAC, since our professional staff, with the help of NAC personnel, is quite capable of resolving any problems that may arise.

Discussions are now taking place with the various authorities involved, namely, the National Art Centre, the National Capital Commission and the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Municipality, regarding the feasibility of sharing responsibility for and costs of these repairs.

● (1735)

[*English*]

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—ESTABLISHMENT OF DUTY-FREE SHOPS IN ONTARIO

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, on October 24 of this year I raised a question about the establishment of duty-free stores in Ontario, page 28260 of *Hansard*. The Minister's answer was unacceptable. Therefore, I would like to speak to the issue of duty-free shops and the policy of the federal Government toward them.

As the Member for Erie, I represent the Town of Fort Erie, which is one of Canada's largest vehicular points of entry. Despite this fact, I have not received the slightest indication from the Minister that there might sometime be a duty-free shop opened in that town. Indeed, the pilot programs or projects have been located in some rather remote western towns. How they propose to gather data from these out of the way border crossings and make it appear relevant to crossings in Ontario such as Cornwall and Fort Erie, I simply do not know.

Ironically, Ontario seems to offer the most potential for the development of profitable duty-free shops yet, according to the Minister, the Province of Ontario has "chosen to protect its state monopoly and thus thwart private enterprise which the Canadian Government wants to promote through its duty-free shops national program."

I applaud the Minister's reference to encouragement of private enterprise. Believe me, it is a real surprise to hear that from a Liberal-socialist Cabinet which has nationalized everything from soup to nuts. I refer to its expensive parasitical Crown corporations, from Petro-Canada, with the free seat cushions for Blue Jay fans, to the Canadair fiasco where executives lease aircraft from other companies to Canadair for their own travel, thus lining their own pocketbooks at the taxpayers' expense.

Be that as it may, the Minister and I seem to differ on the role of the Province in the duty-free shop situation. He insists that it is the fault of the Government of Ontario, that the situation seems to be at a stalemate. He is correct in stating that the LCBO is insisting on the right to brand selection, choosing of candidates to manage the outlets, etcetera.

However, the curt nature of his answers to me in the House, at any rate, seem to tell me that he is rather impatient with the whole issue. Perhaps if he sat down with the Ontario Cabinet and worked the thing out reasonably, with a view to achieving some kind of middle ground, more progress could be made.

The Minister's attitude seems to be, to me at any rate, one of stating what he wishes and obtaining carte blanche to proceed directly in that direction. When things do not work out as planned, he turns to us and tells us to go after the provincial Government.

We have been after the provincial Government. The same day the Minister announced to the House that he had not received a favourable answer from the provincial Ministers I received a letter from the Treasurer of Ontario which reads in part as follows:

● (1740)

> I can now confirm that Cabinet has agreed, in principle, to allow the duty-free stores at border crossings, and I trust, upon completion of a mutually satisfactory arrangement with the federal Government, the first of these stores will be opening in the very near future—

The news then is not all bad despite doom and gloom from the Minister.

I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to an article published in *The* Ottawa *Citizen* of October 25, 1983:

> A compromise appears near that would allow duty-free shops at some Ontario-United States border crossings, including Cornwall, Prescott, and Lansdowne, about 15 kilometers East of Gananoque.

Consumer Minister Robert Elgie said that he is confident that the debate between Queen's Park and the federal Government can be settled within the next few months.

I am fully aware of the problems involved in obtaining agreement between the federal and provincial Governments on this highly sensitive matter. However, as I have mentioned before, I am optimistic that a compromise can be reached as well. I wish to emphasize that there must be attention given to those towns with the best potential for success. Fort Erie is one of those towns.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the employment offered by a duty-free shop would be of benefit to the Town of Fort Erie which has one of the highest unemployment rates in the country. Partisan and political considerations must be laid aside in the selection of candidates for these new projects. If they are, all Canadians can benefit from the job creation potential offered by the duty-free shops.

Mr. Garnet M. Bloomfield (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, from the inception of the land border duty-free shop program, it has been recognized by the federal Government that close co-operation

with provincial liquor licensing authorities would be required. The problem between the federal Government and the Province of Ontario has centered around the Province's desire to protect its monopoly on the distribution and sale of liquor products in the Province. While the program is designed to provide opportunities to the private sector in general and to small business in particular, the position of the Ontario Government so far is that it wishes to operate the liquor sales outlet itself, a situation similar to that in existence at the Toronto International Airport.

Liquor sales form an integral part of a duty-free shop operation. Experience and research to date indicate that up to 60 per cent of total sales may be attributed to these products. The nature of a land border duty-free shop is somewhat different from an airport duty-free shop. In particular, the nature of the land shops has dictated that Customs and Excise take the position that a private-sector operator would need liquor sales to ensure a viable operation, either from the actual sale of liquor or from the spinoff effect of customers who come into the store to purchase liquor products.

Therefore, there is no intention of proceeding with the establishment of land border duty-free shops without provision for liquor sales. Furthermore, the Department remains committed to its original premise that such shops be operated by the private sector.

The Minister has discussed this issue with Dr. Elgie, the Ontario Minister of Consumer and Commercial Relations. Dr. Elgie agreed to study the issue further. There were subsequent meetings between officials which have led to the belief that an agreement can be worked out through further negotiations. The Minister is anxious that the matter be resolved as soon as possible so that the Department can proceed with the program at Ontario borders, including Erie, hopefully around the middle of 1984.

We are encouraged that the Ontario Cabinet has indicated, to certain Hon. Members of this House, agreement in principle with our views. While the Minister has not yet received a formal communiqué from Dr. Elgie in this regard, our respective officials will work on the numerous small details which are associated with any federal-provincial agreement. We expect an agreement will be prepared early next year in time for national implementation of the duty-free shop program. Translating principles into practice is not always a simple task, but every effort is being made to resolve this issue at as early a date as possible.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, this House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

At 5.44 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 25, 1983

The House met a 11 a.m.

• (1105)

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

PLIGHT OF FARMERS IN OKANAGAN-SIMILKAMEEN, B.C.

Mr. Fred King (Okanagan-Similkameen): Mr. Speaker, farmers in Okanagan-Similkameen have reason to feel unjustly put upon. Economically many who may not survive the winter can only wonder at the Government's failure to act in their defence. Now farmers find that the very structure of their industry is under attack, perhaps being destroyed by federal government action under the Combines Investigation Act.

One industry official told the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan), "We have been operating this system for nearly 50 years. If we have been doing something wrong, tell us and we will correct it, but don't take action which will cost us hundreds of thousands of dollars to defend. We are in deep financial trouble without that."

To discourage farmers in the area further, the CBC reported in a most inflammatory manner alleging racial bias, intolerance, and harassment of orchard workers, in generalized statements which are condemned and challenged by the industry.

A further series of unworthy statements made to the Special Committee on Visible Minorities on behalf of transient workers from Quebec is so overstated as to cause despair on the part of the vast majority of Okanagan farmers who are decent and fair in their relationships with their labour.

It is a sad day when a farmer, receiving five cents for a product which costs him 13 cents to produce, and who is paying the highest farm wages in all of Canada, should be subjected to the kind of abuse which seems to be thrown at him by Government, CBC and individuals with an axe to grind.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

INDUSTRY

FUTURE OF HAMILTON STEEL PLANT

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Ontario (Mr. Fennell), in the course of a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Lumley) on November 24, 1983, in a very cursory manner commented that "Stelco is now planning to shut down its Hilton works in Hamilton and move everything to its new plant". I have contacted the executive director of Stelco in Hamilton, Mr. Peter Gordon, and he categorically denied planning such a move, indicating that the statement is just not true.

I am very concerned that a Member of Parliament would make such an irresponsible comment concerning the Hilton works in Hamilton, a plant which currently employs 10,000 workers. Surely there are enough anxieties and worries in the life of many of the employees these days without the aggravation of such comments that have no foundation in truth.

* * *

EXCISE TAX

APPLICATION OF INDEXING TO TOBACCO PRODUCTS—ESTABLISHMENT OF TASK FORCE

Mr. Bud Bradley (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, I notice that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) has announced a task force to examine the current method of indexing the excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco products, chaired by Dr. Douglas Peters. He states that the task force is being established in response to industry's concerns about the technical operation of the indexing system. Surely the word "industry" includes the tobacco-growing industry. This is the industry the Government is systematically setting out to destroy, and that destruction must stop.

The recent 15.8 per cent increase in federal tax on cigarettes is totally unacceptable, and the provincial ad valorem tax in Ontario on top of that is unbearable. The federal Government alone took in $1.14 billion in tax on tobacco last year when the market value to growers was only some $285 million, a four to one ratio. The task force, indeed, has a serious task, that is, to reverse this government rip-off of the agricultural sector.

I note that individuals and associations are asked to make submissions to the task force and to send them to Dr. Peters at the Department of Finance. I would call on any one in this country who is concerned about the Government's abuse of agriculture to make such a submission to Dr. Peters.

S.O. 21

• (1110)

AGRICULTURE

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF RESEARCH STATION ON COLONY FARM IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, Colony Farm is the last large farm left on the north shore of the Fraser River, in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, near metro Vancouver. This 800 acre farm is owned by the British Columbia Government. That Government now wishes to privatize it and sell it to developers so that it can be blacktopped.

Action has been taken at the community level to save this farm. The reason I raise this issue in the House of Commons is that representation has also been made to the federal Minister of Agriculture, asking him to set up an agricultural research station on the farm.

In light of the quickly disappearing farmland in the country, and particularly in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, and in light of the fact that today the livestock from that farm is going up for sale, and that we do need agricultural research facilities in the area, I urge the Minister of Agriculture to enter into negotiations with the Province either to purchase the land itself, or to buy the land in conjunction with the University of British Columbia.

The matter is urgent, and the Minister will be pressed next week by the former Hon. Member for Mission-Port Moody and by the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett). I urge the Minister of Agriculture to act on this right away if he does not want to lose his green hat.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

THE CASE OF HUGH HAMBLETON—EMPLOYMENT WITH CIDA—REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of questions to ask. Why is the Government blocking questions regarding Hugh Hambleton, the Canadian spy who worked in the NATO Secretariat in Paris, in Peru and Haiti ostensibly for CIDA, but in reality on behalf of the KGB? Who is being protected? Why is the Government attempting to prevent all of the truth from coming out?

The Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) tells me that the case is closed as far as he is concerned. The Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen) tells me that he is in no position to comment on the matter. How can the case be closed when we do not yet know who in the Government granted Hambleton immunity although he was known to be a spy? We do not know who warned him not to go to Britain where, as he was told, he was certain to be tried on charges of espionage. Who tipped him off in Britain before he went through the immigration line by suggesting that it would be in his interest to return to Canada? Who is covering up these traces of espionage?

Who recommended Mr. Hambleton for a ranking position in CIDA as soon as he had joined that organization and had been sent off to Peru? Perhaps most important of all, given all of the things that were known by early 1982 about his work on behalf of the KGB, why was he not brought to trial in Canada? Was he delivered up to the British authorities because a trial in Canada would have brought out some unpleasant home truths?

* * *

AGRICULTURE

CALL FOR REMOVAL OF TAX ON FARM FUELS AND FERTILIZERS

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government cannot begin to make up for all of the damage it has caused Canadian farmers through its ridiculous policies. However, it has a responsibility at the very least to remove the federal tax on farm fuels and fertilizers.

Let us look at the Government's record on agriculture. It has refused to provide the Farm Credit Corporation with enough money to keep Canadian farmers afloat. It has forced the Western Grain Transportation Act through without regard for those who must bear the financial burden, namely, the western Canadian farmers. The Government agreed to consider changes in the Western Grain Stabilization Act only after many farmers had gone bankrupt waiting for long overdue changes to be implemented. Those changes have not even occurred as yet.

New statistics show that 390 Canadian farmers went bankrupt between January and October 31 of this year. In my home Province of Manitoba, nearly twice as many farmers have gone bankrupt so far this year as compared to the same period last year. That is absolutely unacceptable.

It should be reasonable to expect the Government at least to aid farmers by dropping the federal tax on farm fuels and fertilizers. This gesture could be the first step toward loosening the financial stranglehold in which the Liberal Government has placed thousands of Canadian farmers.

* * *

THE DISABLED AND THE HANDICAPPED

PROVISION OF WHEEL CHAIRS

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the handicapped in Canada. As the Government knows, corporate profits in the third quarter of this year have gone up over 90 per cent as compared to the same period last year. Yet at the same time, unemployment has increased, especially for the handicapped. It is estimated that the unemployment rate for the handicapped is in excess of 50 per cent.

In the 1981 Report to the House of the Special Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped, entitled "Obstacles", it was recommended that the Canadian Government take a number of steps to increase employment opportunities for the

handicapped in Canada. Among the steps recommended was that wheelchairs be provided for the handicapped right across the nation. At this time it is possible in the Province of Manitoba to have wheelchairs paid for by the Government of that Province. However, the same thing is not possible in the Province of Nova Scotia.

• (1115)

In addition, it is important that the Government give a high profile to the concerns and problems faced by the handicapped. I would urge the Government, in the Speech from the Throne which we expect in two weeks time, to set up a senior secretariat for the handicapped. I would encourage the Government to get all-Party agreement and have a special committee of this House as an ongoing pressure group to work on behalf of the handicapped and to make certain their concerns are expressed to the Government and to the House.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

ADVICE GIVEN BY MINISTER OF STATE TO BUY SOVIET-MADE CARS AND COMBINES

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who is also Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. This is a follow-up to the questions posed yesterday by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Elgin. At that time the Minister was not familiar with the pronouncements being made by the Minister of State responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board.

Last night on television we were able to see Senator Hazen Argue, in the flesh so to speak, addressing the Alberta Wheat Pool. At that time he was advising Canadians to buy Soviet bloc automobiles and farm equipment, specifically Lada automobiles and Belarus farm equipment. Was the Minister of State responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board stating government policy?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet seen the specific statement made by my colleague, the Minister of State responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. I think he was speaking in his capacity as Minister responsible for selling Canadian grain products abroad, and it is not Government policy.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, the Minister therefore is repudiating the statement of the Senator.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: He must be the one Cabinet Minister referred to in the television broadcast as saying that Senator

Argue is going to get his knuckles rapped when he gets back. I see the knuckle rapper is sitting in the House today.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

CANADA-U.S.S.R. TRADE

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, in light of this apparent conflict between Cabinet Ministers on a very important matter, and particularly in light of the fact that substantial moneys are being spent on the bail-out of Massey-Ferguson, and moneys have been extended by way of assistance to Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited, can the Minister advise the House, as Minister of Trade, whether or not statements made by the Senator were a part of any deal made with a Soviet bloc country, a condition precedent as it were, with respect to the sale of Canadian agricultural products?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member, who comes from western Canada and from a Province which produces most of the wheat sold abroad, will appreciate that 30 per cent of the gross national product in this country is generated by exports. Consequently any trading nation must do a substantial amount of two-way trade. What Senator Argue is basically saying is that we have to be knowledgeable of this and that we must import as well as export. As I indicated to the Hon. Member earlier, the specific statements attributed to Senator Argue are not the policy of the Government.

IMPACT OF MINISTER'S ADVICE ON CANADIAN FARM IMPLEMENT MANUFACTURING COMPANIES

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns is that Senator Argue has taken upon himself to flog specific products coming from the Soviet Union, in other words, Lada automobiles. How can the Minister reconcile his position? What is he going to say to Senator Argue when he has been the proponent of support for the Canadian auto industry? What is he going to say to Senator Argue with respect to the position of many, many thousands of Canadians who are farm dealers for various domestic farm implement companies especially in light of the very tenuous condition of the farm implement manufacturing sector? What is the Minister going to say to Senator Argue when he gets back to Ottawa?

Mr. Stevens: Straighten him out.

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to tell my hon. colleague what I will say to Senator Argue, if he would be willing to tell me what he tells his Leader about every single policy put forward by his Party. I want to remind the Hon. Member that Senator Argue has been one of the strongest proponents of the Government of Canada assisting Massey Ferguson as well as White

Farm, on behalf of the farmers of Canada. He has been fairly consistent in his comments.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER STATE VIEWS

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills): Mr. Speaker, it is not satisfactory for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to try to give these cute little retorts. It is not good enough, at a time when Massey Ferguson and International Harvester and virtually thousands and thousands of Canadians are unemployed. The Minister is responsible for international trade and for getting our products into world markets. What is his view of the comments made by the Minister of State for the Wheat Board?

● (1120)

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, rather than be like the Opposition, it is our actions which really count rather than words. It is the Government of Canada which saved Massey-Ferguson, and it is the Government of Canada which has twice saved White farm, in the interest of farmers, labourers and dealers across this country.

Mr. Thacker: Mr. Speaker, any Minister who tries to coerce Canadian farmers into buying inferior products, which will lead to delays in spring planting, which is very serious in the West, is not fit for public office.

KNUCKLE RAPPING REPORT

Mr. Blaine A. Thacker (Lethbridge-Foothills): Mr. Speaker, my second question relates to a news report that the Minister of State would have his knuckles rapped. Would the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce tell us when these knuckles will be rapped, where, who will do it, and can I come over and have a punch, too?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I would not want to take responsibility for anything written or said by the media in this country.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

CORPORATIONS' PROFIT MARGINS—LEVEL OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment who knows from figures released by Statistics Canada yesterday that corporations are doing quite well. Profits for Canadian corporations are up by more than 92 per cent. Clearly the Government's corporate tax give-aways of hundreds of millions of dollars are at least producing a recovery for corporate profit margins. My question concerns the nature of a true recovery for Canadians. Will he tell us why profits are up more than 92 per cent but unemployment levels, year over year in percentage terms, remain virtually unchanged?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I disagree, certainly to some extent, with the concluding part of the Hon. Member's question. There has been a continuous drop in the unemployment rate over the last seven months. Indeed, it has dropped by almost one percentage point over the period to which he refers, so there has been a considerable improvement on the employment side. If he looks at the employment figures rather than the unemployment figures, he knows there has been an increase in permanent jobs in the Canadian economy of well over 300,000 since last autumn. I do not think the picture is as bleak as his citation of the figures would show. Clearly there is great room for improvement on the unemployment side, and that is the focus of the policies of this Government.

In reply to the first part of his question, I would say the increase in profits reflects the extraordinary low level they were at before and I would have thought he would be rejoicing at the existence of those profits, since those profits and their reinvestment in the economy are the source of the creation of jobs in the economy. It is something we should be pleased about and not something which the Hon. Member appears to regret.

LEVEL OF BUSINESS INVESTMENT

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, unemployment levels remain virtually unchanged. A year ago we had about 1.5 million unemployed, and today we have 1.5 million unemployed in real numbers. As to the Government's theory on the way to get a recovery, if increased profits are supposed to lead to new investment and produce jobs, why have two different agencies, one government, and one private, said it is not working? The Conference Board of Canada said that for 1983 investment is going to be down by more than 10 per cent, while profits have gone up by 92 per cent. Statistics Canada, a Government agency, said investment for 1983 is going to be down by more than 7 per cent, while profits are up by 92 per cent. Why are corporations with very high profits not investing to create the jobs the Minister says they ought to be creating?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, there are so many points one could make, but perhaps we could start with the most important one, that the Hon. Member has semantically shifted his terms. He was talking originally about the rate of increase being high, and is now arguing that profits are very high. Well, the original question was concerning the rate of increase. Now he is talking about the level of profits. I think he would not receive general agreement to his argument that profits are too high. The rate of increase has been high because they were so low, but the level of profits themselves is not necessarily extraordinarily high.

• (1125)

It is clear that the approach we are taking to the creation of employment is based on the belief that the private sector is the motor force in creating jobs in the economy. I do not think that the Hon. Member agrees with that approach. That is the approach that we are following.

Of course, in the whole range of commentary about the effectiveness of the Government's economic proposals, and in the forecasts of what will happen in the future, one finds those who are more optimistic and those who are more pessimistic. The hon. gentleman, with that pessimism which characterizes his questions, seizes on some of the worst estimates. I believe, and it is clear that the Minister of Finance, in expressing his view to the House on past occasions, believes that in fact the Canadian economy is strengthening and the private sector is increasing in jobs. The statistics seem to be showing that the Canadian economy is generating more jobs. It has generated 350,000 since last November.

I would not say that the recovery of the economy is galloping, but there are more and more signs of increasing strength in it, and that increasing strength will lead to increasing employment. The profits about which the hon. gentleman has been commenting so negatively are an essential part of that job creation process.

FORECASTS OF 1984 PROFIT AND UNEMPLOYMENT LEVELS

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker I say to the Minister in all seriousness that businessmen are not stupid. If they are operating at only 70 per cent capacity now, they are unlikely to take the great corporate tax giveaways that the Government has given them, and reinvest them. I repeat, they are not stupid. They have got excess capacity and they are not going to create more excess capacity.

To go back to the nub of the issue, considering that profits have almost reached the pre-recession levels, of 1981, and in the coming year will exceed those levels, could the Minister tell us where the justice is if, in 1984, profit levels are going to be right back to where they were in 1981 but, according to the Government's own forecast, unemployment is going to remain at a much higher level than in 1981, in fact around 11 per cent? Does the Minister not believe that the people of Canada really would see justice in the return of profit levels to old levels only if employment levels are returned to the same pre-recession level?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the hon. gentleman is right in his characterization of the figures in comparison to 1981, to what has happened in the past, and he may not be right in his forecast what is going to happen in the future. His forecasts about the future rarely have been right.

Mr. Broadbent: Check the figures.

Mr. Roberts: In terms of the unemployment figures on which he is concentrating, he has to remember, and I hope Hon. Members will remember, that as the economy improves there will be encouragement to those who have been discouraged and left the labour force to re-enter it. So in some way, paradoxically, as the economy recovers, unemployment figures will not show the full impact of that recovery. The full impact of that recovery will be shown more clearly in the job creation figures.

The Hon. Member, for reasons of pessimism which I mentioned earlier, wants to keep going back to the unemployment figures. If he would instead look at the other side, job creation, he would have to put a much more optimistic face on the remarks he is making. He clearly does not want to do that.

* * *

TRUST COMPANIES

PROHIBITION ON PREPAYMENT OF MORTGAGES—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO FEDERAL COURT

Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and the Parliamentary Secretary, I will direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister.

The Minister is aware that some trust companies are requiring mortgagors to waive their right of prepayment of a mortgage under Section 10 of the Interest Act and similiar provincial legislation, as a condition of their granting a mortgage. Inasmuch as many learned legal practitioners have expressed doubts as to whether the waiving of rights would stand the test in a court of law, will the Minister make a reference of this subject to the Federal Court so that the matter may be adjudicated at a level higher than the office of the loan institution?

• (1130)

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I can say on behalf of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that she is actively pursuing this matter. Indeed, I will refer the worth-while suggestion of the Hon. Member to her. I am sure that she will act upon it.

REAL ESTATE SELLING TACTICS

Mr. Bill Kempling (Burlington): Mr. Speaker, I am told that more than 30 per cent of the homes on the real estate market today in many parts of Canada are as a result of foreclosures due to high interest rates. The Minister has had a report on this matter. She has had a report that contains information on bait and switch tactics, misleading advertising, and so forth. The report is complete, yet she is keeping it secret.

Why is the Minister keeping this report under wraps? Why is she hiding it? Why is she waffling while Canadians are losing their homes?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Hon. Member to be patient. I am sure the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs will be making an important announcement in this regard pretty soon.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

GOVERNMENT POLICY ON PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITY

Mr. Fred King (Okanagan-Similkameen): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister who, I carelessly assume, may be conversant with government policy and actions.

In response to the information press clippings which I circulated to all Members of Parliament some weeks ago, indicating the very serious situation facing agriculture in Okanagan-Similkameen, I was pleased to receive a letter from the Deputy Prime Minister which stated, "preserving a strong agriculture community is of great importance to this Government." Considering that this probably indicates a policy discussed in Cabinet, where, in the recent actions of the Government, is this demonstration of government determination to preserve a strong agricultural community?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, since all Government measures tend to protect Canadian agriculture, in the circumstances we must maintain a delicate balance between preserving Canada's domestic interests and free exchange policies in international trade. In fact, I am pleased to see that a Member from Western Canada is asking for more protection. As far as farmers are concerned, we often hear complaints from Western Canada that the Government is too protectionist, and I am therefore pleased to see a Member from Western Canada asking for more protection for agriculture in British Columbia. It is always a problem for the Government to determine how much protection certain sectors should be given, while not closing our borders too often so as to preserve our international interests.

[*English*]

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT DEMONSTRATE COMPASSION

Mr. Fred King (Okanagan-Similkameen): Mr. Speaker, considering that the Farm Credit Corporation does not have enough funds to serve agriculture, that the loans it does make are at 16.75 per cent and beyond the ability of most farmers to pay, that Revenue Canada is terrorizing farmers who must seek other employment to feed their families and keep their farms going, and considering the fact that the federal Justice Department is now harassing the B.C. tree fruits industry with questionable action under the Combines Investigation Act, where is the compassion which one would expect from a Government which is intent on preserving agriculture?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think that in all circumstances the law of the land has to be followed by every citizen. I am sure that the farmers, like anyone else, want to make their contribution to the national scene. The different governments must apply the law of the land has it applies to all sectors of the Canadian economy.

Some years ago, I believe, farmers had no problem paying their taxes. Like other citizens, when their income is better they pay their taxes. If they do not have any such problem they will not be harassed by any officials of the Government.

* * *

INDUSTRY

FUTURE OF HAMILTON STEEL PLANT

Mr. Robert Daudlin (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In the course of the question directed to the Minister yesterday by the Hon. Member for Ontario, a comment was made that Stelco is considering a move of its Hilton works to Nanicoke. Could the Minister confirm or deny that such a move is contemplated or, in fact, in progress?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday when the question was asked, I am not aware of any move being contemplated by the company. I believe the Hon. Member for Hamilton West was in contact with the Chairman of the Board of the company, and the company is also not aware of any move as alleged by the Opposition yesterday.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

CREATION OF JOBS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. Despite increased corporate profits, women workers continue to be condemned to low paying, part time, non union jobs. The Government also discriminates, since only 20 per cent of the former NEED program participants were women. Will the Minister tell us what percentage of the current federal job-creation programs will be targeted to women?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the Hon. Member for giving me some indication that she would want to raise this matter in the House. I can say that in our job-creation programs over-all, the percentage of women participants is about one-third. I could break that down for her into the four main programs which we have. Under Canada Works, 31 per cent of the total participation is by women. Under the LEAD Program it is 38 per cent. Under our Career Access Program,

44 per cent of the participants are women. Under the Job Corps Program, 56 per cent of the participants are women.

WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT IN SERVICE SECTOR

Mrs. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, an expanded service sector would provide permanent jobs for many women, particularly women who are displaced by the recession and high technology. Therefore, what steps will the Minister take to expand jobs in the community service sector, in services such as universal child care and home care for the elderly, since these kinds of jobs also meet real social needs in communities?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the objective which the Hon. Member has described in her question, the importance of creating jobs in those sectors, and the importance they will have for the employment of women. I hope that when she hears what is said in the Speech from the Throne she will feel that the approach the Government has taken will indicate some sensitivity to the concerns she has expressed.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—GOVERNMENT'S POSITION

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Acting Prime Minister. In view of the Government's continued harping criticism of the accomplishments in the country of Grenada, would he indicate if the Government has at long last taken any positive steps on what has transpired in Grenada? Has it made contact with the interim government officials and with Governor General Scoon to indicate our support for what they are doing? Has it offered any assistance and, if so, what has been the nature of that assistance in particular?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to give a precise answer to the Hon. Member, but at least the position of the Government on this situation is quite clear. Our policy on Grenada is not as quoted by the Member for St. John's West in the paper this morning, "to befuddle the reporters and befuddle the public." We have not agreed to the actions of the Americans, but I am sure that our officials in External Affairs who are dealing with this country are doing what is necessary at this time. I am not in a position to report, but at least we have a position and are not like the Tories who speak out of both sides of their mouths on this issue.

GOVERNMENT AID INQUIRY

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, I will give the Acting Prime Minister an opportunity to show that they are not befuddled. Would he indicate what specific aid package has been offered to Grenada? The Americans have offered $15 million to help rebuild the economy, the roads, and other services on the island. Has the Canadian Government made any similar offer to help these people, who feel they have been restored to freedom?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Hon. Member believes that this present Government has a good policy on aid. He wants to know if this policy on aid applies to Grenada at the moment. A few months ago they were complaining because we were giving too much to Grenada. I do not know what is being done precisely today because I am not the Secretary of State for External Affairs. However, I just want to tell the Hon. Member that on the first day of the invasion his Party was supporting the Americans. When they saw that Prime Minister Thatcher condemned the Americans, they became silent.

Mr. Stevens: That is not true.

Mr. Chrétien: Their policy, in the words of their former critic, is to befuddle the public, and I believe it is well known that they are on both sides of the argument. At least our position is clear on the policy toward Grenada.

* * *

• (1140)

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

SCREENING OF PROSPECTIVE ENTREPRENEUR-CLASS IMMIGRANTS

Mr. Chuck Cook (North Vancouver-Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. I think I am speaking for all Canadians in this concern. As the Minister is aware, there is a federal program intended to lure business entrepreneurs to Canada. However, I note that the Immigration and Passport Branch of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police has indicated:

—there's always the concern that criminals get in, but that's basically Immigration's role in screening these people, and we just sort of have to go along with them. If there's no convictions, then we have nothing to fall back on.

Does the Solicitor General agree with that assessment of the role of the RCMP in terms of this new immigration policy?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): No, Mr. Speaker, that is not an accurate statement on the responsibility of the RCMP in relation to the screening of immigrants. They have a duty to do that. It is part of the visa vetting process. They do not necessarily stop at the list of criminal convictions of the individual. They are responsible to look into the whole question of the character of a candidate for immigration to Canada under any of the programs. They make their report to the immigration officials, and it is the responsibility of the immigration officials, under the leadership of my colleague, to make decisions in particular cases about whether admission should be granted.

Oral Questions

MINISTER'S POSITION

Mr. Chuck Cook (North Vancouver-Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, "If there's no convictions, then we have nothing to fall back on", unfortunately, whether the individual is notorious or has a bad general reputation, source of funds is also important. Does the Minister realize the implications of what he has said and what the RCMP is saying? In effect, the implications are that if someone has made $1 million out of loansharking, prostitution, blackmail or extortion, he or she can still qualify to come to this country with that $1 million to set up business again.

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member asks whether I realize what I am doing. Yes, I am contradicting the statement he has just read.

* * *

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

EMPLOYMENT OF TORONTO FIRM

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Solicitor General. On September 1, 1982, the Minister entered into a contract with Dan Sullivan Associates of Toronto to improve the positive image of the Minister in the eyes of the public. During the following year over $43,000 was spent on this rather formidable task. How can the Minister possibly justify this expenditure of public funds to spruce up the Minister's public image?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, that is a good question for the Order Paper.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Kaplan: That is not what the contract was about. I would be very happy to table information to inform the House exactly what the contract was about.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Given the Minister's performance, he would probably sue for breach of contract.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION OF CONTRACT DOCUMENTS

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in a confidential document of August, 1982, the consultant proposes to "increase the positive share of mind that this Minister" and office "has with key publics" and show that "the Solicitor General of Canada is an active forward-thinking influential leader", will the Minister today make public all documents relating to this incredible contract?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I will try to do it today, but I will certainly do it as promptly as I can.

NATIONAL REVENUE

DEPARTMENT'S ENTRY TO TAXPAYERS' BANK ACCOUNTS

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Revenue I will direct my question to the Acting Prime Minister. He spoke about the law of the land to my colleague, the Hon. Member for Okanagan-Similkameen. Could he tell us what new laws have been passed by the Government which allow the Minister of National Revenue to enter, without warning, the bank accounts of taxpayers of the nation who happen to have temporary cash flow problems, and who ask for some relief in terms of the obligations due him as Minister of National Revenue?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of this particular matter. If the Hon. Member has a grievance to express, he can communicate with the Minister of National Revenue. Of course it is always a very difficult task for the people charged with collecting income tax to do their work. If the Hon. Member has some specific complaint, he can write to the Minister of National Revenue, and he will certainly look into the matter.

OFFICIALS' ARBITRARY DECISIONS

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I am asking the former Minister of Justice and the Acting Prime Minister what new laws have been passed which now allow the Minister of National Revenue to enter without warning, without any courtesy extended to the owners and holders of bank accounts in Canada, and demand payment of obligations which Revenue Canada says are due. Have we now moved to a point where everybody in the country is guilty until proven innocent? Is the Minister not worried about the arbitrary nature of decisions being imposed upon Canadians, particularly in this time of economic distress?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to give a legal opinion. The Hon. Member has been in the House for a long time and knows that Members are not supposed to ask for a legal opinion in the House of Commons.

Mr. Huntington: I am not asking for an opinion. What laws are you using?

Mr. Chrétien: If the Hon. Member has some complaint, he can always raise it with the Minister of National Revenue. On the other hand, the officials in that Department have to administer laws which have been passed by Parliament. Of course, if the bureaucrats are not following the law, there is some recourse, and that is why there are courts in the land.

Mr. Huntington: You do not even know the law.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

STATE OF ACCOMMODATION IN QUESNEL, B.C.

Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo-Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. It concerns the deplorable condition of the Quesnel RCMP office, which I pointed out to him in a statement under Standing Order 21 on October 17. The Minister knows that there are 42 staff members in that office, that there are about 3,000 square feet of space, and that there are six cells in that space. This works out to 29 square feet per person. Also, the wiring has been condemned and the heating system is a failure. The warmest the building can get in winter is 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Would the Minister please tell me what he will do about this situation?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I have concluded a contract through the RCMP to provide an additional 1,100 square feet of space. Work will begin very shortly, and I suspect it will be concluded long before next summer.

REQUEST THAT NEW HEADQUARTERS BE CONSTRUCTED

Mr. Lorne Greenaway (Cariboo-Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, is the Minister aware that the 1,100 square feet of space is up on the next floor? This will not be the answer because it is inconvenient to get up there. Also there is the matter of the heating, wiring, plumbing and cells, which are all obsolete and old.

This is a DPW building, and I point out to the Minister that, under the DPW Act, government employees are supposed to have a minimum of 100 square feet of space within which to work. There have been grievances by the lay staff, not the RCMP personnel, to their unions. What we need in Quesnel is a new RCMP headquarters. It is a large subdivision, and this extra space will simply not be the answer.

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the information I have is that this important improvement will bring the office up to the standards it should have. I remind the Hon. Member that police do not basically work within the office premises; they work within the community. They spend less time in the office than other officials of the Government of Canada. The minimum space requirements for police needs are not the same as those for full-time employees who stay in a particular office all day.

* * *

THE DISABLED AND THE HANDICAPPED

"OBSTACLES" REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS ON HIRING OF HANDICAPPED—LEVEL OF MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. The problem of finding employment for handicapped workers continues to be very serious, with unemployment ranging between 50 per cent and 90 per cent across the board. Will the Minister move soon to implement, on the one hand, the recommendations of the "Obstacles" report which would require the Government to enter into agreements with employers doing business with the Government to hire handicapped workers and, second, to amend the Canada Labour Code to bring the minimum wage for handicapped workers at least up to the level of the minimum wage for all other workers in the country?

An Hon. Member: Are you awake over there?

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Labour): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker; I was reading a document. Perhaps the Hon. Member could ask his question again.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

• (1150)

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I will ask the question again in lieu of a supplementary. I was saying to the Minister that employment for the handicapped continues to be a very serious problem right across the country, with between 50 and 90 per cent of the handicapped unable to find employment. Will the Minister take two steps, one recommended in the 1981 "Obstacles" report, which suggested that the Government ought to incorporate into its contracts that it undertakes with private firms a clause which guarantees employment for a reasonable percentage of handicapped people and, second, amend the Canada Labour Code to bring the minimum wage applicable to those who are employed under the category of handicapped up to the level at least of the minimum wage that is applicable to all other persons in the country?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with the Hon. Member's two suggestions. They were indeed worth repeating. I can give him the assurance that my Department is, in fact, considering these two questions and that we hope to be able to find a satisfactory solution very shortly.

* * *

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GRENADA—SUSPENSION OF AID PROGRAM

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the one asked earlier by the Hon. Member for York-Peel with regard to aid to Grenada. The Acting Prime Minister will be aware that, shortly before the difficulties on the island, we suspended the cocoa rehabilitation program because Grenada did not have the cash to meet its part of the obligation. Has this matter been taken under advisement, and is Canada now prepared to go ahead with the program on its own, waiving for the time being the necessity of Grenada coming up with its share of the cost of that program?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to give the Hon. Member a yes or no answer. I will certainly pass his question on to the Department of External Affairs and ask them to communicate directly with him.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

THE CASE OF HUGH HAMBLETON—REPORTED OFFER OF PROSECUTION IMMUNITY—REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. Has he had an opportunity to reconsider the statement he made, to the effect that in the Hambleton case neither he nor any Canadian authority made an offer of immunity from prosecution to Mr. Hugh Hambleton, the KGB spy?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to reconsider that statement. That is a fact. I reviewed the file carefully and no offer of immunity at all was made to the spy, Hugh Hambleton.

EVIDENCE GIVEN IN BRITISH TRIAL

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, is the Minister then suggesting that in the British trial they used either falsified or tainted evidence?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I am aware that in the course of the trial in Britain it was suggested that the arrangement that existed in Canada amounted to an immunity. That was no material evidence, in the sense that the evidence against Mr. Hambleton would have been affected by that characterization of the Canadian arrangement one way or the other.

* * *

PORTS

PORT OF CHURCHILL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. As the Minister knows, the provincial Government of Manitoba has been requesting for some time that improvements be made to the Port of Churchill, the rail line to Churchill, and also that the federal Government provide some help in providing a hydro line to the Port of Churchill. Has the Government made a decision on these projects and, if so, when can we expect announcements on them?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member knows, these projects do not come under my specific area of responsibility. However, I know that the Minister of Transport and I have had several meetings with the Manitoba Government with respect to possible joint co-operation on the projects the Hon. Member raises.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

KING POINT DEVELOPMENT DISCUSSIONS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. As he knows, the North Slope Project Review Group set up by his colleague, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, three weeks ago turned down proposals by Gulf for Stokes Point and by Kiewit and Sons for King Point. Kiewit and Sons are still negotiating with the Minister's officials, apparently for a loan of somewhere between $80 million and $170 million. Will the Minister explain to this House and to Yukoners what the process is for the acceptance of the Kiewit and Sons proposal for King Point when the process has been so muddied by his colleague, and that same project was turned down just three weeks ago?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that my officials are carrying on discussions because clearly the decision rests with my colleague, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

THE CASE OF HUGH HAMBLETON—POSSIBLE ARRANGEMENT WITH GOVERNMENT

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Solicitor General. He now talks about an arrangement which the Government had with Hugh Hambleton. I am wondering how he distinguishes between an arrangement and an offer of immunity. Was one in writing and the other one simply by word of mouth? Was he, or was he not, offered immunity?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member will recall that this was the subject of the Question Period for many, many days. I explained fully, in answers to the House, the relationship between the Security Service of the RCMP and Hugh Hambleton. I invite the Hon. Member simply to review that to find exactly what the difference is, if he does not know it, between an offer of immunity and any other arrangement.

PIPELINES

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINE TO VANCOUVER ISLAND

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. The British Columbia Government has been holding hearings on a natural gas pipeline to Vancouver Island. I believe the hearings are now completed. Has the Province made any representation to the federal Government for prospective funding for that natural gas pipeline?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions with the British Columbia administration about the proposed pipeline. However, they had to hold public hearings and look at both the ecological and economic problems associated with that. We have always said that we have to ensure that it is economically viable. We do not know that as yet. There has been no specific discussion about a financial contribution, but they did indicate that, if they were to proceed, they would come to the federal Government for some help.

* * *

NATIONAL RESOURCES

OWNERSHIP OF COAL LANDS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I would like to correct something I said yesterday. In reply to a question from the Hon. Member for Kootenay East-Revolstoke, I said that I had not received any communication from the British Columbia Government on the coal lands. I have, in fact, received a letter, and I have replied. This information escaped my mind yesterday. I apologize to the Hon. Member for not giving the correct answer yesterday. I have already told him privately that it had escaped my memory.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

INCLUSION OF VISIBLE MINORITIES IN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

Mr. Laverne Lewycky (Dauphin-Swan River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. As he is aware, there is an affirmative action program which has, as target groups, unemployed women, the physically handicapped, and our native population. What type of consideration has the Minister given to seeing that the visible minorities are also included in any affirmative action employment program brought forward by the Government?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, that is a very important element, one which we are examining with some care. The Job Corps Program is, I believe, particularly ready to be focused in on that kind of approach. The matter the Hon. Member raises is of great concern to us. We are trying to find ways of responding to the kind of question he has raised.

* * *

PIPELINES

NATURAL GAS PIPELINE TO VANCOUVER ISLAND—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It concerns the question just asked about the two proposals for a natural gas pipeline from the mainland to Vancouver Island. I listened carefully to the Minister's answer. Is he saying that there is in fact no commitment whatsoever from the federal Government with respect to financial assistance for a gas pipeline to Vancouver Island after the provincial Government decides which route is preferable? Is that the position that the Minister is taking?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, we have always taken the position that, if it is a viable approach, the Government will consider putting money into the project. The first consideration is to determine whether there is a relationship between the cost of the project and the benefits of it.

• (1200)

Of course, one of the problems at this time is that many of the prospective buyers of natural gas on the Island have used other forms of energy for conservation purposes. I suppose that in every case there must be a relation between the demand and the cost. This is being analysed at this time. If, of course, it is a viable project, we will have to look to the Government to find out if there are any prospects of financial help. I can say that we first must know if the project is viable.

* * *

PETITION

MR. FLIS—HUNGER STRIKE OF POLISH CANADIANS

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petition presented by the Hon. Member for Parkdale-High Park (Mr. Flis) on Thursday, November 24, 1983, meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

* * *

THE LATE GRAHAM SPRY

TRIBUTES TO BROADCASTING PIONEER

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that yesterday Graham Spry passed away. He was 83 years old and died peacefully.

The Late Graham Spry

Mr. Spry was a reporter, war correspondent, scholar, lobbyist and Canadian par excellence. His Canadian Radio League in the early 1930s pushed for a public broadcasting network in Canada and Parliament created the CBC in 1936. That is why Mr. Spry was called the father of the CBC. He was also one of the founders of the CCF and was an assistant to Sir Stafford Cripps. Mr. Spry leaves behind his wife Irene, herself a distinguished economist and historian, and a son and a daughter.

Mr. Spry even stood for this House a number of times and in his own words was always defeated by large and enthusiastic majorities! Yet he still offered to Canada his ideas and his visions of a united federal Canada through communications. Those ideas and visions were adopted by all three Parties which are presently in the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, he was a journalist and a man of great depth, and we shall miss his vision and his ideas.

[*English*]

Perhaps I may conclude by saying that I had the honour to meet Mr. Spry when he was 80 years old and it was a great privilege for me. I could see that sparkle in his eyes. He was a humble man yet he had done so much for Canada. He was truly a great Canadian who had given a great deal to my generation. I believe that the generation to come, although they will never know him personally, will be the beneficiaries of his ideas, of the CBC and of some of his other accomplishments in the area of broadcasting in Canada. During his 83 years he contributed immensely to Canada. He was really a great Canadian and we will miss him.

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) for the excellent idea of taking notice of this sad and important event, an event which is especially sad for the family of Graham Spry. I am one of those who had the privilege to know Mr. Spry, although from somewhat of a distance. As a young man, I knew what he had done because I lived in an isolated rural community in the Province of New Brunswick. I realized very early that the radio broadcasts of which he was very much one of the founding fathers had linked Canadian communities and Canadian people in ways which were not always as visible as this institution but which were no less real.

[*Translation*]

I think that in the history of our country, we shall have reason to remember people like Graham Spry. I know that his desire to see a greater understanding among Canadians made him choose this form of transmitting the information and knowledge that form the sole basis for understanding and tolerance among people who, historically have differed in origin, language and beliefs.

[*English*]

I believe this country will survive not only because of its wealth but because of its citizens. Graham Spry sensed a very long time ago that understanding and tolerance would come from knowledge, and that broadcasting could transmit that knowledge. In every sense of the word, Graham Spry was a father of the new Canada.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with those who have already spoken in tribute to the late Graham Spry. I am particularly pleased to be able to speak in tribute to this man as Graham Spry, among his many other accomplishments, was a good and faithful servant of the Province of Saskatchewan for many years. He served as Agent General in the Ofifce of the Province of Saskatchewan in London.

One of the things that I most particularly recall about Graham Spry, not knowing him personally but knowing of him and his family and the distinction with which all of them have served our country, was his love for the Gatineau Hills. He had a residence in the Gatineau Hills where he spent many, many hours of his life. I know he spent those hours with the greatest of enjoyment, as many of us have had the privilege and pleasure of doing the same.

As has been pointed out, he was a distinguished citizen of the country and a Companion of the Order of Canada. He was a recipient of the John Drainie Award in 1972 for his distinguished contribution to broadcasting. He will be sorely missed by all Canadians because of his contributions and I know that I speak on behalf of all Members of the House when I extend to his widow and his children our sincere and heartfelt condolences.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

VISIBLE MINORITIES—PRESENTATION OF FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Robert Daudlin (Essex-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of tabling the First Report of the Special Committee on Visible Minorities.

[*English*]

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY—PRESENTATION OF SEVENTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Miss Coline Campbell (South West Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the seventh report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

[*Editor's Note: For above reports, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

WAYS AND MEANS

TABLING OF NOTICES

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 64(1), I wish to table in both official languages a notice of ways and means motions to amend the statute law relating to income tax and to make related amendments to the Canada Pension Plan and the Unemployment Insurance Act, 1971. In accordance with Standing Order 64(2), I also ask that you designate the Order of the Day necessary for the consideration of these Ways and Means motions.

* * *

PETITION

MR. PARKER—TAXATION OF TIPS AND GRATUITIES

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, it is my honour today to present a petition to the honourable the House of Commons in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned constituents of the Riding of Kootenay East-Revelstoke in the Province of British Columbia and other concerned citizens, who now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted right thus to present a grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your honourable House will therefore provide a remedy, humbly sheweth that waiters and waitresses are being unfairly taxed on gifts in the form of tips and gratuities.

Wherefore the undersigned, your petitioners, humbly pray and call upon Parliament to change the regulations so that tips and gratuities would be like political contributions and not be taxed as income to the recipients. And as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

* * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions. Can I follow the procedure of inviting Hon. Members who wish to have the motions in their names presented to rise at this point? If no Hon. Members rise, we will proceed to Questions on the Order Paper.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,888 and 5,338.

[*Text*]

TRAINING CENTRE TAXES

Question No. 4,888—**Mr. Gass:**

1. Does the training centre at (*a*) Touraine, which is owned by the Department of Public Works (*b*) Cornwall, which is owned by the Department of Transport (*c*) Rigaud, which is owned by the Department of National Revenue, Customs and Excise (*d*) Arnprior, which is owned by the Department of Public Works (*e*) Heron Road (Ottawa), which is owned by the Department of Public Works, pay municipal and provincial taxes and, if so, what was the amount paid by each centre to the municipality and/or province in each of the past five taxation years?

2. For the fiscal year (*a*) 1981-82 (*b*) 1982-83, what was (i) the total number of employees at each centre (ii) the total amount paid in wages at each centre (iii) the income received by the government from each centre?

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Revenue, Public Works, Transport and the Public Service Commission as follows:

In so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned:

1. (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) and (*e*)—See Appendix "A".

2. (*a*) and (*b*)(i), (ii) and (iii)—See Appendix "B".

In so far as the Department of Transport is concerned:

1. (*b*) See the Department of Public Works' reply to Part 1.

2.	(a) 1981-82	(b) 1982-83
(i)	271	300
(ii)	$7,609,785	$10,158,000

(iii) The Transport Canada Training Institute recovers the direct costs relating to training, accommodation and meals for residents. Total recoveries for 1981-82 and 1982-83 were $2,693,910 and $2,655,890 respectively.

In so far as the Department of National Revenue is concerned:

1. (*c*) See the Department of Public Works' reply to Part 1.

2. (*a*)(i) 61 employees

(ii) $1,385,385

(iii) The Customs and Excise College is an in-house training centre for Customs and Excise employees only. Therefore the College does not operate on a cost recovery basis.

(*b*)(i) 62 employees

(ii) $1,616,164

(iii) See reply to Part 2 (iii).

In so far as the Public Service Commission is concerned:

1. (*c*) See the Department of Public Works' reply to Part 1.

2. Touraine Training Centre	a) 1981-1982	b) 1982-1983
(i) Total number of employees	41	46
(ii) Total amount paid in wages	$ 964,000	$1,102,000
(iii) Income received	$1,734,000	$3,101,000

The amount shown as income is derived from recoveries made through the Staff Development Revolving Fund. The Source of income is other government departments and agencies.

Order Paper Questions

APPENDIX "A"

1. Municipal and provincial taxes

TRAINING CENTRE	MUNICIPALITY	TAXATION YEARS (PAYMENTS) 1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	TOTAL
(a) Touraine	La Ville de Gatineau, Québec	52,499.04	51,728.05	74,839.82	85,508.17	98,650.86	363,225.94
	Commission scolaire Champlain	11,347.05	27,234.67	18,918.21	11,998.12	11,381.40	80,879.45
	Greater Hull Protestant School Board	470.50	823.21	423.33	209.64	372.79	2,299.47
	TOTALS	64,316.59	79,785.93	94,181.36	97,715.93	110,405.05	446,404.86
(b) Cornwall, D.O.T. Training Centre	City of Cornwall TOTALS	46,959.76	497,908.66	708,812.79	1,255,007.63	1,430,120.65	3,938,806.49
(c) Rigaud	Ste-Madeleine de Rigaud Parish	48,347.00	39,618.00	65,872.00	72,246.00	78,346.85	304,430.45
	School Commission—Vaudreuil	—	267,304.30	163,696.44	15,856.00	8,091.79	454,948.53
	TOTALS	48,347.00	306,922.30	229,568.44	88,102.60	86,438.64	759,378.98
(d) Arnprior	McNab Township Ontario TOTALS	18,119.39	16,894.03	16,593.19	17,872.84	20,357.68	89,837.13
(e) Heron Road Training Centre (Ottawa)	City of Ottawa	163,008.54	175,099.52	237,981.46	274,476.23	309,371.07	1,159,936.82
	Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton—Fire Supply Charges	1,733.89	1,733.89	2,796.97	3,252.29	3,772.66	13,289.70
	TOTALS	164,742.43	176,833.41	240,778.43	277,728.52	313,143.73	1,173,226.52

NOTE: PROVINCIAL TAXES PAID TO PROVINCES—"NIL"

APPENDIX "B"

2.

		TOURAINE		ARNPRIOR		HERON ROAD (OTTAWA)	
		(a) 1981-82	(b) 1982-83	(a) 1981-82	(b) 1982-83	(a) 1981-82	(b) 1982-83
i)	TOTAL EMPLOYEES	1	1	23	24	7	7
ii)	WAGES	MAM-08 $9.64 hr.	MAM-08 $10.60 hr.	$425,442.17	$430,136.41	$160,743.00	$177,486.00
iii)	REVENUES	See PSC's reply to Part 2 (iii)		$285,485.90	$536,297.15	$158,932.96	$533,946.43

MONEY ALLOCATED

Question No. 5,338—**Mr. Taylor:**

In 1983 to date, for each constituency, what was the exact amount of money allocated under the (*a*) Canada Works Program (*b*) Local Employment Assistance and Development Program?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): See reply to Question No. 5,033—Part I tabled this day.

* * *

[*English*]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if question No. 5,033 could be made an order for return, this return would be tabled immediately.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary have been answered. Is it the pleasure of the House to have question No. 5,033 deemed to have been made an order for return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Text*]

FUNDING FOR EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

Question No. 5,033—**Mr. McGrath:**

1. For the fiscal year 1983-84, by Constituency, what amount was allocated under the (*a*) Canada Works Program (*b*) Local Employment Assistance and Development Program?

2. By Constituency, what is the (*a*) labour surplus (*b*) labour force (*c*) labour surplus rate (per cent)?

Return tabled.

[*English*]

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

• (1210)

[*English*]

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I have noticed a practice creeping in to the business of replying to questions. I find it a rather ominous one. There are two questions answered each day. I am sure more than two questions are put on the Order Paper each day. There was a third question today, the answer to which was to be deposited because it was rather long. I think the Government ought to be

a little more assiduous in pushing ministries to reply more generously to questions on the Order Paper.

I had cause yesterday, for example, to look at questions which were put on the Order Paper in 1980. I did not actually count them, because I did not have the time. I was hoping though that more than two questions would be answered today, but I find only two questions are being answered today. However, I would say there must be about 60 questions left over from 1980, probably even more from 1981, even more from 1982, and certainly more from 1983.

To reply to these questions two at a time is, to my way of thinking and I think the House will agree with me, really not serving the purpose for which questions are placed on the Order Paper. I was told yesterday that I ought to put some questions on the Order Paper, but to put them on the Order Paper is to bury them, virtually for all time.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure exactly what the Hon. Member is trying to imply. If he is implying that the Government is holding back answers to questions, he is totally wrong. We have answered 85 per cent of all the questions which have been placed on the Order Paper in this session. Three were answered today because three answers were ready. When there are more than three answers ready, I bring them to the House immediately. When replies to questions come back from the Department and have been signed by the Minister or by the respective Parliamentary Secretary, they are tabled in this House immediately. There is no intention or attempt by this Government to refuse to answer questions or to hold back answers to questions which are prepared to be tabled. Exactly the contrary is true, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Eighty-five per cent—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has made his observations. Nothing has been said today that has not been said on a number of occasions in this House, including the references.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

LABOUR ADJUSTMENT BENEFITS ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Labour) moved that Bill C-172, an Act to amend the Labour Adjustment Benefits Act and to authorize certain payments in relation thereto, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I think the motion should be amended to refer the matter to the Committee of the Whole.

We have an agreement that this Bill and the following be dealt with through all stages today, with one speaker per Party.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I want to confirm the understanding of the Government House Leader that we intend to deal expeditiously and with dispatch with these two items.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Mr. Ouellet, seconded by Mr. Pinard, moved:

That Bill C-172, an Act to amend the Labour Adjustment Benefits Act and to authorize certain payments in relation thereto, be read the second time and, with unanimous consent, referred to a committee of the whole.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-172 proposes certain amendments to the Labour Adjustment Benefits Act. This legislation, which was passed by Parliament many months ago, provided, as a last resort, financial aid to older workers affected by permanent lay-offs in designated industrial sectors or communities in Canada. The sectors in question could be designated either nationally, regionally or locally. Industries designated at the national level include textiles, clothing, footwear and leather. As the House is aware, these sectors are experiencing major economic problems as result of competition from imports and industrial restructuring. At the end of September, we had 2,080 active files under this program. Sixteen more communities and a number of other industries were also designated under the Industrial and Labour Adjustment Program. At the present time, 321 people are receiving assistance under the program which comes under the Labour Adjustment Benefits Act.

The amendments to Bill C-78 as proposed in Bill C-172 are the results of presentations made by Members on both sides of the House, by union representatives, especially the CSD, and by employers and private citizens.

I am happy today to be able to act on the representations I received. First of all, the proposed amendments will prevent involuntary deductions from survivor's pensions when benefits are calculated. Many widows and widowers were being treated unfairly under the present legislation, which was clearly not the intention of the legislator.

Second, the amendments proposed in Bill C-172 will also provide greater flexibility in eligibility criteria for workers less than fifty-four years of age, with many years of service, who will now be able to take advantage of their combined years of service in designated sectors. It was pointed out to us, more specifically, that it was unfair that someone who had worked for thirty years in the textile industry could be eligible for benefits while a neighbour with twenty years of experience in the textile industry and twenty years in the clothing industry,

would not be eligible because he did not have thirty years of employment in the same sector. We are therefore introducing a remedy that will allow workers to combine their years of service in sectors designated for the purposes of this legislation.

Third, the amendments will resolve a problem of interpretation, owing to the different definitions of "lay off" in English and in French, by eliminating the word "involuntary" from the English version.

Fourth, the bill will provide for payment of benefits to qualified workers whose applications for certification to the Labour Adjustment Review Board were delayed for reasons beyond their control. There is always a possibility of administrative delay, and I think it would be unfair to blame such delays on the person who is supposed to receive these benefits. Therefore an anormaly in the Act will be corrected in order to deal fairly with potential, qualified recipients.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind Hon. Members just how important it is to adopt these amendments without delay. I thank all my colleagues on this side of the House as well as the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party for agreeing to adopt this Bill today because, as many of us know, Quebec's National Assembly amended its pension plan last June, making it possible for workers, among other things, to retire at age 60 with appropriate actuarial adjustments. This amendment will come into force on January 1, 1984. It will have dire consequences for current and future recipients of the Labour Adjustment Benefits Program. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, should the legislation not be amended by that date, Quebec recipients between the ages of 60 and 65 would no longer be eligible for benefits as of January 1, 1984. That is why we have to take immediate action, and the problem stems from the wording of the existing legislation which provides, and I quote:

Benefits are not payable to a recipient, whether or not he has applied for a retirement pension under the Canada Pension Plan or the Quebec Pension Plan.

The legislation will therefore be amended to remedy that situation.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to understand why I am seeking the support of all Members of the House to ensure quick passage of the amendments to the Labour Adjustments Benefits Act. I am convinced that once these amendments are implemented, they will give us more leeway and widen eligibility for benefits provided under the legislation. The purpose of the Bill is to clarify and, in certain cases, strengthen the raison d'être of the Act which aims at easing the adjustment of older workers who have been laid off in some industries in designated communities.

In conclusion, I would like to thank a group of Quebec colleagues whose advice was a great help in drafting these amendments, particularly the Hon. Members for Saint-Hyacinthe, Lotbinière, Richmond, Shefford, Manicouagan, Richelieu, Portneuf, Frontenac and Montmagny-L'islet. I also want to thank the union representatives who made representations and submitted a well-researched brief to my Department. It enabled us to draft the amendments which we are introducing today and which will certainly be a definite advantage to Canadian workers eligible for those adjustment benefits.

• (1220)

[*English*]

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. The ten-minute question and answer period does not apply to a Minister moving a Bill. However, the Hon. Member can certainly seek unanimous consent to put a question if he wishes.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, the question is very brief. I think the Minister knows what is coming. We want something on the record. I ask for unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, on page 7 of Bill C-172, Clause 12, there is reference to certain amounts. The last sentence reads:

—shall be paid to him out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Can the Minister confirm that that does not mean those funds will not turn up in the estimates? Those funds have to be the subject of estimates each year and we are concerned about not getting into a situation where they are not under the control of Parliament.

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question. I understand it is indeed important to clarify this situation.

These funds have to be allocated through the estimates of the Department of Labour and they are. There is an item every year which covers these payments. The reason the Bill reads the way it does is to establish that indeed it is the Government of Canada which has paid for it.

One of the problems we are faced with every year is to predict the amount paid, because it depends on the number of workers who are eligible. Therefore we are putting in a general amount subject to debate during the estimates once a year, but this amount could be more or less, depending on the number of workers. This clause allows for payment where the prediction is not correct. Obviously it would be reported in the years following and Members of Parliament would have the chance once a year to discuss this matter and these expenditures during debate on the estimates.

Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I rise for a brief moment on behalf of the Conservative Party to say to the Minister and all those who brought the recommendations for these amendments to the Minister, as did those of us in the Official Opposition concerned about labour matters, that this is an example of co-operation between the Govern-

ment and both Opposition Parties. It is an example of co-operation between the Government, Members of Parliament and those members of the trade union movement who on a constant basis are watching matters as they proceed and are continually bringing to us suggestions for amendments and improvements. I think all Members of Parliament greatly appreciate the work done within the trade union movement to keep us abreast of the required changes, the necessary adjustments in the various laws which are so important to the working people of our country.

Therefore, I say through you, Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that we support this Bill. We thank the Minister for having listened and having brought these amendments forward and trust they will indeed be helpful, as I think they will be. Again, we appreciate very much the work done by those members of the trade union movement who put their briefs together, spoke with us and brought these matters to our attention.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I will be equally brief. The content of the Bill is supportable and welcome. We are particularly pleased that the Government has in fact taken these steps now and not delayed. We recognize the problems confronting many workers across the country, particularly in Quebec, as a result of changing of occupations and their being unable to qualify for the benefit periods.

It is good that if workers were laid-off during this period when the designation order is in effect, they would remain eligible for benefits if and after the designation order is lifted. The question of accumulation of time was causing people a great deal of difficulty.

● (1230)

There are times when people question whether or not we ever get along; I do not mean the Minister and I, but just generally in the House of Commons. I am forever trying to convince people that in fact in the House of Commons there is more done by co-operation and consent than they might realize. All that seems to be put forward in what they might see, hear or read is the conflict. On this occasion it is therefore good to be able to say that we want to support what the Government is doing.

[*Translation*]

In particular, I am thinking about the amendments for the benefit of Quebec workers through an adjustment to the Canada Pension Plan for survivors. Perhaps Quebec workers are faced with situations due to the changes made to the Quebec Pension Plan. There are numerous possibilities that workers would not get the pensions after a year.

[*English*]

We are pleased to have that occur and to get that adjustment made. It makes a great deal of sense. Without delaying the passage of the Bill, it has our complete and full support.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Blaker in the chair.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

On Clause 5—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief. I have a few comments to make so as to reassure myself and some of my constituents who have been through those difficulties. Clause 5 provides for a new qualification rule, that is an aggregate of 30 years, plus 50 years of age. I would like the Minister to reassure me and tell me whether this provision will be retroactive for all applicants who were turned down in the past and who would now be eligible under the new provision, whenever the appropriate company has been designated as being eligible.

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Chairman, I can confirm to the Hon. Member that indeed the clause concerning the 80 rule provides that applicants who could have been eligible when the legislation was adopted, and if the 80 rule had been in force, will be covered, and now that the Act is in force, they will henceforth eligible for benefits.

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Chairman, will they have to submit a new application?

Mr. Ouellet: Mr. Chairman, I think they would be well advised to do so, unless their application is pending, but to avoid any problem I would suggest to those workers that they submit an application as soon as possible.

Clause 5 agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 6 carry?

Clause 6 agreed to.

Clauses 7 to 13 inclusive agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

* * *

[*English*]

GARNISHMENT, ATTACHMENT AND PENSION DIVERSION ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-171, an Act to amend the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Pinard: We require the same consent as I required for the previous Bill, Mr. Speaker.

Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the House to proceed to all stages today in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. Hnatyshyn: That is the arrangement entered into and it is agreed by our Party.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion will be as follows: Mr. MacGuigan, seconded by Mr. Pinard, moves:

That Bill C-171, an Act to amend the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act, be now read a second time and, by unanimous consent, referred to a Committee of the Whole.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MacGuigan: Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of the purport of this Bill and has given his consent, as far as Her Majesty's prerogatives are affected, to the consideration by Parliament of the Bill, that Parliament may do therein as it thinks fit.

Most Hon. Members, Mr. Speaker, will be aware of the controversy which has arisen over whether or not the wording of the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act includes Members of Parliament as well as the staff of the House of Commons, the Senate and the Library of Parliament.

[*Translation*]

Last September, the Seventh Small Claims Court of Ottawa-Carleton considered a case involving a member of the staff of the House of Commons. In its decision rendered in mid-October, the Court stated that the Act in question applies to the staff of the House of Commons. The amount due was determined last Monday and the employee concerned has appealed the decision of the Small Claims Court.

[*English*]

While I am satisfied that the appellate courts would uphold the lower court decision, the appeal process would likely be a lengthy one. Such a delay would not, in my view, be fair to spouses seeking to enforce family support orders, not to other types of creditors. For this reason I am proposing amendments which make it abundantly clear that Members of Parliament, from both the upper and lower Houses, and the staff of the House of Commons, the Senate and the Library of Parliament, are subject to garnishment under the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act. This will be achieved by creating a separate division to apply to the House of Commons, the Senate and the Library of Parliament.

Once the Act has passed, the necessary regulations will go forward to the Governor in Council as soon as the Speakers of the House of Commons and the Senate have indicated their approval of the regulations to me. This will clear the way for the regulations for the pension diversion portions of the Act which have been delayed pending clarification of Part I. It will clear the way for them to proceed and be proclaimed into force early in January, 1984.

I would just say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that this is not, as is quite evident from the consent here this morning, a partisan matter. It is equally important, I think, to all of us in the House of Commons that we be seen not to be obstructing in any way legislation which was passed last year and in which we believed we had already yielded this ancient privilege. As a result of the delays which have occurred, litigants are in danger of being put to great expense in achieving what we thought had already been guaranteed by the law.

● (1240)

This is, therefore, a clarificatory piece of legislation. It may not be strictly necessary in terms of law. In fact, I do not believe it is; but certainly it is necessary in terms of fact so that Parliament will not be seen to be holding on in an unseemly way to privileges which it has already assured the public it has abandoned.

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (Saskatoon West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak very briefly to this Bill. I just wanted to say a couple of things with respect to the amendments which Members of our Party will, of course, support. As the Minister himself pointed out in September of this year, it has been an unedifying spectacle that the very important Parts II, III and IV of the Bill have not as yet been proclaimed.

The intention was at the time the Bill originally came before the House that the matter be put into effect immediately. Indeed, Members of our Party have been calling for this legislation for some considerable period of time. I recall in 1980 a former colleague from Leeds-Grenville, Mr. Tom Cossitt, was very active in asking for this legislation to be brought forward. It continued to be the case on the part of my colleague from Victoria (Mr. McKinnon), who in fact raised this matter with the Minister in September of this year. He should be given some credit for really bringing this matter to the point where the Minister has, to his credit, brought forward the amending legislation. I am sure there will be no question as to the right to effect garnishee and other action of attachment with respect to Members and staff of the House of Commons, the Senate, and the Library of Parliament.

I will pose a specific question now and ask the Ministr during Committee of the Whole to comment on this aspect of the Bill. There is a unique provision, as I pointed out to the Minister earlier, on which he may wish to comment. Under clause 16(2) it is specifically provided that there shall be no execution against the House of Commons and the Senate in respect of a garnishment served on a Member of the House of Commons, a staff member of whomever, or the Senate. I would appreciate hearing the legal rationale for that particular provision.

The effect, as I would understand it, would be that if the House of Commons, for example, did not obey the garnishment order, it would not be possible for litigants to proceed to execution against the House of Commons and to receive the money that they would be entitled to under the judgment. I am sure the Minister has had an opportunity to obtain a legal opinion or advice with respect to that provision. I would be

obliged, accordingly, if he would answer that point during the course of the Committee of the Whole.

In conclusion, all I can say is that we are in support of these amendments. We are very anxious that the rights apply, particularly in cases of those maintenance orders and orders for single parents that are very often difficult to enforce for a variety of reasons in our federal state. When these orders are extant and in fact involve public employees, or indeed Members of the House of Commons or the Senate, our Party believes that the same rights apply in the enforcement of such debts against all citizens of Canada. Hence, we have no difficulty with the relinquishment of what have been traditional rights or exemption from garnishment.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to this Bill on behalf of the New Democratic Party. As I understand Bill C-171, it is essentially a housekeeping measure. The amendments are proposed to tighten up the poor drafting of the original Bill, Bill C-38, which was passed on June 18, 1982. Although it has taken a year and a half to correct the vagueness of Bill C-38, we must commend the Government for recognizing this and acting upon it. We will support Bill C-171.

As the Minister said, some of the ambiguities in the present Bill were revealed in a recent court case. For the record, the case was *Texaco Canada Limited* versus *Dagenais*. It was a decision of the Small Claims Court in Ontario on October 12, 1983. This subsequent scrutiny of the Bill indicated that there was some doubt as to whether MPs and Senators would have been included in the original Bill as well as Parliament Hill employees. Clearly, the principle is that we should all be equal under the law. That is the motto of the Supreme Court of the United States and I believe it applies equally in Canada. Therefore, the lawmakers and employees on the Hill should not be above the law either.

There are three principles in the original Bill C-38 on which I would like to comment. The first principle is that Bill C-38 eliminated a form of privilege which is that the wages of the employees of the Crown were exempt from garnishment based on the historic concept of royal prerogative, which holds that since a court cannot move binding orders against the moneys and properties of Her Majesty, a garnishment order cannot be made against money paid by the Crown to an employee of the Crown. There was no just reason for these categories of people to be afforded special treatment. Personally, I had a case with one of my constituents in Vancouver who was trying to collect money from her former husband on a maintenance order. She could not garnishee his wages because he was an employee of the Crown. This was cleared up in the old Bill.

I suggest that we should acknowledge the support of the Public Service Alliance of Canada of Bill C-38. They acknowledged that federal employees should not be able to hide behind their debts.

I think we should also give credit to Parliament Hill employees who appreciate the clarifying aspects of Bill C-171. While they recognize that they should not have special status, I want to point out to the Minister that, on the other hand, they should not be subject to special handicaps or exemptions. While we do not want to give them the special privileges which are eliminated in this Bill, they do not have the equal privilege of collective bargaining and organizing. In other words, we do not treat the employees of Parliament Hill equally. If we are to apply the principle of having their wages subject to garnishment like the rest of the population, the principle equally applies that they should be allowed to collectively organize, receive decent salaries and be able to bargain for their working conditions. Let us be fair and apply the principles right across the board. I am sure the Minister would agree that the same principle of equality must apply.

The second principle in the original Bill corrected the unfairness to creditors. People should not be able to abdicate their financial responsibilities simply because they are Crown employees. I believe we all agree with that.

Third, the original Bill allowed the Government to divert pension benefits to comply with financial support orders. This provision is contained in Part II of Bill C-38 and has yet to come into effect. We urge the Government to fix a date of proclamation for the remaining elements of Bill C-38, Parts II to IV. I believe the Conservative Party spokesman, the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West (Mr. Hnatyshyn), made reference to this. What is the Minister waiting for? Why does he not proclaim those particular sections?

We in the NDP are in full agreement with the exemption of Old Age Security and veteran war disability pensions from those diversion provisions as covered by Bill C-38.

In summary, we are glad to see the original legislation improved upon and the intent clarified before the end of the session. On a personal note, I just lost a rather large legal case which I have fought for three years all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada. It took eight days in the trial division in British Columbia. I do not know whether the Minister will garnish my wages to collect his legal costs. Perhaps I might in fact be one of the first people to which this Bill applies. Perhaps I will have to appeal it, win against him in the appeal court and then garnishee his wages!

• (1250)

In conclusion, we on this side of the House support the speedy passage of this legislation. However, I remind the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) that if he is going to rely on the principle of equality, not only must Parliament Hill employees suffer the consequences of having their wages garnisheed and so on like anyone else, but they should be equally treated to some of the benefits of the general population, to wit, the right to collectively bargain.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and, by unanimous consent, the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Blaker in the Chair.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. House in Committee of the Whole on Bill C-171, an Act to amend the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act.

Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act

On Clause 1—*Minister*

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Chairman, I have another point which I omitted to include in my concise remarks on second reading. The Minister will recall that I made reference to the proclamation of Parts II, III and IV of the original legislation. The Minister has had correspondence with the Hon. Member for Victoria, and with his permission I would like to read into the record the Minister's response, which in part reads as follows:

Parts II-IV of the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act have not been proclaimed because of the difficulty in designating "Ministers" to be responsible for pension or retiring allowances for Members of Parliament. This difficulty stemmed from the dispute over whether or not Part I of the Act applied to the Staff and Members of Parliament. With passage of the amendments to Part I, the appropriate "Ministers", acceptable to the House of Commons and the Senate, could then be designated for Parts II-IV.

As the regulations, designation of Ministers and coming-into-force order must be approved by the Governor-in- Council, then registered in the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and gazetted, the process may take some six weeks, without taking into account the Christmas holiday period. I have instructed my officials to aim for January 1, 1984 as a proclamation date, which would then be the effective date for the amendments and Parts II-IV together.

I would appreciate having the confirmation of the Minister that it is his intention and the Government's intention to move with the proclamation on the remaining parts of the original Bill as soon as possible, conceivably on January 1, 1984.

Mr. MacGuigan: Mr. Chairman, indeed I can confirm what I stated in that letter to the Hon. Member's colleague. We want to proceed as rapidly as possible with this implementing legislation. We will proclaim all the parts at the same time. If we can manage the January 1 date, we will do that; certainly it will be as soon as possible after that time.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 10 inclusive agreed to.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Mr. MacGuigan: Mr. Chairman, we slipped by Clause 5 when I think both the Hon. Member and I were trying to find out to which clause his earlier question pertained.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Yes, it pertains to Clause 5.

Mr. MacGuigan: If we could revert to Clause 5, I would be pleased to answer his question.

The Deputy Chairman: Is there unanimous consent to revert to Clause 5?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

On Clause 5—

Mr. MacGuigan: Mr. Chairman, the Hon. Member raised a question about why there was provision that execution should not issue on a judgment given against the Senate, the House of Commons or Library of Parliament in garnishment proceedings permitted by this Act. As Hon. Members will appreciate, the debts which are owing here to members that might be attached are being paid by one of those bodies, either the House of Commons, the Senate or the Library of Parliament. I think it would involve us all in a great deal of difficulty if the House of Commons, because of some bureaucratic delay, were a day late in sending out the required payment under the garnishment order.

For example, if someone had a sheriff's order to start seizing the buses on which Hon. Members travel or something of that kind because of a private litigant's dispute, we can be assured that in this form the legislation will be taken at face value and implemented bona fides, in good faith, by all the elements of Parliament. It will not be necessary for execution to issue in order to make sure that that happens. This clause was also contained in the original Bill which we passed.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Chairman, that is a point on which I was not clear. In his last sentence the Minister said that this was contained in the previous provisions of the Bill. It may have escaped my notice, but my impression, on looking at the legislation before, was that this provision was unique and that the same provision did not apply with respect to other departments of Government or other employees of Government. If I am not mistaken—and I stand to be corrected because I am anxious to be co-operative today—the provision only extends to the House of Commons and the Senate. I know the dangers of having buses seized; it would cause serious problems for some Hon. Members! I walk to my office, so it would not bother me. There should be some better explanation. If there is some reason at law, some technical reason or tradition as to why the House of Commons should be exempt, I would be interested in that information. If he could point out what clause in the original Bill contained a similar provision, at least there would be unanimity with respect to dealing with all Government departments. He may have that information in his possession at the moment.

Mr. MacGuigan: I can tell the Hon. Member that it is Section 18 of the legislation we passed last year which contains the same provision.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, there was an agreement among House Leaders that if we were to reach the stage of adopting the two Bills we have just adopted through all stages, we would call it five o'clock. However, I understand that my hon. colleague, who is unusually co-operative today, would like that to be done without prejudice to the right of the Official Opposition to give notice of the motion to be debated on Monday before it is really five o'clock. Certainly we do not object to that. Also we understand that it is without prejudice to their right to give notice of any objection to any item in the Supplementary Estimates before it is really five o'clock.

I do not know whether I have covered all the concerns of the Hon. Member but certainly, Mr. Speaker, if you call it five o'clock now, we will agree without prejudice to what I have just said.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Hon. Member for Saskatoon West.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I am the Hon. Member from co-operative Saskatoon West, as usual.

Mr. Evans: At least we know the riding is co-operative.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I did not want some technicality to prevent us from filing notices of objections with respect to the Estimates which will be voted on next week. Accordingly, I appreciate that clarification. I understand that there may be a reasonable number of objections which are now in the process of scrutiny and preparation, and that we will retain the ability to file not only the content of our Opposition motion but, indeed, the notices of objections before five o'clock Eastern Standard Time, Canada.

Mr. Waddell: On behalf of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to co-operate in calling it five o'clock for many reasons. One, of course, is that we do have many Members from British Columbia who are busily preparing for the impending B.C. Lions victory by two touchdowns over the Toronto Argonauts!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Subject to the conditions mentioned by the Hon. Member, the President of the Privy Council and the Hon. Member for Saskatoon West, is it the pleasure of the House that I call it five o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Accordingly, I extend best wishes for a pleasant weekend. It being five o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until eleven o'clock Monday morning.

At 1.01 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 28, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

[*English*]

POINT OF ORDER

MR. BLENKARN—SUGGESTED IRREGULARITY IN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)—RULING BY MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps I could deal with a point of order which was raised by the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) on November 17. The Hon. Member raised a point of order with regard to procedural acceptability of Vote 6b under Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984. I was unable to deal with this matter earlier because, as Hon. Members will recall, Supplementary Estimates (B) were referred to committees on November 3, 1983 and were not before the House.

As has been noted before, however, it is helpful to the Chair that there be adequate time to study points of order on the Estimates and the Chair appreciated the courtesy of the Hon. Member in raising the matter when he did. The House will also recall that the Chair wished to extend an opportunity to Hon. Members to rebut or add to the procedural argument. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray), on November 24, did make a further contribution. I wish to express my thanks to both Hon. Members who were most helpful to the Chair when considering this important matter.

In presenting his case, the Hon. Member for Mississauga South referred to Section 29 of the Canada Post Corporation Act. He submitted that no authority is given to the Government to seek an appropriation other than "an appropriation to pay losses" and that therefore no legislative authority exists for the appropriation expressed in Vote 6b.

• (1110)

In support of this submission the Hon. Member quotes from the Chair's decision of June 12, 1981, at page 10546 of *Debates,* stating, in part:

—the Government may not, by the use of an Appropriation Act, obtain authority which it does not already have under existing legislation.

I have examined both the Supplementary Estimates (B) and the relevant legislation with respect to the Hon. Member's point of order. The Canada Post Corporation Act states, in part, in Subsection 29(1):

Where at any time the available revenues of the Corporation are insufficient to pay all the operating and income charges of the Corporation as and when due . . . The Minister of Finance may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, place at the disposal of the Corporation such amounts as may be required . . . to meet all such charges.

Subsection 29(2) provides a mechanism for reimbursement of the Treasury for such sums and Subsection 29(3) provides as follows:

Where the annual revenues . . . are insufficient for the purposes of Subsection (2) the Minister shall cause the amount of the insufficiency to be included, in the form of a deficit appropriation item, in the next Appropriation Act laid before Parliament thereafter.

Hon. Members will note that the Act refers to "operating and income charges" which the annual revenues are not adequate to cover.

I would now invite the attention of Hon. Members to Vote 6b at pages 32 and 33 of the Supplementary Estimates (B) in which the "Objects of Expenditure" is described as being for "operating" the Corporation. Such a payment was specifically envisaged under Section 29 of the Act.

The Hon. Member for Mississauga South suggested in his submission that the Act did not give the Government the authority to make such a payment because it refers to "activities that have nothing to do with losses". However, the relevant section of the enabling legislation makes no mention of losses but deals only with the insufficiency of revenues to cover operating and income charges. Furthermore, Hon. Members will find that a payment to cover similar operating expenditures was made to the Canada Post Corporation under Consumer and Corporate Affairs Vote 6c in the Appropriation Act No. 4, 1982-83.

In the opinion of the Chair, the Government is seeking to make a payment which is specifically provided for in the Act, and in presenting such an appropriation the Government is not seeking to enlarge its legislative authority. I therefore find that the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Mississauga South is not well taken and that Consumer and Corporate Affairs Vote 6b is procedurally in order.

In closing, I again wish to express my gratitude to both Members for their valuable assistance.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—S.O. 62—GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Since today is the final allotted day, the House will go through the usual procedures to consider and dispose of the Supply Bill. In view of recent practices, do Hon. Members agree that the Supply Bill be distributed now?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano) moved:

That this House agrees without reservation with the prediction of the Prime Minister made on August 13, 1969, in a nationally televised press conference when he said, "We'd soon be on the road to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control" and calls upon the Government to initiate policies which would avoid the Prime Minister's prediction.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion is an extremely serious one. It is really at the heart of our well being and that of our children tomorrow. It has to do with the last 14 years of extravagant and wasteful spending after the warnings given to the nation back in 1968-69 by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Before I belonged to a political party, I was most impressed with the words of the Prime Minister at that time. The words that really got to me are these, and I quote as follows:

This process of making choices among the myriad of claims and demands on our resources in the context of business enterprise and Government is often referred to as planning and priorities. It is not really very different than the process that each of us in our own lives, whether as individuals or as family units, have to go through. If an individual fails to plan in a coherent way he will soon find that he has run out of resources and has left many urgent things undone. He may find that his children's education is neglected or the medical bills are left unpaid because he has taken an expensive holiday or purchased a red convertible.

● (1115)

Governments are really no different than individuals in this respect and they too must engage in solid planning and to ensure that their scarce resources are being applied to the most urgent and useful purposes.

He went on to say, Mr. Speaker:

Perhaps the most startling fact to emerge from this review is that almost without exception this decade has been characterized by yearly budgetary deficits exceeding $4 billion in total and requiring upwards of $300 million per annum to service.

And he is speaking of the decade of the 1960s. It is easy to see from the sincerity and wisdom of those remarks back on August 13, 1969 that the Prime Minister was as aware then as some of us in this House are today of the seriousness of the behaviour of the Liberal Government over the last 14 years. Back in 1968-69, in the budget address, Mr. Edgar Benson said on October 22, 1968:

We intend to continue severe restraint upon those direct expenditure programs under the Government's control, eliminating what is obsolete, and permitting only the degree of growth that is essential.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, spending on a national accounts basis was $12.6 billion. The annual deficit was $491 million and net debt at the start of that fiscal year was $17.7 billion. On August 13, 1969 the Prime Minister said to the nation on a television broadcast, Mr. Speaker—which is the object of our motion today—and I quote:

We'd be on the road to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control.

That year our spending on a national accounts basis was $13.8 billion, and the Prime Minister bragged about that surplus of $493 million. The net debt was at $18 billion. That is the starting point of our debate today.

In 1970-71, at the Liberal policy convention on November 20, 1970, the same Prime Minister said:

You know, anyone can say, "why don't you do more?" The answer is the same answer as always, there are competing claims on the economy.

In the meantime our spending had gone up $2 billion in that one year. There was no longer a surplus but a deficit of $372 million, and the net debt had slightly tapered down from $18 billion to $17.6 billion. Following that was the Benson budget speech of 1971-72, in which Mr. Benson said:

We have continuously appealed to Canadian governments, business and the labour movement to be modest in their demands and not demand more from the economy than is coming to them in increased productivity.

Every year I have been in this House, for the past nine and one half years, Sir, we have heard that the only way out of the spending and inflation dilemma is through improved national productivity. We were then still spending $18 billion. We then had doubled our annual deficit to $700 million and our net debt was up to $18 billion.

The year 1971-72, was the year of "a buck is a buck is a buck", that great promise of equity and distribution and equality for all. The Hon. John Turner in his budget address of 1972-73, said:

The bare fact of the matter is that we cannot do everything at once. We simply don't have the resources. There are limits to the scope of fiscal policy. There are limits to stimulus and readjustment.

We have now gone up $2.8 billion in spending. We have now moved from a $700 million to almost a $1 billion annual deficit, and our net debt has moved up $800 million.

● (1120)

Then we jump to 1973-74. We had the same Mr. Turner as Minister of Finance, and in his budget address of November 18, 1974, he said:

we must do all that we can in these circumstances to restrain the growth of governmental expenditures

We have sought and shall continued to seek to cut out waste, to place limits on the growth of the public service and to approve only the most essential new programs.

We have now moved from $20.8 billion Government spending to $30.8 billion in two years. We moved from a $1 billion deficit to a $1.7 billion deficit and our net debt had moved from $18.8 billion to $21.2 billion. The rhetoric was there, Mr. Speaker. They knew exactly what was needed if this nation was to remain healthy and inflation did not reach excessive amounts which would harm the well-being of the elderly, the sick and the youth emerging from our educational system. I can remember Mr. Turner standing in the House and saying that the thing he was proudest of was the million jobs he created as Minister of Finance. Where are those jobs, Mr. Speaker? As we stand here today we have two million unemployed. Where are those jobs from "old blue eyes" which started us on this spending spiral?

Then we move into Mr. Macdonald's period of budgetary extravagances; he moved our annual deficit from $6 billion to $10.8 billion. Then we got that gem of them all, Mr. MacEachen. He moved us from a deficit of $11.5 billion to $13.6

billion, and by the time we got to 1982-83 we had gone to a $24.6 billion deficit. Throughout this period of time we heard the rhetoric of these Ministers of Finance and the Prime Minister. They knew exactly what had to be done to manage the country's economy for the wellbeing of the people. But nowhere were they able to deliver what they said they would deliver. Instead we have the situation where today this institution is no longer relevant to two-thirds of the people in Canada because they can no longer trust us as politicians. They can no longer accept the political lies delivered over the past 14 years by this Government.

We come now to 1978-79. We had another Minister of Finance, the Hon. Jean Chrétien, who followed the Hon. Donald Macdonald. In his budget address of November 16, 1978, he said:

> There can be no weakening in our determination to keep expenditures under tight control.

By that time, Mr. Speaker, spending on a national accounts basis was at $43.9 billion, the deficit was $12.2 billion and the net debt was $44.9 billion. Again we see the evolution of political rhetoric in a direction exactly opposite to that of the reality of extravagance and irresponsible management of the public tax resource.

• (1125)

On January 12, 1980, the Prime Minister said: "We will hold the line of Government expenditure growth to under the rate of the Gross National Product". That was the first time we heard about this extravagant spending being now related to Gross National Product. He told the nation: "The deficit will be reduced in a phased and orderly fashion. Any new expenditure programs to meet evolving needs and requirements of Canadians will be financed by reallocating existing expenditures or by increases in revenues. We will not add to the deficit by adding new programs." At that time spending on a national accounts basis was at $54.4 billion, the annual deficit was $11.48 billion, going down slightly through the year of Mr. Chrétien, and the net debt was $57 billion.

In Mr. MacEachen's period, spending rose to $89.5 billion when he was finally tossed out. The annual debt doubled from $12.6 billion to $25.25 billion and the net debt rose from $68.5 billion to $95 billion. Mr. MacEachen was the man who belittled the previous Minister of Finance in the Clark Government, the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). He belittled him time after time in the House by saying he would never bring down a budget that would put 18 cents a gallon tax on gasoline. In this period of time there was the other massive mistruth or lie and 18 cents a gallon soon became 18 cents a litre under the next Government. Eighteen cents a gallon became 77 cents a gallon after belittling 18 cents.

It comes down to 15 years of rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, all of it misleading. The Liberal Government has known all through the last decade and a half the consequences of profligate spending and management of the federal tax resource. One can legitimately conclude that its attack on the free enterprise market economy has been deliberate. It has said one thing in support of it, it has espoused the rules of management which you need to espouse to remain healthy as a nation, and it has done exactly the opposite. The Government knew that if the nation continued to pay ourselves more than the value of what we produced we would create the high unemployment that we have today. Any thinking, average educated person knew that that was coming.

Did this so-called Liberal Government spend money advocating the need to reduce our anticipation levels? No, sir, they did not. That was probably the one thing we had to do above all others. We had to reduce the anticipation level of the nation as we came out of a period of affluence. Did the Government spend money advocating the need to improve our productivity? I do not remember seeing any advertisements in that regard. I heard a lot of talk in the House about the fact that if we did not improve our productivity we would not be able to reduce inflation. The Prime Minister used to tell us that time and time again. Instead of doing just those two things with the information through the advertising dollars that it had the power to spend, what did it do? The Government launched into an extravaganza of telling us the virtues of nationalization and the virtues of VIA Rail, that Crown corporation which has to draw $50 from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for every ticket it sells. There is no bottom line management there at all. They have put full and half page ads in the paper extolling the virtues of Canadair. Canadair is the Crown corporation which just had to write off $1.4 billion.

Mr. Nielsen: But it is ours.

Mr. Huntington: They advertise it is ours. They advertise the virtues of our Petrocan. The national energy policy stopped, dead in the water, all of the small businesses, the steel fabricators and all of the feeder industries that go into what was a vibrant exploration industry for energy in western Canada. Look at the advertising and the millions of dollars that the Liberal Government can find to tell us that Petro-Canada is ours. We can see what has happened to well drilling in the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. While the Government will tell us about PIP grants and other programs, it has delivered a degree of intervention over the economy such that only those things which the bureaucrats and politicians in Ottawa want to go ahead will proceed. The innovation, exploration and risk-taking ability of the country has gone.

• (1130)

Just recently the Government spent $220,000 on a beautiful book extolling the virtues of our Constitution. But that legislation has moved us from the rule of law into some kind of a Napoleonic code whereby the rights we now have are the rights that are stated and not those unstated rights which we had under the former Constitution.

Let us examine the Supplementary Estimates (B) during this last supply period to see the increase in spending on information, advertising and advocacy by the Liberal Government throughout the period of six and five which was imposed

on Crown employees and other sectors of the nation. During that period when everyone else was to hunker down in order to reduce the effects of inflation on our lives and our country, the Government went ahead with the most lavish and outlandish expenditure on advertising, advocacy and information that one could imagine.

During the six and five period in the last two years, according to information taken directly from the Supplementary Estimates (B), the Economic Development Department moved its advertising expenditure from $2,000 through to $575,000. That is a 28,000 per cent increase. The budget of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans for advertising and advocacy went from $1.5 million to $4 million. That is a 161 per cent increase. The information expenditure for the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce had a 27 per cent increase while advertising had an 11 per cent increase. Where is the six and five program for this kind of expenditure? The Department of Labour saw an increase of 75 per cent in its expenditures for advertising and information.

There was a 35 per cent increase in this area for the Department of National Revenue. Why does that Department not tell the people of Canada that it now goes straight into their bank accounts without giving them the courtesy of a notice? Why has it not spent money on advertising that or advertising changes in interpretation bulletins and other matters? Instead, it does so by stealth. It will go into bank accounts before it tells owners.

For Science and Technology, the increase was 558 per cent. That sounds like a large increase, but the budget only moved from $73,000 to $481,000 although this is the most important area of our lives in Canada today. But Science and Technology has absolutely no priority at all.

The advertising and information budget for the Department of the Environment increased by 50 per cent. The increase for Communications was 126 per cent and Justice had an increase of 666 per cent. This all occurred during the six and five era. So much for saying one thing and doing another.

When one considers the Main Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates, there has been an increase in spending of 14 per cent through this six and five period. On August 13, 1969 the Prime Minister said:

> We could not tolerate a 14 per cent increase in federal expenditures. If allowed to grow unchecked, eventually our spending would become so scattered that the real needs of our society would be missed.

That is what he said. He continued:

> And to spend vast sums on welfare, education and other programs while allowing inflation to continue would merely place hundreds of thousands of Canadians on a treadmill from which they could not escape.

We are on that treadmill today. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) is in the House. She is in a struggle with some Provinces that are on this treadmill and do not know how to budget their affairs. That is what the Government has delivered as a result of saying one thing and doing exactly the opposite.

In March, 1976 the Auditor General's Report warned that if the Government continued to spend at its current rate, the nation would be out of control. He told us that it was out of control and spoke of the critically serious situation we faced in this country. But nothing has happened since that warning. The Government has continued its reckless spending and slothful, wasteful habits. We have not addressed old programs as the Prime Minister said we should. The old programs have just become a base upon which incremental increases are added.

It is obvious that between the bureaucracy and those elected to govern nothing will happen in this area unless it takes place in the House. The House has put a group of 20 of its Members to work in the Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure and the reorganization of rules in the House. Those of us on that Committee saw a need to move the influence of the House back into a stronger position over the habits of the bureaucracy and Governments in power. This problem will not be addressed until the House addresses it and until elected Members within it undertake the responsibility and recognize the seriousness of the extravaganza of the last 14 years to begin to bring it back under control.

We are dealing with human nature and the House is full of that emotion. However, I say that if we do not begin now to apply ourselves to a corrective pattern over the slothful extravagance of expenditure, we are doing a total disservice to our children and those who follow. We are threatening the survival of this democratic system and we are putting their freedom on the platter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Huntington: I appreciate the courtesy of the House very much. I will not take too long.

Sixty-five per cent of the people in this country now consider this institution to be irrelevant. Today we were handed the *Votes and Proceedings* for Friday, November 25, with Ways and Means motions and amendments to the Income Tax Act. It comprises some 226 pages. It could be that this is just a compilation of all the Ways and Means motions that have been on the Order Paper, but nobody in the House today knows or comprehends what is in that volume. I use this as an example of taxation without representation. We, as Members of the House from all Parties and all stripes—it does not matter from where—somehow fail the people who elected us when we allow this rate of expenditure to continue.

If we had had a gold standard form of monetary system back in 1969, our spending today in terms of constant dollars would have moved from $15 billion to $26 billion. This treadmill which the Prime Minister warned us about in August of 1969 would not exist today. It would not have been half as complicated for Canadians to understand the fundamentals of

what we are talking about here today. Political rhetoric is meaningless to the people of Canada as a result of the past 14 years of hearing the Government saying one thing and allowing something else to happen.

My plea to the House today is that rather than continuing to continue to reject the ten reports of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure, it should somehow force the Government to allow those reports to come in for full debate and inquiry in order to move more influence and strength into the House so that we as elected Members can say we did our part; that the House of Commons did its part in trying to bring a system that is truly out of control back under control. I suppose the blame for this is at the root of human nature but somehow the irresponsibility of the Government over the past 14 years is a root cause for the two million unemployed today.

• (1140)

Before they stand and say this is worldwide—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Huntington: Let me say that no country in the world had a better opportunity than Canada. We had the chance to be energy self-sufficient within five years. We had the chance to build pipelines. We had the chance to build a pipeline from Prudhoe Bay across our land to deliver energy into the mid-western United States, but that opportunity was wasted absolutely. No, Sir, the socialists would not allow that to happen. We had the opportunity to put infrastructures in place and phase them in so that in becoming energy self-sufficient we could deliver ourselves to a condition of health and wealth and improve the sharing of that health and wealth with others in the world. But no, Sir, that was denied to us. We have been mismanaged and our opportunities have been blown by this Liberal Government.

My plea to Members in all Parties is to do something about this condition. I think the opportunity to do something will be found in report No. 7 which is lying buried and smothered by this Liberal Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there any comments or questions?

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, in the motion before us presented by the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) is quoted a remark made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in 1969. Contrary to what is implied in the motion, this Government has in fact since that date implemented a whole range of policies to improve the management and control of its expenditures.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Gray: I want to give some concrete examples of this. For that purpose, I want to discuss first the Government's policy on its spending. The Government's white paper of October 14, 1975, contained the following statement of policy:

> The federal Government shares the view that the trend of total spending by all Governments should not rise more quickly than the trend of the Gross National Product.

Ceilings on total outlays in the ensuing years have been established in general accordance with this statement. The record of expenditures itself reflects the general success of the Government in holding the growth rate of total outlays below the rate of growth of the Gross National Product. Although the recession has understandably resulted in expenditure growth in excess of Gross National Product growth for the last two years, this principle outlined in 1975 continues to govern the determination of our over-all, multi-year expenditure plan. Of course, as I have said, the Government's expenditures in the past two years have gone up to offset the effects of the recent recession by providing further resources for direct job-creation, supporting investment by the private sector, the Government's own Special Recovery Projects, and more support for housing, all to create more jobs as well as protecting the unemployed through more expenditures on programs like unemployment insurance.

Last April the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) confirmed the commitment of the Government to the principle that the growth rate of total outlays should be in line with the rate of growth of the Gross National Product. He said:

> This commitment was met until the recession last year. I am reaffirming this commitment tonight. The fiscal plan I will be tabling with this budget shows that total outlays as a share of GNP will fall steadily from this year to 1986-1987. By that year, federal spending will be virtually the same size relative to the economy as in 1981-1982, before the worst of the recession. To achieve this outcome will demand continuing diligence in restraining expenditure growth.

One year after the announcement in 1975 of its policy on over-all expenditures, the Government further made manifest its intent to improve the management and control of its expenditures, and of Government more broadly, for that matter, by establishing the Royal Commission on Financial Management and Accountability, the Lambert Commission.

The terms of reference by the Commission as set out by the Government clearly reflect its concerns. These terms referred to unprecedented demands placed on government by the growth requested by the public in its responsibilities and programs, a desire to ensure efficiency and probity in the Public Service of Canada, a serious concern about the adequacy of financial administration in government for establishing effective control over, and accountability for, public funds, and the need to use resources effectively, avoid waste and increase productivity in Government.

Even before the Commission began its deliberations and up until the present, the Government has been taking a range of steps to respond to these concerns and thereby strengthen management and accountability throughout Government. I would like at this time to touch briefly on some of the major initiatives in the last six or seven years.

In conjunction with, and in support of, the general policy to hold spending generally in line with the rate of growth of the GNP, the growth in the size of the Public Service has been tightly constrained. Growth in person-years under Treasury Board control has been explicitly limited as a matter of policy to no more than 1 per cent annually in the last several years and, despite heavy pressures on government programs, the size

of the Public Service under Treasury Board control is almost the same today as it was in 1976-1977.

There has been the introduction of the Policy and Expenditure Management System, the envelope system. This was another major step forward. It provides an expenditure management framework that sets multi-year levels for both total outlays and for various envelopes or policy sectors. It establishes policy committees within cabinet to undertake policy development and decision making within the discipline of the envelope system. While the previous Conservative Government introduced key portions of this system, the current Government has provided its consolidation and final implementation. I would also remind Hon. Members that the key developmental work on the envelope system was undertaken before the previous Conservative Government was in office.

A key elaboration of PEMS, another way of describing the envelope system, has been the introduction by the Treasury Board of the Multi-year Operational Planning System. This system is aimed at fostering more integrated resource planning, budgeting and management throughout the Government. Two key concepts, budgeting to results and budgeting for management, underlie the Multi-Year Operational Plans submitted to the Treasury Board. The first concept is designed to facilitate practical but systematic budgetary analysis based on concrete program outputs and inputs. The second is aimed at providing a clear understanding throughout the Government of the responsibilities of Public Service managers and how these responsibilities translate into budgetary requirements.

The office of the Comptroller General, created in 1978 in response to a central recommendation of the Lambert Commission, assists in the establishment of sound management practices in the federal Government by developing policies and standards and by promoting and monitoring improvements in financial and operational management. Over the last four years 30 or so key departments have participated in one of the Comptroller General's key initiatives called Improvement in Management Practices and Controls, or IMPAC, which is directed at the internal management process of individual departments. IMPAC has resulted in the establishment of action plans for over 100 major projects to improve organization, planning, internal and external reporting, automation, program delivery procedures, audit and program evaluation. Almost 80 per cent of the work on these projects has now been completed, and there is clear evidence of the ongoing yields that are the result. The IMPAC program has identified a total of more than $250 million in annual recurring benefits, of which more than $122 million in annual recurring savings have already been realized.

Substantial progress has been made in implementing the revised form of the Estimates, extending significantly the information made available to Parliament. The Government now presents in the form of Part I a summary of its spending plans in straightforward language and numbers. I am sure the Hon. Member for Capilano will recall his own role with respect to the creation of this document. In the Part III volumes detailed information is being made available on the individual programs in each Department and agency with the express intention of improving the accountability to Parliament by the Government. All of these major initiatives, along with numerous others, have been in the spirit of the recommendations of the Lambert Commission and have contributed to a new framework for management in the Public Service, one which is comprehensive and coherent, yet is also flexible and adaptable and which facilitates accountability.

● (1150)

I would now like to say something about the nature of the Government's current expenditure plan, using it to illustrate the key forces at play in trying to maintain over-all expenditures roughly constant in relation to GNP over the longer term, while responding as effectively and as efficiently as possible to the very real needs of the people of this country.

First, I would like to review briefly the important role in total spending played by statutory expenditure items and other programs providing automatic stabilizers designed to offer Canadians some measure of social and economic shelter in turbulent economic times. Second, I want to comment on that relatively small portion of total spending attributable to the operating costs of all Government Departments.

As the Minister of Finance has indicated, the worst of the very difficult economic climate is behind us. Canadians are regaining their confidence, growth is resuming, inflation is down dramatically, as are interest rates. Unemployment has also decreased but remains distressingly high. Job creation, therefore, continues to be a major Government priority.

The 1983-84 expenditure plan calls for total spending of $90.7 billion, an increase of 12.7 per cent or $10.2 billion over 1982-83. Of this increase, a little over $1 billion is attributable to the rise in public debt charges, almost $1 billion to increased defence costs and over $1.5 billion is directly due to new spending initiatives announced in the budget, including over $500 million for the Special Recovery Capital Projects which are aimed at encouraging and facilitating economic recovery in Canada.

Of the remaining spending increase of about $6.8 billion spread over hundreds of Government activities, fully one-half is entirely due to increases in only four major programs—Government contributions to unemployment insurance, the Old Age Security, the guaranteed income supplement and spouse's allowances programs, and payments to the Provinces under the Established Programs Financing, that is to say, post-secondary education, medicare and the Canada Assistance Plan.

These programs are, of course, the core of our social and economic security system. They provide enhanced and extended benefits to the unemployed throughout Canada, particularly in the regions hardest hit by the recession. They offer basic income support to the aged, particularly those with lower incomes. They support the financing of at least 50 per cent of the cost of hospital insurance, medicare, extended health care, post-secondary education and social assistance payments, welfare services, child support services such as foster care and

daycare, and a broad range of other family and social support services.

I have highlighted these large elements in our expenditure plan because of the special importance such programs take on the tough economic times as automatic stabilizers against some of the worst effects of a recession and the gradual, fragile recovery period we have just entered.

I do not think we should overestimate the scope for changing some of our most basic programs since what Government does reflects society's views of its goals and how Government can assist in achieving them. We must, after all, face some fairly definite facts. For example, there are historic costs associated with the attainment of interprovincial and inter-regional equity in Canada. There are also the costs of achieving a standard of interpersonal equity in Canada.

Successive generations have shared a view of social equity and have succeeded in having it reflected in laws which for many people are tantamount to being the social as well as the legal definition of what it means to be Canadian. While we may consider changing some of those laws, I doubt that Canadians would want us to put at risk fundamental values and goals in pursuit of arbitrary approaches to limiting Government spending.

Of course, in what I have said I have not intended to imply that there is no room at all for streamlining and repriorizing federal activities, and consequently spending, while still effectively meeting the demands on Government posed in a changing environment. I believe we have demonstrated the ability, through processes like the envelope system, to make increasingly tough decisions about programs and policy trade-offs. For example, in his economic statement in the House of Commons last fall, the Minister of Finance cited the reallocation of $1.1 billion from existing programs to new ones, primarily to stimulate job creation at a time of unacceptably high levels of unemployment. However, I must add that this reallocation did not reflect a judgment that this money was being wasted in its previous application, but rather a judgment of priorities.

In the crucible of difficult economic times, it is a transfer of Government support from some very worthy purposes to others which are currently more urgent. However, as I have pointed out, and as I will illustrate further in a few minutes, the room we have to do this, without making fundamental changes in the transfer programs for which the largest portion of federal expenditures are made, is much more limited than most people realize.

One of the major challenges to all Canadians is the need to improve the productivity and competitiveness of our economy. Of course, achieving productivity gains across all sectors of the national economy is beyond the single-handed ability of the federal Government. It requires a co-operative and joint effort by business, labour and Government—in short, by all Canadians.

However, there are ways in which the Government can act and is acting concurrently and supportively. One way is to demonstrate that we intend to and can enhance the productivity of the Government's own operations. As I indicated when I tabled the current year's Main Estimates, as President of the Treasury Board I have set as a major priority continuing this Government's policy of improving the federal Government's management and the efficiency and effectiveness of its programs.

Perhaps I should clarify my definitions of efficiency and effectiveness in Government. Efficiency refers to the way we manage our resources in order to minimize the cost of delivery of Government programs. Effectiveness, on the other hand, refers to the range and the quality of the services that Government delivers to the Canadian people, as well as the extent to which these services meet the objectives expected of them.

As we seek to improve the efficiency of Government as I have defined this concept, it is important to understand the scale of the Government costs involved, since one frequently has the impression of a misinformed, exaggerated view on the part of some that somehow the bulk of the $90 billion federal budget is being squandered on Public Service salaries and perks. The truth of the matter is, of course, that about three-quarters, or about $68 billion of the $90 billion, consists of payments we make to Provinces, businesses, groups and individuals in Canada, as well as for external aid purposes, and from which the recipients benefit directly. The actual cost of developing, administering and delivering these programs is of the order of $12 billion for all Departments and agencies, leaving aside the $8 billion for national defence and the $2 billion for capital projects. Of this $12 billion, about $8 billion is for wages, salaries and employee benefits.

Therefore, while I am confident the federal Government can demonstrate commitment to obtaining efficiencies in administration, I must stress that any such administrative savings obviously will not produce any drastic reductions in the deficit, nor in the size and role of government.

When every Canadian shares a role with every other Canadian in making our national economy more competitively productive, it becomes important for government administration to establish and maintain a high standard of efficient and effective operations. The Government has in the recent past taken a number of steps further to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its operations, initiatives such as IMPAC and the multi-year operational planning process that I have already mentioned.

These kinds of initiatives seek to compensate for the multiple goals often found in the public sector and the lack of an automatic, profit-based bottom line as is available in the private sector, by emphasizing the need for a formal and clear definition and articulation of the results which each program of the Government is expected to achieve. They also involve the development of systems and procedures to allow for measurement of the extent to which the results promised are in fact realized.

● (1200)

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I think the two aspects of our current expenditure plan which I have touched upon illustrate clearly the forces and the constraints within which expenditure and its management must proceed. However, there is no doubt in my mind that a strong framework for controlling expenditures and managing within these constraints has been put into place.

The Auditor General, who is often critical of aspects of government management, has, I think, recognized improvement in the Government's management of its expenditures, because in his last report he said:

I identify the gradual but unmistakable emergence of a new determination in Government and in Parliament toward improved management and more stringent accountability.

He went on to say:

—the political will is now present, and a number of senior managers in the Public Service are responding with a degree of firmness and courage that has not been seen for some time.

Finally, he said:

—I sense a new attitude with respect to improved financial control and a renewed interest in accountability.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the words of the Auditor General help to confirm why the House should reject the motion which is before it. Contrary to the suggestion made by the Hon. Member who presented the motion, we have been working toward progress in the Government's management of its expenditures. We have been making progress and we will continue to do so in the interests of the Canadian people and in the interests of the sound management of our economy. Again, for that reason I urge the rejection of this motion.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) a question. At the beginning of his speech, he spoke quite correctly about the tremendous amount of work that has been done within the bureaucracy and within the Treasury Board in terms of the Comptroller General's progress toward putting in place internal audit and evaluation systems. He spoke quite correctly in terms of the new form of the Estimates as being a reorganization of information for better disclosure. He is aware, however, of the 1976 warning by the Auditor General. At that time spending was $40 billion; today it is $100 billion. The deficit and spending as a percentage of the GNP has risen from 21 per cent to 25.7 per cent in 1983-84. Something is basically wrong.

The missing equation can be found within report No. 7 of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure. Why does the Government continue to sit on that report? Why does it not approve it and restructure the committee system so that the work being done by the Comptroller General can finally get to the House and its proper disclosure and exposure can take place? Why does the Government continue to refuse to allow parliamentary participation in the whole matter of accountability to come to pass?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member and I share a similar desire to improve the process. I was pleased to recognize the work of my hon. friend on the new form of the Estimates. I think we have made progress with the interim rules as well as with the new form of the Estimates. The Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans) is present in the Chamber and I would ask him to bring my hon. friend's comments regarding this report to the attention of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard) so that, in consultation with House Leaders, this item can be raised with a view to seeing when it might be brought forward for discussion.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief. The President of the Treasury Board has spoken glowingly of the Government's efforts in terms of productivity. Why, then, has he refused to acknowledge or do anything about the reports of the Auditor General from 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982 which dealt with the lack of, and want for, productivity within the Public Service?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I disagree with my hon. friend's contention that we have ignored the Auditor General's Reports. Evidence of this is contained within the Auditor General's last Report to the House in which he spoke of his identification of the gradual but unmistakable emergence of a new determination in government and in Parliament toward improved management. He spoke as well of sensing a new attitude with respect to improved financial control and so on. I do not think we have been ignoring the Auditor General's Reports. In fact, one of the main jobs of the Comptroller General, through programs Like IMPAC, is to develop definitions for improved productivity within the Public Service and to develop programs to carry out these definitions.

I repeat what I said in my remarks to the House a few months ago. Unlike the private sector, there is no simple and automatic bottom line definition of productivity or of the results we are seeking within the Government. The Government has a multiplicity of goals, often goals which the private sector could not and would not work toward when applying a strictly profit-based bottom line. This is one of the challenges faced by the Government in terms of over-all improvement of its productivity. That does not mean we should not try to improve productivity.

We are moving in the direction of improved productivity and are making progress through programs like the IMPAC program of the Auditor General. This can be confirmed by the fact that the programs put in place through IMPAC have already demonstrated annual savings of $122 million. These savings are not simply one-time savings but annual savings, with more savings expected as other programs are in place. This shows that we are taking seriously the recommendations of people like the Auditor General.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise the issue of the social costs of the government programs with the Minister. I would point out to the Minister that, as a direct consequence of a particular government program called the National Energy Program, apartment vacancy rates in the City of Calgary are at about 14 per cent. I am told by realtors that

there are over 7,000 homes on the market as a result of foreclosures and over 20 per cent of the office space in the City of Calgary is currently vacant. There has been an enormous increase in the unemployment rate. In fact, the unemployment rate in the City of Calgary is higher than the national average, in spite of the fact that a great many people in the labour force have chosen to leave the City of Calgary and return to other parts of Canada.

I wonder what the Government has been doing in terms of obtaining good projective data about the social costs of a planned government program. Specifically, now that the projections which we as a Party made to the Government some two years ago about the NEP have come true, what steps is the Government taking to lessen the impact of those social costs by replacing its programs with ones that makes sense for the nation? What sense of responsibility does the Government have and what systems will it implement to change programs that are extremely costly to Canadians, even though those costs do not show up directly on a government balance sheet?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I would first like to challenge my hon. friend's premise that the unfortunate unemployment rate and economic difficulty that exists in Calgary today was created by the National Energy Program. My hon. friend would seem to have us believe that there has been no decline in world energy prices and no worldwide recession, causing an economic slowdown and therefore a sharp drop in the demand for energy. Those are the factors that have led to the unemployment rate and economic decline in Calgary.

We must remember that there is no national energy program in the United States. Its Government has gone to world oil prices and the cities in its oil producing regions have experienced unemployment and economic decline. I challenge the accuracy of my hon. friend's premise because he seems to be totally ignorant, as he should not be, of what has been happening in the world in terms of decline in world oil prices and decline in demand created by the worldwide petroleum recession. That is what has caused the unfortunate economic situation to which he refers.

We have shown that we are able to work co-operatively with the industry and with the provincial Governments in order to deal with changing circumstances while remaining true to the basic principles of the National Energy Program. This is exemplified by agreements the federal Government has worked out recently with the Province of Alberta and with oil companies that would see major tar sands projects at Wolf Lake and Cold Lake involving investments of hundreds of millions of dollars go ahead in that Province. My hon. friend is confirming what seems to be a hidden agenda of his Party to destroy the National Energy Program. If that is the case, obviously it will do great damage to Provinces like Nova Scotia and, in fact, to all Canada, because it will be impossible to achieve the objectives of energy security, fairness, and stronger industry objectives which all Canadians support.

• (1210)

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister who will remember that on March 7, speaking to his estimates for this year in reply to a question from the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens), he said, as reported at page 23508 of *Hansard:*

—as I said in my statement in the House on February 22, there will be, as in the past, Supplementary Estimates, but it is our intention to accommodate them within the envelope reserves which I made public at the time of making my statement.

We have Supplementary Estimates to vote on now, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) could explain to the House why the PIP grants increase of $484 million is accommodated in the envelope reserves and how $60 million for Petro-Canada is accommodated in the envelope reserves? Indeed, where in the envelope reserve for energy is the money available for the Supplementary Estimates now before the House?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to provide my hon. friend with a detailed written answer but I want to reiterate the point I made in speaking to my estimates and when I tabled the Main Estimates. I said that in addition to the budgetary Main Estimates printed in the blue book and in the Part III's, the total outlays set out in the Government's expenditure plan include several billions of dollars in reserves to accommodate decisions on expenditure which will have to be brought to the House for approval through supplementary estimates. As far as I am aware, we have remained consistent with what I said. I will be happy to provide my hon. friend with the necessary information in writing.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The period for questions and answers have expired and can only be continued with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There does not appear to be unanimous consent.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I want to state at the outset, lest there be any attempt to misunderstand on the part of the Conservatives, that we will support the motion. We will, perhaps, support it for somewhat different reasons and I want to deal, in part, with some of our reasons.

This is an inadequate way of dealing with a very complex topic. An Opposition day does not lend itself to actually coming to grips with the problems of the way the Government determines its expenditures, the way it establishes its tax system and the cost—to the public of Canada in this case, but it could also be to one of the Provinces—that has to be borne by those who pay the taxes. Unfortunately, on an Opposition day one has to engage in a discussion that is all-encompassing rather than zeroing in on the areas of greatest concern.

I would be more impressed with the logic of the Conservative argument if I could look around the country and see Conservative administrations applying the kinds of principles in a reasonable and humane way that the spokesmen for the Conservative Party put forward today. I would be more impressed if I could look at a Province like Ontario and find within its operations the kind of care and discipline that the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) indicates ought to be in place at the federal level.

I agree wholeheartedly that in many instances the Government does not spend taxpayers' money wisely. As I look at the expenditures, I sometimes wonder why it is that those who earn so little must bear so much of the burden. I frequently look at individuals in my constituency and in others across the country and wonder why people on a marginal level of subsistence are required to contribute so significantly to the over-all tax burden of the Government and the country.

I might be more impressed with the proposals advanced by the Conservative Party if I did not see, even within that group, a tendency developing toward extravagance. The recent expenditures undertaken by the Government on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney), both in the upgrading of Kingsmere for his temporary residence and the rather extravagant expenditures on Stornoway as a semi-permanent residence, are examples. I cannot help but wonder if these are advisable expenditures, given that the person who preceded him there was one of his own Members who undoubtedly took good care of Stornoway. The Government is required to spend something in the order of $100,000—and that does not include the vestibule. When the Leader of the Opposition and his Party suggest that the Government ought to make cuts, yet they require that this money be spent in order to make a residence more comfortable that was in fact very comfortable to begin with, and at no cost to the Leader of the Official Opposition; then we cannot help but wonder whether that Party speaks with a forked tongue.

Having said that, I want to say that I agree that the Government spends its money in part—and I emphasize in part—in ways that I find unacceptable. Over the course of the last eight or ten years I have developed the impression that both at the federal level and at the Conservative provincial levels in Canada, a system is developing which is dangerous and probably harmful to the participants themselves. The major corporate sector, upon which both the Conservatives and Liberals rely almost entirely as the engine of society and the engine of the economy, is unable adequately to manage its own affairs. It is running into considerable financial difficulty, is unable to borrow at the banks, and is unable to find the capital necessary to cover its costs from normal investors. That sector comes to the Government on a regular basis and asks for further handouts, either by way of direct Government subsidy with no pay-back, or it asks the Government to underwrite its borrowing. This means that the strength of the people of Canada will be used to assure it of the capital it requires to keep free enterprise operating. I find it difficult to stomach that at times when, on the other hand, I see a veteran walking around with a colostomy bag who is getting only an old age pension and a veteran's pension of $58 per month and has to survive on that.

• (1220)

I believe the Government has begun to lose sight of its primary purpose of trying to ensure that there is some reasonableness in the way it operates on behalf of the people of Canada. I ask my colleagues in the Conservative Party, the managers of the private enterprise system which they tout all across this land, is it reasonable that the people of Canada who punch a clock, work in an office or are now retired should be required to pay more and more into the coffers of the federal and provincial Governments in order to subsidize, underwrite or in one way or another cover the bad management practices of those who would want, if given the chance, to run the country?

The practices which are being promoted by either the Liberals or the Conservatives—both of whom represent, or at least claim to represent, this major private corporate sector touted by both as being the only salvation for the future—are the same practices which have been followed by the major corporations which have failed repeatedly adequately to manage the resources which they hold in trust for their shareholders. I find it passing strange that I should be hearing of the need to cut and I cannot somehow or other pick up on exactly where those kinds of cuts are going to take place.

I can only assume from looking through the various supplementary estimates and taking into account the objections filed by my colleagues to the right, that perhaps there is some evidence contained in their choice of cuts which would allow me to make judgments about where they believe the cuts should take place. I note, for example, that they want to cut out of the budget the funds for the establishment of a transportation of the handicapped program. I wonder if that is indicative of where the cuts might be made in the future. If that is the kind of cut which the Conservatives are promoting, then I want nothing to do with it. I want to make it clear to the Conservative Party that I will not support that kind of reasoning.

Miss MacDonald: That is not in there.

Mr. Deans: That is in there.

Mr. Blenkarn: Where? I do not find it there.

Mr. Deans: If you cannot find it, then take a look through the book. I have just finished analysing it.

In looking through the cuts—time will not permit me to go through them all—I cannot help but feel that if that is the approach to be taken and the method to be used, I want nothing to do with it. If, however, the Conservative Party is talking about cuts in areas where the Government is handing out money willy-nilly to its friends and former colleagues in order to support their failing businesses in the fond hope that perhaps there might be one or two jobs created—without any guarantees or prerequisites—then I agree wholeheartedly.

That is the difference. If the Conservatives are suggesting that we ought to make the tax system more fair, that perhaps we should bear down on those 200 or more citizens of Canada who earn $60,000 and up and pay absolutely no tax, then I agree with them. If, however, they are suggesting that their entrepreneurial friends should be given further access to the trough in the process, then I reject that.

Mr. Blenkarn: No way.

Mr. Deans: Yet I do not hear them speaking about the problem—

Mr. Blenkarn: You stick around.

Mr. Deans: —of their Liberal friends being up to their necks in the public trough. I do not often hear the Conservative Party discussing that in or around the House of Commons, although it can find umpteen reasons to discuss those at the opposite end of the scale, those on inadequate pensions or those who are working for $10,000 or $12,000 a year and struggling desperately to make ends meet, when it talks about perhaps having a more fair distribution of the wealth of the country. If the Conservatives want to ensure that the people who go out and struggle daily to meet their financial commitments are able to share more equitably in the wealth, I feel I might be in a position to say that we would like to hear the specific proposals so we can deal with them.

I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, something I know you are probably aware of, having been involved in politics and being a student of politics all of your life, that the only government in this country which operated on the basis of efficiency and careful expenditure of public funds for years, which ran its government at the lowest per capita level of civil servant to taxpayer, which ran its government without a deficit, which made sure there was in fact excess money left for investment, was the New Democratic Government of Saskatchewan. I know the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) will bear me out. The Government of Saskatchewan, up until the time it became a Conservative government, when the New Democratic Party was in office ran the tightest fiscal ship in the land. When Bill Davis' Tories were running a deficit, Allan Blakeney's New Democrats were operating in the black. When Bill Bennett's Tories were running a deficit, Allan Blakeney's New Democrats were running in the black. When Peter Lougheed's Tories were running a deficit, Allan Blakeney's New Democrats were operating within their means.

Mr. Huntington: How did they build the Heritage Fund?

Mr. Deans: When I listen to the Conservative Party talking about management, I can only judge them on the basis of those who are of like ilk and who have been given the opportunity to put into practice the management skills which the Conservatives are proposing should be put into practice by their blood brothers, the Liberal Party. I think to myself that almost without exception in similar economic circumstances the Tories managed as badly as the Liberals.

• (1230)

The cost of government to the individual taxpayer in Conservative Provinces, as at the federal level, was more than could reasonably be borne with the exception of the time Allan Blakeney was Premier of Saskatchewan. Therefore, I wonder what the Government could do to satisfy the Conservatives. I doubt very much it could do so in a way that we would find acceptable; but we have a right to hear from the Conservatives exactly where the Government should make its minor adjustments in order to satisfy the Tory approach to fiscal management.

Is it a Conservative desire to redesign the tax structure to both simplify and make it fair? In doing so, are we going to ask those who use the loopholes put in place by Conservative and Liberal administrations to pay their fair share? We agree that should be done. If, as and when the need arises to provide public funds to private corporations, is it the position of the Conservatives that private corporations have to put up equity to protect the public funds? Will they have to enter into agreement to guarantee that the public dollars do not simply go down the drain following the misspent dollars of the corporate boardrooms in the years previous? If so, then we say yes, that kind of program might meet some success.

Is the Government to undertake the elimination of patronage moneys spent by both Liberal and Conservative administrations? Will they eliminate this patting your friend on the back and giving them a little job just to keep them going, the hiring of the Allan Greggs? You know the kind of thing I mean, Mr. Speaker. If that is to be done and public funds are not used for crass political purposes, then, by God, we will support that. If that is the kind of thing the Official Opposition is requesting from the Government, then they have our full support.

The best and most recent example of what I am talking about is where the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) spent some tens of thousands of dollars in an effort to improve his image.

Mr. Blenkarn: Hard to do.

Mr. Deans: It may be hard to improve his image. If that kind of expenditure is to be cut out, we agree 100 per cent that it should be. But if it is to be in the social services area where people who have nothing to protect themselves with are to be further damaged by the measures of a Tory administration, then, thank you but no thank you.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member spent 20 minutes asking a lot of questions and I would like the opportunity to answer a few. He speaks of the Alberta Government being in deficit. True, in maintaining their social programs they are in deficit. But at the same time they put $5 billion aside in the Heritage Fund. I think that shows frugality in the sense that you put aside money in good times so that it is there when it is needed in hard times. That does not happen in socialist governments, as we have seen in the behaviour of the Liberal Government here.

I would also like to point out that the restraint programs of the Government of British Columbia have the support of at least two-thirds of the people of that Province. The faces in opposition are the same socialist faces which are seen at NDP meetings out there.

The Hon. Member refers to cutting expenditures. What about the $1.1 billion in cost overruns in ongoing projects this past year by the incumbent Government? There was $290 million paid to persons not legally entitled to benefits from the UIC. That is the kind of waste which proper management and disclosure will control.

One-third of all taxes paid by Canadians, Mr. Speaker, one dollar out of every three, is used to pay interest on our national debt. What about managing the debt and reducing it, as the Conservative budget in 1979-80 started to do? That was the first budget to project spending increases which matched only the expected inflation rate. It was the first budget to show fiscal responsibility and the Hon. Member's Party stood and defeated it in this House. The first time in 15 years that a government projected fiscal management, his Party stood and defeated it. For those reasons I cannot give too much credence to the questions and statements of the Hon. Member.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I was not sure whether there was a question there but I was looking for it. However, I want to answer one thing that was said. As the Hon. Member knows, when Tommy Douglas took over as Premier of Saskatchewan it took years to get rid of the debt he had to take on as a result of the previous administration. From the day he got rid of that debt until the day Allan Blakeney lost, they ran in the black consistently. Within one year the current Government of Saskatchewan, a Conservative Government, was $500 million in debt.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) seems to address the issue of social costs with a somewhat—and I can well understand it—defensive manner. No wonder. That Hon. Member and those he sits with are the ones who put this Government into office and precipitated the unemployment of two million people in this country and all the fiscal costs and human tragedy which go along with it.

Why does the Hon. Member not complain about the disastrous economic policies of this Government which have precipitated the human suffering in this country? Why did he stand in his place last week and refuse to allow the social costs of unemployment to be debated in this House?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I was waiting for that. To begin with, the first point made by the Hon. Member is wrong. It was not the NDP who defeated the Conservatives, it was the people of Canada. The people of Canada went to the polls and voted you out. Do you know why? Because you were incompetent. That is why, incompetent. So don't keep blaming other people for your incompetence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member will remember that his remarks should be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. Deans: Oh absolutely, and you, Sir, are not incompetent. I am talking through you, Sir, to the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald).

With regard to the matter of last week, everyone knows that out of the five days allotted to the Opposition, the Conservatives, in their usual way, were trying to get them all for themselves. They were not prepared to give us one day out of the five allotted. We asked for a day and we were told No. I therefore filed a motion on another important question in order that that could be debated as a priority matter. I did not know which one they were going to call. If the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands really wanted a debate on the question of those who need help most in the country, they could have called her motion today.

● (1240)

Miss MacDonald: I notice the comments of the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain and I notice that in them he implied that this Government's economic policies are competent. The Government may take some satisfaction from that, Mr. Speaker, but I can tell you the people of Canada do not take much satisfaction from it, and neither should the Member for Hamilton Mountain.

Mr. Deans: One final comment I hope. I can only assume that the Member subscribes to the policies as enunciated by her finance critic when he says that they will not tell the people of Canada what they stand for, because if they knew they would never vote for them.

Mr. Blenkarn: The Member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Deans) made an accusation that a Member of the Progressive Conservative Party filed an objection to the supplementary estimates that in some way dealt with the handicapped. Would he either point out the opposed items in the supplementary estimates as set out in the Order Paper of November 28, or stand in this House and withdraw the remarks?

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker I will point it out. It is No. 15, standing in the name of Mr. Huntington:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $1 under the Department of Transport-Departmental Administration Program.

The explanation of the requirement is the establishment of a transportation of the handicapped program. Just so that the Member can find the page, it is page 195 of Supplementary Estimates (B) booklet A, Departmental Administration Program, Vote No. 1b; and if he reads down just a little below he will find that that is in fact dealing with transportation of the handicapped.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has a problem at this point. It has recognized the Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) previously on an exchange and the Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) has been on his feet. The Hon. Member for Capilano.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, that 1b Vote, and the objection to it, is that it is the use of moneys voted for capital to

build a search and rescue training school that has been transferred over to be used for general expenditure. That is reason that objection is in there. It is not as the Member for Hamilton Mountain just said at all; so withdraw.

Mr. Blenkarn: Withdraw, withdraw.

Miss MacDonald: It doesn't bother him to misstate.

Mr. Deans: How would you be able to tell? To begin with, you are not here often enough to be able to tell?

Mr. Blenkarn: Cheap shot.

Mr. Deans: That is not cheap, that is true. I only deal with the truth. Let me read it again. If I made a mistake I will certainly withdraw it.

Mr. Huntington: You made a mistake. Withdraw.

Mr. Deans: If I made a mistake I will withdraw it. Let me read No. 15 again:

November 25, 1983—That Vote 1b, in the amount of $1 under the Department of Transport—Departmental Administration Program, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

November 25, 1983—Notice is hereby given of opposition to Vote 1b, in the amount of $1 under the Department of Transport—Departmental Administration Program, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984.

I now turn to the departmental estimates, Transport, Departmental Administration Program and Vote 1b. Vote 1b goes on to explain what the purpose of the expenditure is. Under the explanation of requirement it says: "Establishment of a Transportation of the Handicapped program".

There may be more, and I am prepared to concede the Conservatives' reasoning may be somewhat different, but in looking at the program and reading what they have said and what is said in the supplementary estimates booklet, I can only conclude that if one votes against that money and therefore has it removed from the budget of the Government, then the program for the establishment of a transportation of the handicapped program cannot then proceed. I think that is reasonable.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has a problem at this point. The Chair has ignored the clock for a minute or two. It appears that there will be a supply Bill for supplementary estimates before the House and there will be an opportunity, I believe, at that point for an exchange which hopefully will clear up the differences.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to correct an injustice which has been laid on my back. The objection to the $1 vote in question is transferring $1,598,999 from departmental capital budget to operating expenditures. They are transferring $1.6 million from money that we in the House voted for the building of a search and rescue training school over to operating expenditures. It is that principle that is being objected to in this objection.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair again, in the interests of allowing Hon. Members an opportunity to clarify the record, has not seen the clock. Are further interventions to this point or to another point?

Mr. Hawkes: No, it is a question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Member for Mississauga South, is it on the same point?

Mr. Blenkarn: No, debate.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Member for Kingston and the Islands, is it the same point?

Miss MacDonald: My point is a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is directed to remarks by the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain who implied that I had not been here. I say that to you, Sir, as somebody who has been here regularly working on the pension reform committee on which the NDP Member for Nanaimo-Alberni (Mr. Miller) has also been working. I would challenge what the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain has said about any of us who have been working day in and day out—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I believe the Hon. Member has made her point but it is not a point of order. Reflections on the presence or absence of Members in the House are generally considered to be bad taste in the procedures of the House. There is a citation to the effect that the Chair discourages references to the presence or absence of Members.

Mr. Deans: You have got to be able to take it to give it out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: At this stage the Chair recognizes the Hon. Member for Mississauga South for debate.

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you very much for recognizing me at this point. The debate before us concerns the statement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in a televised press conference, and I want to read his quotation into the record again: "We'd soon be on the road to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control". We are on the road to financial disaster because nothing was done to bring spending under control. That is exactly the point of this debate. It disturbs me that the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray), who was here earlier, is not here to follow the debate further through the day.

We have a tremendous country. In our country we have relatively young, educated people. The possibility of resources in our soils and water are unparalleled anywhere in the world. There is really no reason we should be in the difficulty we are in. For every dollar the Government spends this year, over 30 cents will have to be either borrowed or printed. That certainly puts us well down the road to disaster.

Until 1975 we had deficits but they were not of the order, magnitude or percentage of Gross National Product of the deficits we have had since that time. Mr. John Turner, the then Minister of Finance, started the program of spending

much more than was conceivably taken in taxes. Every year since he was Minister of Finance our deficit position has become worse and worse. It is on that particular problem that I would like to address the House today.

• (1250)

In the past year, despite what the President of the Treasury Board said earlier, the percentage of the Gross National Product used directly by the Government rose to 47.3 per cent in 1982. That did not take into account the tremendous amounts of money controlled and spent by Crown corporations in supplying services and engaging in activities, some of which are profitable and some of which are very unprofitable. Therefore, the amount of the Gross National Product that is controlled by the Government has now reached the point where over half of what is created and developed in this country is done by the Government. That has led to the mess we are in.

Let me refer to some of the facts and figures that were set out by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) on April 19. Even if we take into account the exceeding optimism expressed by the Minister in his budget statement, I point out that we have now arrived at a position where our deficits will not allow the country to break even. Even under the most optimistic conditions, such as having virtually 100 per cent employment and the country proceeding at full speed, we would still have a deficit of approximately 3.5 per cent of the Gross National Product.

I say this with regard to the Government's statement which was filed on April 19 and Members are at liberty to look at that documentation. Members will recall that there was a special presentation on the effect of deficits contained within the budget papers. The evidence, as clearly stated by the Department of Finance in its presentation to the House, was that we have that kind of a structural deficit.

The House will recall that the Government's projections in its fiscal plan indicated that we would have a very good year next year when there would be an increase in the Gross National Product of the country of 5.2 per cent. That would be followed in 1985-86 with an increase of 4.4 per cent and the same thing the following year, 1986-87. However, if we follow this deficit position of the Government during those years, even with this enormous growth rate which I point out is far in excess of what we experienced in the 1970s, the Government deficit would still be in excess of $25 billion. Its borrowing requirements would be in excess of $19 billion. The result is that even with projected good times, boom times, if you like, the Government will not come close to balancing the books of the country. This must change.

This country, no more than any individual who runs a household, cannot use credit year after year to pay the grocery bill. We must eventually have a balance. It has never been required that government should be able to balance its books every year. During tough times such as we have experienced in the last two years, perhaps governments should be allowed to go into a deficit position. That is what is called a cyclical deficit. In good times the Government should show a surplus. But I would point out that the Government's present actions make it impossible ever to show a surplus. Indeed, a deficit is built right into the system and, according to the Estimates filed in the House by the Minister of Finance on April 19, the deficit is close to 3.5 per cent of the GNP.

This means that at the present time the Government would either have to increase taxes by approximately $14 billion or $15 billion, reduce its expenditures by the same amount, or perhaps a combination of both.

Let us look at the question of increasing taxes. I think we are all aware that there are precious little opportunities available for large tax increases in the country. Canadians are already paying a level of tax that is in excess of the tax level paid by our trading partner, the United States.

As a practical matter, it is impossible for one nation to have a tax impost that is higher than that of its competitor and trading partner. While there could be different taxes within each country, the over-all effect of taxation must be approximately the same or the country with the higher taxation level will suffer dramatically. Indeed, that is what is happening in Canada today.

Generally speaking, taxes in the United States are considerably lower than those in Canada. That is one of the major reasons the United States did not go as deeply into the recession as Canada and is coming out of it much more rapidly and dramatically than we are. That is why over-all employment in the United States is one million more than it was before the recession, and why over-all employment in Canada is 250,000 less than it was when we went into the recession. Therefore I see no way that we can dramatically increase taxes to cover that structural deficit.

Let us look at the other alternative, that is, to cut our suit to meet the amount of cloth available. This requires some priorizing of Government expenditures. We must consider what the country should do to get itself back on a sound footing. First, I believe we should begin with the concept of zero-based budgeting. I do not believe that Government Departments such as the Department of Agriculture for example, can continue to have its budget automatically increased to meet inflation. This should apply to all Government Departments. With respect to programs, I believe we must get down to the brass tacks of coldly and calculatingly deciding which programs we must keep and which ones we must discard. Interestingly enough, I was reading to Prime Minister's statement which was referred to in the motion and that is what he said in 1968. That is not what he did but what he said.

Next, we should consider carrying out the recommendations suggested by what is commonly referred to as the Huntington-Lachance report. Specifically, this deals with the question of priorizing expenditures and involving the House in that process. In other words, we should create an estimates committee of the House that will work with the Treasury Board in priorizing and determining the expenditures of the Government and where that money should be allocated. It is my view, and I believe that of my Party, that the first obligation of

government is to ensure that the social service network which is in place is maintained.

I notice it is one o'clock. Perhaps I could proceed after three o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being one o'clock, this House stands adjourned until two o'clock later this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, we have seen the writing on the wall for a while now. In a report to be submitted to the Macdonald Royal Commission on the Economy, the Canadian Mental Health Association says that child abuse, suicide, alcoholism, disease, divorce and crime are soaring as a result of unemployment. Deep in everyone's gut most of us believe this to be true.

"Unemployment is more than a problem of economics", the report says. "Regardless of the theory that one uses to explain the existence of unemployment, it is obvious that it takes its toll in ways that go beyond the loss of a pay cheque".

It is also a political problem. The Government has continuously failed in its objective to create permanent jobs to address the real human tragedy that is taking place. This Government has only barely scratched the surface of the problem. It is a national disgrace, and should be our first and utmost concern. As Progressive Conservatives our first priority is the creation of jobs.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

BANGLADESH—HUNGER STRIKE BY POLITICAL REFUGEES IN MONTREAL

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, since November 17 approximately 40 political refugees from Bangladesh have been carrying out a hunger strike at the Montreal Refugee Centre. The purpose of this hunger strike is to alert Canadians and the Canadian Government to the shocking situation in Bangladesh, and to their situation as refugees here in Canada. They have told us that there are now 800 refugees from Bangladesh in Canada who have fled that country because of its harsh anti-democratic regime. Any criticism of its Government can result in 7 to 14 years' imprisonment. The national constitution has been suspended, and hundreds of students have disappeared or have been killed. It is estimated that, in the period from 1972 to 1983, 25,000 persons have been killed for political reasons.

Considering this grave situation and the fact that Canada provides substantial foreign aid to Bangladesh, the refugees ask the Canadian Government to make strong protests to the Bangladesh Government. In addition, they ask the Canadian Government to speed up the process for their official recognition as refugees, awaiting status with more humane, economic, social, and medical assistance.

I beg this House and the Government to give this matter serious attention.

* * *

GREY CUP GAME, 1983

TORONTO ARGONAUTS' SHIP COMES HOME

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise today in all modesty and humility. It is not necessary to remind Canadians of what happened yesterday. The City of Toronto today is basking in the joy of reversing a 31-year drought. The Argos won the Grey Cup with an overwhelming victory, one that was never in doubt.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Wilson: Members today must be somewhat apprehensive. For years we have been aided in our quest for national unity by Toronto's continuing successful role as the doormat of the Canadian Football League. Everybody loved to beat Toronto, and did so with regularity, and, in later years, with some affection. We from Toronto held this country together by giving all regions a common cause. They loved to beat Toronto, and we let them. But now, no more.

However, there is a new glimmer of hope on the horizon, Mr. Speaker. We need not view yesterday's result with apprehension. I refer to some recent remarks by Jim Coutts, that perennial candidate in the riding of Spadina.

Mr. Coutts has taken to making election predictions. He has likened election contests to sporting contests. Mr. Coutts, when asked about recent standings in the Gallup Poll, compared the Conservative Party with the Argonauts. Today I know that all Canadians, not just Argo supporters, will embrace that conclusion, for not only did the Argos win the Grey Cup but they won it having shut out their opponents in the second half. One final comment, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Wilson: This House owes a great debt to Mr. Coutts. He has demonstrated how something as potentially divisive as

S.O. 21

a hard fought Grey Cup final can be transformed into a strong unifying force for all Canadians.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

ENFORCEMENT OF MAINTENANCE ORDERS

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, last week on Private Members' day the Government talked out a Private Member's Bill on maintenance. This was a Bill directed to simplifying maintenance orders. It had the defects of a Private Member's Bill, and it is not the solution to the problem we need. Nevertheless, it is time to ask the Government what it is doing to bring in legislation on the matter.

The appalling rates of non-payment of maintenance orders have been known for years. The Law Reform Commission back in 1969 made recommendations for a more effective system. These were endorsed, and other recommendations were made by the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada in 1970. Yet in 1976 another Law Reform Commission study reported that most maintenance payments were in arrears to some extent. The Government is on very poor grounds now in November, 1983, to be saying that more time is needed to study the complexities of the matter.

Thousands of Canadian women and children live in poverty as a result of nonpayment of maintenance orders. Last June the federal-provincial Committee on Enforcement of Maintenance and Custody Orders reported, with a number of specific and concrete recommendations for reform. Some require federal action, or joint federal-provincial action. Federal legislation is needed to facilitate the location of the defaulters and to make maintenance orders binding on pension benefits, estates, unemployment insurance benefits, and income tax refunds. The object is prompt, automatic enforcement.

A unified family court system is needed to permit one-step access to maintenance.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired. The Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall).

* * *

SHIPBUILDING

LACK OF ORDERS AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, measures were introduced by the Government to strengthen the Canadian shipbuilding industry on January 6, 1983, and confirmed in a Ways and Means Motion tabled on June 29, 1983. These measures are crucial for the survival of the industry, and it is essential that the Ways and Means Motion be passed as soon as possible. We on this side have been willing to support these measures with little or no debate if the Government would bring them forward.

Commercial orders in Canada have virtually dried up, and employment in Canadian yards has dropped from above 14,000 in March, 1982, to under 7,000 in September, 1983. Foreign built vessels are entering Canadian waters in record numbers. The industry needs the suppport it was promised in the January announcements because its very survival does hang in the balance. We are ready. We simply wonder when the Government will be ready to bring these measures forward.

* * *

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

SIZE OF GOVERNMENT DEFICIT

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Government has repeatedly stated that it will bring government spending under control. But since the Liberals have been in power they have turned a budget surplus of $493 million into a $31.3 billion record deficit for this year. The interest on the national debt alone will cost taxpayers $17.6 billion dollars this year.

In private industry an enterprise with revenue that only equalled 65 per cent of expenditures and with gross debt that was four times the value of its net assets, would be forced into receivership.

● (1410)

It is time for the Government to stop the Canadairs and to review the Devcos, as the Canadian taxpayers cannot afford any more of these ridiculous handouts. The people of Canada want action, instead of words and promises. They want the Government to show some responsibility and require the recipients of these handouts at least to be held accountable.

The Government is very good at preaching restraint, yet at the same time it had no qualms about spending $15.7 million on food and entertainment in 1982-83. With that kind of restraint policy, the prediction by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in 1969 that Canada would be on the road to financial disaster if nothing was done to control Government spending will become a reality.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NICARAGUA—INTERVENTIONS BY UNITED STATES BACKED FORCES

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, two years before his assassination Prime Minister Maurice Bishop of Grenada said that there must be a great outcry of international public opinion not only when the marines land in somebody else's territory but also when there is evidence of a systematic and concerted plan of destabilization. For Grenada, that outcry came too late. It is not yet too

late for Nicaragua. We must cry out against the growing United States threat against that country.

The United States has revived the Condeca group of front-line states to give a pretext of regional concern about security. In the United States the Council of Hemispheric Relations has learned that "Operation Pegasus" plans a buildup of contra activities from Honduras, trying to provoke a counter attack from Nicaragua. The United States continues war games and simulated invasions in Honduras. It finances violence within Nicaragua, where thousands of people have died, and it has just appropriated another $24 million for that purpose. In the meantime Canada has no embassy in Nicaragua and must get all of its information second or third hand, mostly from the United States.

Canada could help to stabilize the situation by opening its own embassy, and by providing aid on a priority basis. We must act—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

POLITICAL PARTIES

PROSPECTIVE LIBERAL PARTY LEADERSHIP CANDIDATES

Mr. Girve Fretz (Erie): Mr. Speaker, despite the discouraging Liberal results in the latest Gallup Poll, the media seem to think that John Turner is not horsing around anymore. The more he denies his interest in running for Liberal leader, presumably after "the Last Supper" coming up in December, the more we suspect that he intends to run. After all, how unexciting the life of a senior law partner must be as compared to the plush life of a future Opposition Leader.

While the cat is away the mice will play. While Mr. Trudeau is away—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Fretz: —in a last-ditch effort (a) to solve the world's problems, and (b) polish his own image, the Liberal pawns, seeing the possible future checkmate under King Trudeau, are seeking discreet ways to advance up the board and grab the crown. Even the beauteous and illustrious Iona Campagnolo may yet make the move out on the Liberal limb, that is if Jean or Eugene don't break it off first, but it is Mr. Turner who sits on the back burner—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. There is a real question about the use of Standing Order 21 for attacks on individual Members of the House. The Chair has brought this to the attention of other Members previously.

Mr. Fretz: This wasn't an attack, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Hamilton West.

INDUSTRY

EFFECT ON STEEL INDUSTRY OF PROPOSED ALUMINUM SOFT DRINK CANS

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the federal Government has taken some recent initiatives to boost Canada's steel industries. The changes to the Crow rate and the expansion of the rail networks in western Canada will give Canadian steel companies a chance to bid competitively for millions of dollars in contracts. As well, the Anti-Dumping Tribunal is currently looking into several claims put forth by Canadian steel companies about unfair pricing on some steel imports. However, it is a very serious concern to me that the Government of the Province of Ontario is presently considering ending the steel industry's monopoly on soft drink can production.

Stelco and Dofasco have carried out a department by department analysis of the impact on employment of the loss of the soft drink can market. Their analysis has shown that such a ruling would result in a loss of 607 jobs, with 560 of those lost jobs being in Hamilton and Nanticoke. Although these job figures are for the soft drink can market for all of Canada, a loss of the Ontario market would make production for the rest of Canada uneconomic.

The current regulations state that 85 per cent of each soft drink can must be made of steel. In light of the hardships that the steel industry has recently endured, a decision to end its monopoly in soft drink can production would be extremely burdensome. I therefore sincerely recommend that the Ontario Cabinet protect the steel industry's jobs in these difficult times.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

CANADIAN MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION REPORT—SOCIAL COSTS OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Deputy Prime Minister. For the second time within a week a major report has shown the tragic human costs of unemployment. Over the weekend the Canadian Mental Health Association said that child abuse, suicide, alcoholism, disease, divorce and crime are soaring as a result of unemployment. Last week when I raised this issue with the Deputy Prime Minister because of a similar report by the Family Service Association, the Deputy Prime Minister tried to slought it off.

Today I would like to ask him, seeing that it was his Government's policies, and his 1981 budget in particular, that caused the hardships that so many people are suffering, will he tell us when the Government will realize the magnitude of the

social costs it has created and begin to take steps to redress that cost?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I think all Members of this House and all Canadians are very concerned about the social costs of unemployment just mentioned by the Hon. Member, particularly because in nearly all Canadian families there are young people who are entering the labour market for the first time and are unable to find employment. That is why, contrary to what the Hon. Member claimed, the Government has made every effort not only to increase substantially the amount of funding for job creation in this country but also to direct such funding more specifically towards training and jobs for our young people, and that is the kind of policy we intend to pursue in the future.

[*English*]

RESPONSIBILITY FOR WARNING GOVERNMENT OF POLICY CONSEQUENCES

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, not only does the Deputy Prime Minister try to slough off these questions, he passes them over to someone else who will not answer for the costs that he created.

The Canadian Mental Health Association says that the real unemployment rate is much higher than that which is given by Statistics Canada, and that the downstream social costs are going to run into the billions of dollars because of prolonged unemployment. When the Government took the decision to introduce measures which would bring about higher unemployment, which Cabinet Ministers were responsible for warning the Government of the long-term social costs that would be created, and why did the Cabinet pay so little attention to them?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that a Member with the Hon. Member's experience should get upset because the Acting Prime Minister did not answer her question. We have a system in Parliament which also existed when the Hon. Member was a Minister, under which there are Acting Ministers when a Minister cannot be in the House. Today, I happen to be acting for my colleague, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, and I shall certainly try to answer the Hon. Member's questions. I must say I totally disagree with the Hon. Member's argument that by introducing certain policies, the Government has created unemployment. In fact, the opposite is true, because as I said before in my first answer, everything is being done to focus employment policies on specific target groups, including young people and those groups where unemployment rate is very high, and I think the Minister of Employment and Immigration and the Minister of Finance have demonstrated in the past that we have created more jobs in this country than has been the case in any other OECD country in recent years.

[*English*]

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT ACT TO CREATE JOBS

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, obviously the Deputy Prime Minister does not want to own up to the mistakes he has made and that is why he sits in his seat. I would like to point out to him, or to the Minister he has named to speak in his place, that both of these reports in the last week stress the really long-term—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Will the Hon. Member please ask her question?

Miss MacDonald: Because of the long-term problems that are going to be created for children of the unemployed, and these are stressed in both reports, when will the Government see that there will be enough jobs created to turn this situation around? When will the Government stop the escalating destruction of family life and of children's lives because of the policies it has already introduced? When will the Government turn that situation around? When will it see that jobs are created so that that kind of situation no longer exists in our country?

● (1420)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member would do well to stop the rhetoric and start looking at the evidence. She would then realize that every day, jobs are being created all over Canada, through programs such as Canada Works, the Local Employment Assistance Program and the Career Access Program. Perhaps the Hon. Member would realize the extent to which Canadians in the private sector are making use of the Industrial Regional Development Program, the IRDP, under which eight industrial incentives programs were consolidated to accelerate the job creation process.

[*English*]

SKILLS TRAINING FOR RECIPIENTS OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. Those of us on this side of the House are concerned about social costs, including wife beating, suicide, and alcoholism. The antidote to those problems, Mr. Speaker, is clearly for a person to have something productive and useful to do.

I wonder if the Minister could respond to this concrete suggestion. Current statistics indicate that one in 100 people who receive unemployment insurance are allowed to take training and receive benefits. Could the Government accept a target of one in ten Canadians who collect unemployment insurance being eligible to take training this winter? Could

those people be trained for a job rather than sit idle and collect unemployment insurance? Would the Government accept that suggestion?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I think this is an interesting suggestion, and I may say that over the last twelve months, we have been trying through the Skills Growth Fund to achieve this objective, in other words, to increase the number of people receiving benefits so that more people will be eligible for training, to ensure that these people will be able to find more permanent employment in the future.

[*English*]

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, had the Minister looked at the data, he would have seen that the numbers are going backward rather than forward, according to the latest statistics.

REQUEST THAT ENERGY EXPLORATION FUNDING BE DIRECTED TO WESTERN CANADA

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, may I offer the Minister another concrete suggestion? Under the National Energy Program, funding for exploration in western Canada has been cut by one-third and funding for frontier exploration has been increased, not by an equal amount but by somewhat less than that, being about 40 per cent to 45 per cent. Frontier exploration creates less than half as many jobs as would be created through the same expenditure on exploration in western Canada. My concrete suggestion is to take the funding from frontier exploration and use it in western Canada to create more jobs and produce more oil faster during this crisis. This would mean that less money would have to be sent to Saudi Arabia and Mexico and that jobs would be created in Canada. Would the Minister consider taking that kind of a major initiative?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to consider all kinds of suggestions, but I may remind the Hon. Member, although I am not the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, that as far as energy is concerned, both the Province of Alberta and the Government of Canada provide grants for industry and for exploration, and we are responding to requests from the private sector in this area. However, I think the Hon. Member's suggestion is worth looking into.

[*English*]

PROFITS OF CORPORATIONS—RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance and refers to the Canadian Mental Health Association report. As the Minister knows, that report documents the suffering experienced by unemployed Canadians, including depression, anxiety, and mental illness.

The Minister is well aware that corporate profits have reached pre-recession levels while the unemployment rate remains well above the pre-recession level of 7 per cent. Does the Minister think that it is fair that corporations should benefit from the recovery while people continue to suffer from depression and mental illness? How long will it take him to lower the unemployment rate to pre-recession levels?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Hon. Member that, indeed, corporate profits have recovered but they have not recovered to the levels experienced in the 1970s before the recession. In addition I remind him that, if we wish to create jobs, those jobs will have to be created mainly by the private sector and the private sector must have high enough profits to allow it to create those jobs. The private sector will be the engine of growth in that regard.

I would also remind my hon. friend that most of the jobs created in the last six months have been created by the private sector. Canada has created relatively more jobs than any other industrial country in the world. Canada has been a world leader in job creation in 1983 and we hope to continue that trend into 1984 and reduce unemployment as fast as possible.

Mr. Keeper: Mr. Speaker, we would like to see the Minister reduce unemployment as fast as he increases profits.

RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY CANADIAN MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Mr. Speaker, the same Canadian Mental Health Association report indicated that we cannot continue to develop strategies that barely scratch the surface of this deep and dangerous issue. The report made several recommendations. It recommended that massive lay-offs be justified, that workers facing lay-offs be allowed time off with pay to look for another job, and that the Government improve and expand its job-creation and training measures. I would like to know if the Minister is prepared to take action with regard to these specific proposals or if he intends to stand by and watch Canadians suffer while their mental and physical health deteriorates.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member kept himself abreast of the actions of the Government he would know, for instance, that the Government has been constantly adjusting its job-training and creation programs to answer the needs of the labour force as those needs are changing. We are continuing to do this in order to make sure that we get the most effective results for the large expenditures of money that are being incurred to alleviate the serious problem of unemployment.

Oral Questions

INDUSTRY

MAISLIN TRANSPORT LTD. BANKRUPTCY—ADVICE GIVEN BY DEPARTMENT'S OFFICIALS

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and refers to the Maislin bankruptcy which will cost Canadian taxpayers some $34 million. I am sure the Minister is aware of a recent article in *The Toronto Star* which reports that his officials prepared a detailed report to Cabinet expressing grave doubts about the possibility of saving the Maislin situation. However, at that very same time the Government was indicating that there was a reasonable possibility that Maislin would survive. Clearly the House has been misled by the Government. Why did the Minister proceed with the bailout in the face of the clear and contrary advice of his officials?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, first I think the Hon. Member is making an assumption by saying that it would cost the taxpayers of Canada $34 million. As the Hon. Member should know because of his business experience, that is yet to be determined. Second, with regard to any report that may have been made by officials, I am sure the Hon. Member does not accept verbatim every single word in every report made by government officials no matter how distinguished or competent those officials may be.

NATURE OF GOVERNMENT'S DECISION

Hon. Michael Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Minister has neglected to tell us why the report was ignored. I said at the time that it was a dumb business decision and a dumb economic decision. This report reinforces that conclusion. It also reinforces the conclusion drawn by Hon. Members on this side of the House that the decision was not based upon business or economics but was a pure political payoff. Can the Minister give any specific information today which would give Canadians a shred of confidence needed to believe that that conclusion is not warranted?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member continues to discuss the Maislin situation. If I recall correctly, Members of the Conservative Party were also against helping out Chrysler and yet that has been one of the greatest success stories in the history of the world.

GOVERNMENT'S DECISION-MAKING POLICY

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, we must determine whether this is just a $34 million mistake or whether there is a pattern of the Government ignoring early warnings given by its officials. Did the Government receive early warnings from officials against its actions in the cases of Canadair, Dome, and Massey-Ferguson?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, based upon his position when he was Prime Minister of Canada, the right hon. gentleman should know that it is not the habit of Ministers to comment in the House upon discussions they have had with their officials. However, I wish to remind the Right Hon. Member that Massey-Ferguson is still operating and thousands of jobs have been saved across the country. White Farm Equipment has been bailed out twice by the Government, with some consideration given to representations made by members of his own Party. There are at least 11,000 people in the country working for the Chrysler Corporation who owe their jobs to the initiatives taken by the Government to assist this company in the last two years.

● (1430)

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Canadians deserve some guarantee that their money is not just being thrown away by the Government. From documents revealed over the weekend we know that the Government deliberately ignored the most serious warnings of its own officials that there would be a loss in the neighbourhood of $34 million.

REJECTION OF ADVICE

Righ Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, the advice against this spending came in May 1982, and the decision to spend came in July, 1982. We want to know if there is a pattern of the Government receiving advice warning against waste of money and ignoring that advice, or is this case an accident? Is Maislin the only case in which the Government acted against the advice of its officials when its officials warned that public money would be wasted?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, it is rather amusing to see the former Prime Minister of the country make a statement like the one he just made.

On every decision that the Government takes, it receives all kinds of advice. I am sure we could go back and look at the Chrysler situation, for example, and see that a number of representations were made by Members on that side of the House when the Right Hon. Member was Leader of the Opposition, against the Chrysler situation.

Sometimes Governments do make mistakes; sometimes things do not turn out exactly as planned. That is as disturbing to the Government as it is to the taxpayers of Canada. However, I think that the over-all track record of the Government in the so-called bailouts that the right hon. gentleman refers to, has been pretty good.

CANADA MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

REPORTED THREAT OF WITHDRAWAL FROM CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING PROJECTS

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. At the weekend the President of Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation indicated that the Government was not getting a big enough bang for its buck in social housing, that it might withdraw from the co-op sector of public housing, and instead, institute some kind of direct shelter allowance for low-income renters. Whether that report is accurate or not, I want to ask the Minister what his views are on the possibility of the Government withdrawing from social housing and public co-op housing and introducing a direct shelter allowance.

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, there is no question at all of moving away or withdrawing from social housing. I hope the Hon. Member will take the time to read the report which is an evaluation of the co-operative and non-profit housing program and which has just been released. That report indicates what we have felt for some time, that is, that the program might not be targeted as well as we want and that we should look for ways of doing a better job. If the Hon. Member takes that positive attitude, then we are in complete agreement. There is no question of withdrawing from social housing programs.

Mr. Blackburn: Mr. Speaker, the Minister did not answer my question specifically on co-op public housing and on shelter allowance, both of which were mentioned by the President of Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, at a time when thousands of Canadians are out on the streets. It is true that over the last five years the federal Government has reduced social public housing investment by $700 million.

GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Derek Blackburn (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I want a direct answer to my question on whether the Government is getting out of social housing and whether it is going into direct shelter allowance and away from co-op housing. Yes or no.

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member should really not confuse co-op housing, which is a form of social housing, with the other programs of social housing, particularly those intended for senior citizens, which is the group most in need. There is no question of moving away from encouragement to social housing for those who are most in need. The difficulty I have is that the queue of those waiting is getting longer, and the program is not adequately targeted for those who have the most pressing need for improved housing. Shelter allowance is one possibility, but it is one among a number of possibilities. That is why—

Mr. Blackburn: Oh, oh!

Mr. LeBlanc: If the Hon. Member would allow me to answer, instead of shouting, perhaps I could transmit some information. Shelter allowance is one proposal, but it is one which we have not adopted. We are examining it with the others recommended in the report.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

DENMARK—DRUG RAID ON AMBASSADOR'S RESIDENCE

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, Canada made rather unfortunate headlines last weekend in Denmark as a result of a drug raid on the Canadian ambassador's residence in Copenhagen. Would the Minister indicate how long the Government knew that an international drug ring was using the Canadian ambassador's residence as a meeting place and drug depot for its activities?

Mr. Speyer: A bunch of dopes!

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member is building up the case rather beyond what it deserves. The situation was drawn to my attention very recently that the local police were investigating an employee of the ambassador's residence on the suspicion that she had been involved in the drug business. We did co-operate with an investigation undertaken by the Danish police and they did uncover, I believe in the room of the employee at the ambassador's residence, a considerable quantity of hashish.

Mr. Stevens: One hundred kilograms.

Mr. MacEachen: A considerable quantity. We co-operated with the Danish police, and I think it is a good thing that the situation has been uncovered. It is not the normal situation.

Mr. Nielsen: It was too big to hide under the bed anyway.

EMPLOYEE'S CONNECTION WITH FUGITIVE FROM CANADIAN JUSTICE

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister. Would he indicate if the Government was aware that the maid to whom he has referred, and who was employed by the Canadian Government, for six years was working with one Bjaern Hinesberg, who skipped bail in Montreal in 1975 after being charged with six others for conspiracy to import drugs into Canada? Did the Government know that the residence was being used as a meeting place for the drug ring? In fact, when the investigation was under way and the maid was being arrested, the doorbell rang and two Britishers were arrested, were picked up right on the door step of the Canadian government residence, they being implicated in the drug ring themselves.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker,

that information was made public. It is a fact that while the police were apprehending the employee and finding the drug loot, a couple of accomplices walked in and accommodated the police at that very moment. Not both of them were British; one was an Irishman.

* * *

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

DECENTRALIZATION OF INCOME SECURITY PROGRAM OFFICES

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare but in her absence I would ask the Parliamentary Secretary to respond. I have in my hand a news release and a letter from the Minister stating that four offices will be decentralized, three from Toronto to places like Peterborough, Chatham and Timmins, and one from Halifax to Sydney, in the relocation of offices dealing with income security programs. I should like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary if there is any meaning in the fact that three of these four offices represent Liberal ridings, Chatham, Timmins, and Sydney, and the moves are all taking place during the period of the release, 1982-84. Why is the Minister not having the one in Peterborough take effect until 1986?

Mr. Jim Schroder (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I think if you look at the operations of the Government you will find that in the designation of offices under the decentralization we have been very fair.

CREATION OF JOBS IN PETERBOROUGH, ONT.

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, in trying to be fair, as the Minister no doubt is, in the letter to me she refers to the 165 new jobs that will be created in Peterborough. I am sure her colleague, the Minister of Employment and Immigration, is happy to hear about that. If she is really fair to Peterborough, why is she creating the 165 jobs in 1986?

Mr. Jim Schroder (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I think this is further evidence of the fact that we are being fair. I do not think the people in Peterborough would be very happy about the fact of us not having those jobs.

* * *

INDUSTRY

ESTABLISHMENT OF HELICOPTER PLANT IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC—SIZE OF PROJECT

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. A few weeks ago the Minister announced that Bell-Textron was building a large helicopter facility in the Mirabel area of the Province of Quebec. Could the Minister confirm that in fact Bell Helicopter Textron first proposed a $37 million project rather than a $514 million project, which would create 22 jobs?

• (1440)

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): No, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact I believe the first project it raised with us was something like a quarter of a billion dollar project, and through good negotiation we were able to up that into a half a billion dollar project.

LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. Paul Dick (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, of course we note that the federal Government is participating to the tune of $165.2 million. There were a number of other localities, in New Brunswick, Ontario and elsewhere, which were being considered. Could the Minister indicate whether or not localities in the Province of Ontario were offered the same federal financial assistance?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): If I recall, Mr. Speaker, the level of assistance for a substantial portion of that project was dependent upon the area in which the plant was located, using, for example, the tier 1, tier 2, tier 3, and tier 4 criteria laid down under the IRDP program.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT BUY COLONY FARM IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have just one question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture. As the Secretary knows, there have been numerous requests from authorities in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, inlcuding the President of UBC, for the federal Government to purchase Colony Farm from the Government of British Columbia before the farm gets blacktopped, especially with the Smithers research facility now unavailable to the Department of Agriculture. Would the Parliamentary Secretary tell the House whether the federal Government is actively considering this urgent request from the people in that area that the federal Government consider buying Colony Farm?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Member's question, I must say first of all that Agriculture Canada is at present operating a research station at Agassiz in southern British Columbia. In fact, Agriculture Canada does not need other farms for research in British Columbia. The Department does, however, deplore the fact that the Government of British

Columbia is getting rid of this 640-acre farm which is being used exclusively for agriculture, and it is to be hoped that other private interests will be able to acquire this property.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

REGULATION OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS—GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. The Minister will know that we now have a situation where the banks are involved in security trading, where we have the insurance companies wishing to be involved more openly as trustees of pensions plans and holders of securities for others, we have very unhappy trust companies, and the Minister is contemplating increasing their commercial lending. We have the credit unions again unhappy about their status. I was wondering if the Minister of Finance has any plans to introduce any legislation to clean up this mess in the regulation of financial intermediaries.

Are we going to leave the various branches of financial intermediaries to continue to compete with each other, break the existing statutes and, find a way around various regulatory controls? What plans has the ministry in terms of straightening out and ending the confusion between financial intermediaries and their individual responsibilities?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Hon. Member that, if he knows of any statute being broken, he should bring it to the attention of his provincial Attorney General so that action can be taken. I suggest to him that he will not be able to point out any such instances.

As to the other aspect of the Hon. Member's question, I am surprised that the Conservative Party is now for more regulation and less competition. If that is the new policy of the Conservative Party I am going to take note of it until it is changed by the critic for that Party, who said that the public should never know what its policies are before the election.

Finally, I would like to say that if any legislation is to be introduced, it will be announced in due time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Mississauga South for a short supplementary question.

GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, the Minister knows that there is a great deal of confusion taking place in the marketplace. The Minister knows that the Province of Ontario produced a White Paper—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Will the Hon. Member ask his question?

Mr. Blenkarn: I was in the process, Mr. Speaker, of trying to get the question out as quickly as possible. When will the Minister advise this House as to where the Government stands with respect to the regulation of the various financial intermediaries, or is it just going to be a question of doing nothing and letting all heck break loose, as it did with Greymac, Seaway, Caledonia, and Strathcona? When is the Government going to do something to get that house in order?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that most of the cases referred to by the Hon. Member come under provincial jurisdiction, not federal jurisdiction. Second, I would like to point out to the Hon. Member that the position of the Government is spelled out in the statutes and the regulations which are in effect at the present time. When I have changes to announce, they will be announced in due course.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

POSTING OF FEMALE EMPLOYEES BY DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. The Minister will know that approximately 20 of the young men and women recruited by his Department in 1982 are now being posted. Will the Minister tell us why all of the women are being cross-streamed to Immigration and, evidently, none of the men?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, no, I cannot tell the Hon. Member about that. I will make inquiries and give him all the information I can get.

IRISH EMBASSY POSTING

Mr. David Kilgour (Edmonton-Strathcona): Again, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 8,000 career personnel in the Minister's Department, will the Minister tell us why so many of the top positions are filled by people who are not promoted from within on the basis of merit? Will he also tell us why the ambassador to Ireland is no longer a career diplomat and is now one of the Minister's political friends?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the post in Ireland has been held by the same person for some months now. It has been the practice for the Government to appoint to a number of posts persons who are not members of the diplomatic service. I believe that is a defensible thing to do. I do not see any reason for being defensive about the present incumbent in Ireland.

Oral Questions

INDUSTRY

MAISLIN TRANSPORT LTD. BANKRUPTCY—GOVERNMENT'S CONTINGENT LIABILITY

Hon. Bill Jarvis (Perth): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and is supplementary to earlier questions put by the Hon. Member for Etobicoke Centre regarding the Maislin bailout. If I understood the Minister, in reply to a question he indicated that the taxpayers had not lost $34 million, I presume because the Government has not written the cheque yet. Is it true, first, that the Government is carrying on its books a contingent liability for $34 million with respect to Maislin? Second, and more important, what is the Minister's estimate of the taxpayers' loss? I presume his Department must have that estimate. If it is not an estimated loss of $34 million, by what lesser amount does the Minister estimate the taxpayers will lose over the Maislin bailout?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member, being a member of the legal profession, will know that there is almost no way to determine amounts until such time as the receiver makes his report regarding the disposal of the assets and how much money can be raised as a result of the disposition of those assets. The amount of $34 million, as of this point in time, is incorrect, and we will not know the amount until such time as the receiver makes his final report.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

THE CASE OF DONALD MARSHALL—COMPENSATION SOUGHT FOR WRONGFUL IMPRISONMENT

Mr. Chris Speyer (Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. There is a growing sense of outrage at the lack of justice which is being accorded to Donald Marshall, who spent 11 years in penitentiary for a crime he did not commit. If, in a civilized and healthy system of justice, we try to right the wrongs which have been accorded to an individual, what leadership has the Minister of Justice shown in rectifying the injustice done to Mr. Marshall in terms of compensation for the legal fees and for the 11 years which he unjustifiably served in a penitentiary?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): As I believe the Hon. Member may know, those precise questions were asked and answered in this House last week. The fact of the matter is that Mr. Marshall was prosecuted by a Crown prosecutor in the Province of Nova Scotia under the direction of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, after the investigation of his crime by police of the City of Sydney, Nova Scotia, which, of course, falls under the jurisdiction of the Province of Nova Scotia. Therefore, there is no federal involvement of the Department of Justice in the investigation or trial of Mr. Marshall.

• (1450)

Although we certainly have no responsibility to do anything, because I am so concerned that the Province of Nova Scotia has not yet assumed any responsibility in this important case, I have discussed the matter with the Attorney General of Nova Scotia and asked him to consider very seriously the responsibilities I believe the Province should undertake.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER ACT

Mr. Chris Speyer (Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, if the Province of Nova Scotia takes no action to correct this injustice, in those circumstances will the Minister of Justice act?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member was elected in the Province of Ontario and knows, I am sure, that that Province, which has analogous problems in the field of justice, appears to be prepared to assume its responsibilities. Is he suggesting that, when a provincial Government does not fulfil its responsibilities in matters within its jurisdiction, the proper course for the federal Government is to play "Big Brother" and take over the whole of provincial jurisdiction? If that is the position of the Opposition on this, I would like to hear about it.

Some Hon. Members: You hypocrite.

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The Chair has recognized the Hon. Member for Haldimand-Norfolk.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

USE OF IRON ORE SLAG IN HARBOUR PROJECT AT PORT DOVER, ONT.

Mr. Bud Bradley (Haldimand-Norfolk): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment who will know that the Department of Public Works has approved the use of iron ore slag for break-wall fill in the harbour project at Port Dover, Ontario. Can the Minister advise us whether his Department has carried out studies on the effects of the slag on fish species found in Lake Erie?

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I know that to give an adequate reply to that question I will have to review the report if it is with us at the present time.

* * *

MEDICAL CARE

REQUEST FOR INTRODUCTION OF NEW CANADA HEALTH ACT

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Deputy Prime Minister. For a year and a

half the Minister of National Health and Welfare has been bemoaning the problems of Medicare associated with the question of extra billing and user fees. Once again she spoke on this issue in Toronto and pointed out the problems of delaying action. She said, "Each week we wait, each month we wait, there are Canadians who have to pay extra who can't afford it". Considering that the Government has scheduled another week's holiday to start this Wednesday, will the Government practise what it preaches, recognize there is a crisis in Medicare and, instead of recessing for that week, bring in a Canada Health Act now?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it seems reasonable to me that the House should have a short break between the end of the longest session in Canadian history and the new session. I understand that break has been agreed to by all Parties in the House. I ask the Hon. Member not to be terribly disappointed because it will be possible to deal with the matter he has raised at an early date in the new session of Parliament.

EXTRA BILLING COSTS—REQUEST FOR EARLY ACTION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, the Government cannot have it both ways. It cannot say this is a crisis seriously affecting Canadians and, at the same time, say we need another week's break, just when we had a break two weeks ago. We are prepared to stay for that week, all day, every day, if it is necessary to pass the Act. We will do that.

Mr. Huntington: Rubber stamp it.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: Just because the Conservative Party has not made up its mind on this issue does not mean we have not.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare pointed out that it is costing Canadians more than $1 million a week in extra billing costs alone. We have a crisis in Medicare and we could deal with that measure within a week. Therefore, why will the Government not bring the Bill before this House within 24 or 48 hours?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is sort of a regular pattern to this performance we are seeing today. It is known as the pre-Christmas NDP grandstanding.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: Since I have been in this House, every time the House is ready to break for a well established reason the NDP always says, "Why don't we stay another day, another week and get this urgent piece of legislation done?" In the meantime they are filibustering most of the legislation, holding it up when it comes before the House.

REQUEST THAT SCHEDULED WEEK'S RECESS BE CANCELLED

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I remind the Minister that Christmas is on December 25, not today. I also remind him that the Government of Canada has been talking about action for a year and a half, the Liberal Party has been playing politics with the sick of this country, and we are tired of it. If the Government is so concerned about the whittling away of the basic principles of Medicare, which the Minister of Health goes on about week after week, and given the fact we had a week's holidays just two weeks ago, what would be wrong with coming back to deal with the matter within that week and restore to Medicare the basic principles which Canadians used to accept?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Hon. Member that the Minister of National Health and Welfare is doing a tremendous job in supporting the principles of Medicare. She will be regarded as the person in this country who has taken the lead in that matter. I can understand why the Hon. Member wants to get a piece of the action rather late in the day. She is carrying the ball, and she will do it very well.

* * *

ENERGY

ADMINISTRATION OF PETROLEUM INCENTIVES PROGRAM

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Because of the drain on the Government Treasury caused by the PIP grants, and because of the many accusations that exploration companies are abusing PIP grants, has the Minister launched an inquiry from his Department into the administration and uses or abuses of PIP grants?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if such an investigation were to be made, it would not be done by my Department but by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. If the Hon. Member has any specific charges to make, perhaps he could make these known privately to my colleague, or publicly if he prefers, but we shall investigate if he is able to provide evidence that some abuse may have occurred.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, the Minister is fully aware that the cost of exploration drilling in the so-called Canada Lands has increased three-fold since PIP grants were introduced. As he is responsible for the federal treasury, and this is clearly a treasury responsibility, has he or his Department launched an investigation into the uses or abuses of the PIP grants program?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I already answered the Hon. Member's question. He is repeating the same question so he will get the same answer.

* * *

• (1500)

SUPPLY AND SERVICES

ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF F-18 PROGRAM FOR PROVINCE OF QUEBEC

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Supply and Services.

When he visited Valcourt about a month ago, the Minister said, in referring to the F-18 economic benefits, that to him it was obvious that Quebec would not be getting the promised 50 per cent of those benefits. Can the Minister confirm to the House what he said at the time?

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I said in Valcourt that... First of all, I can inform my hon. friend from Joliette that we never promised 50 per cent. What I said in Valcourt was that it seemed obvious, since many contracts had already been allocated, that we would not achieve the desired percentage, but we were certain that over the duration of the contract that is, over fifteen years, we would get $1.5 billion in economic benefits, as we informed our fellow Quebecers when we gave the contract to McDonnell-Douglas Canada Ltd.

INQUIRY WHETHER ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR PROVINCE OF QUEBEC WILL BE AS PREVIOUSLY ANNOUNCED

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I just want to remind the Minister that the former Minister of National Defence had spoken in terms of 50 per cent, according to the initial forecasts, which would give Quebec $1.5 billion. Now, as far as the percentage is concerned, I have the clear impression that the Minister is prepared to confirm that the commitment made by the former Minister of National Defence will not be respected. My question is quite straightforward: With respect to the percentage of economic benefits, could the Minister confirm that the 50 per cent commitment will not be respected?

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to inform the Hon. Member that Quebecers will get $1.5 billion in economic benefits in Quebec, as a result of the F-18 contract. I may remind the Hon. Member, although some of his colleagues may not be as pleased as he is, that the Bell Helicopter contract and the Pratt and Whitney contract for research in the aerospace field will keep more than 50 per cent of the aerospace industry in Quebec, and that is what Members from Quebec on this side of the House want to see.

* * *

[*English*]

PETITION

MR. PARKER—TAXATION OF TIPS AND GRATUITIES

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that the petition presented by the Hon. Member for Kootenay East-Revelstoke (Mr. Parker) on Friday, November 25, 1983 meets the requirements of the Standing Orders as to form.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

WAYS AND MEANS

TABLING OF NOTICE

Hon. Roy MacLaren (Minister of State (Finance)): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 64(1) I wish to table in both official languages a notice of Ways and Means motion to amend the Petroleum and Gas Revenue Tax Act.

* * *

NUCLEAR-WEAPON-FREE ZONE ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-699, an Act to declare Canada a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Some Hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take a moment to introduce this Private Member's Bill. I should point out it is very similar to Bill C-678 introduced by my friend, the Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Anguish), with two notable differences. The first difference is that when I drafted this Bill I was anxious to ensure that the conditions of Canada's nuclear weapons free status be made to apply to the Government of Canada both within Canadian territory and those regions of the world where Canadian forces may be stationed, in particular with reference to NATO. The second difference is to include in my Bill provisions for the Government to negotiate treaties and/or agreements with a verification in respect of Canada's nuclear weapons free status. I would point out that it seems to be especially timely to table this Bill at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions. Should we go through the usual procedure at this point? The Hon. Member for Yukon.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, why do you not simply ask the Members in whose names the motions are put down if any of them wish to proceed today?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If any Hon. Members in whose name a motion stands recorded in the Order Paper wish to proceed at this point, would they please rise and so indicate? If not, we will proceed to Questions on the Order Paper.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: No. 4,914

[*Text*]

HIGHLAND DAY CARE CENTRE, INVERNESS, N.S.

Question No. 4,914—**Miss MacDonald:**

1. Has the Highland Day Care Centre in Inverness, Nova Scotia, received grants and/or other funding from government sources to date and, if so, what were such grants or funding?

2. Who is the proprietor of the Centre?

3. What is the yearly rent for the premises?

4. To whom and from what source is the rent paid?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): 1. The Highland Day Care Centre in Inverness, Nova Scotia, now known and incorporated as the Shean Day Care Centre, has received funding for two Canada Community Development Projects (CCDP). This program was administered by the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission (CEIC).

Under Round II of CCPD—1982—$48,000

Under Round III of CCDP—1983—$40,000

2. The Centre is located in the basement of the Royal Bank Building, a privately-owned property. The Director of the Centre is Charlotte Campbell and the President, Board of Directors is Rita McIsaac.

3. The rental rate is $300 per month or $3,600 yearly.

4. The rent is paid to the proprietor. Information concerning the source from which the rent is paid is not available.

[*English*]

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary has been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Supply

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—S.O. 62—GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Huntington:

That this House agrees without reservation with the prediction of the Prime Minister made on August 13, 1969, in a nationally televised press conference when he said, "We'd soon be on the road to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control" and calls upon the Government to initiate policies which would avoid the Prime Minister's prediction.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) still has seven minutes remaining in his remarks.

Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South): Mr. Speaker, when we broke at lunch I was going over some of the priorities that I felt a House of Commons committee might look at in determining the priorizing of government expenditures. I was speaking about social services.

From this Party's point of view, we would expect that the first priority of any government expenditure would be to make sure that those less fortunate in our society had some of the opportunities, protections and safeguards in terms of education and health that those more fortunate have. Unfortunately, in some of our social service expenditures there is a tendency to look after the greedy more than the needy. In looking at those expenditures one might want to do some screening to determine whether those expenditures are really for those who need the service as opposed to those who happen to want to get to the trough. Basically, our view would be that the social net, the ability to look after our neighbours, is a thing that we look to government for first. Expenditures on social services would be our first priority.

Our second priority would go to the question of defending our nation. We think it is terrible that we do not spend sufficient money to protect our nation but rather depend, to some extent, on the nuclear arm of the United States for our protection. If we are going to have a place in the world and be respected in the world, and if we are going to protect our heritage, then surely we must spend more of our country's wealth in looking after that heritage.

The third point is that people in Canada demand that we use our funds to look after the sense of justice that is required; that the criminal law be enforced, that we have police protection to protect us from those in our society who might want to take advantage of us and that there be a fairness in the administration of justice. That that would be a priority.

Next, there would be a priority in terms of communication and transportation. After all, we are a great, diverse nation and we must keep our nation together. Therefore, expenditures in terms of communication and transportation are important expenditures which deserve some priority.

After you go beyond those you look at the other things that government does and you find that to a large extent what government does is spend money, but not very well. I have not been in this House that long, but I have heard Minister after Minister stand in the House and tell us how many jobs his Department or his program was creating. Indeed, if the Government has created all the jobs it has created, everyone in Canada would be working at least three shifts a day, seven days a week, trying to fulfil those jobs. The fact is that the Government is not very efficient at creating jobs. It is the private sector which creates jobs, the people with ideas and entrepreurial ability who create jobs. It is a waste of Government funds for the Government to try to do something which it does not do well.

• (1510)

We should consider what the Government can do. I have suggested some of those possibilities. The Government cannot entertain us well. The Government, through CBC and other activities which it tries to encourage in the name of culture, spends a lot of money trying to entertain us. The basic question is whether it is doing it very well. I suggest that any committee which would look into that would see those expenditures with a somewhat jaundiced eye.

The third point is that governments are in competition with each other. As a result, we see provincial Governments in this country with trade embassies in London, Paris and Rome. As well federal Governments have trade embassies in the same places. That duplication, and triplication in some instances with respect to health services, must be eliminated. Surely we could have a mechanism to determine which government may be best suited to do a job that is required. There would be no need for the involvement of other governments.

For instance, with respect to the health and medicare proposals made by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin), perhaps we should bear in mind where the responsibilities lie. If it is a provincial responsibility, perhaps the provincial Governments should deal with that responsibility and relieve the federal Government of the responsibility so it will not spend money from the federal treasury on those activities.

That is not to say that there should not be transfers of tax money from one jurisdiction to another. It does not mean that there should not be transfers to make sure there is equal opportunity in Canada. But the federal Government should not be involved in activities that clearly fall within provincial responsibility. It is a waste of money and effort. It is something which significantly increases our deficit.

Having determined what envelopes are available and how they are established, we should get down to the basic matter of how much money can properly be taken out of the system in terms of taxation. When that is determined, we ought to limit the spending of the Government to that amount while maintaining a healthy economy.

I appreciate that changes cannot be made instantly. We already have a system which has saddled us with what amounts to a deficit of some $30 billion. The Government's priorities cannot be changed overnight in order to get us back into a position where government will balance on a cyclical basis. That must be our objective and one which a new government must attempt over a five or six year period. It may even take longer than that since the present Government has put us into a horrendously difficult financial position. We cannot easily wean ourselves from that difficulty. To some extent, we are almost like heroin addicts. We have been given a shot of more money in government services every year than we can afford to pay for and it will take us some time to withdraw from that level of government spending to which we have unfortunately become accustomed. It certainly is a level that we cannot afford. It will take a new government a number of years to get our country back into the position in which it should have been had the present Government followed its own leader's advice.

In order to reach that goal I believe it is necessary to follow the recommendation of the report by the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure to create a special committee of the House to priorize government expenditures and act as a supervisory committee over how parliamentarians authorize the expenditures of taxpayers' money. In that regard may I move the following motion:

That the motion be amended by deleting the period at the end of the last line and by adding the following thereto:

"including, but not limited to, the adoption forthwith of the Seventh Report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure."

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Does this mean that the Conservative Party is amending its own motion?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As far as the Chair is concerned, any Hon. Member of the House has the right and privilege of putting an amendment forward and this is what has taken place. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is in order.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I make this motion to the House—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but the time allotted to him has expired. He may continue only with unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: According to the rules of the House, Hon. Members have the right to ask questions of the Hon. Member or to make a short commentary if they wish. Are any Members seeking to be recognized for that purpose?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Member if he would provide Members of the House with a brief explanation of the purpose of his amendment.

Mr. Blenkarn: I thank the House Leader of the Official Opposition, who seconded the motion, for giving me an opportunity to explain it. Members of the House are appointed to standing committees to review estimates. Usually, Members who are interested in a particular field of government activity sit on standing committees related to those areas. For instance, if a Member is particularly interested in environmental issues, he or she would sit on the standing committee which deals with the environment. Similarly, Members who are seriously interested in health and welfare sit on the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

What happens is that those Members sitting on a standing committee are interested in seeing money spent in the area with which that standing committee deals. Therefore, they would like to see government expenditures given priority in their particular area of interest. We see that there is no over-all control on these expenditures and when we stand in the House to deplore government spending it is always in an area of interest to someone else.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the Hon. Opposition House Leader is the Member who asked the Hon. Member to explain the intent of his motion. He has now left the House. Since he is the only Member who wanted to hear, he should—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: That is not a point of order. The Hon. Member for Mississauga South may complete his answer to the question.

Mr. Nielsen: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

• (1520)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) is an experienced parliamentarian. He realizes that Parliament has a certain dignity that is important, but I recognize him on a point of order.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, it is on the record now that what the Hon. Member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) said is totally without foundation. That is all I wanted to have on the record.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Mississauga South can complete his remarks.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, the reason for the motion is that the existing parliamentary committee system does nothing to scrutinize, reduce, or control spending within an envelope, an envelope system or a departmental system, for that matter. Generally speaking, those people scrutinizing the estimates are Members of Parliament who are very interested in that class and kind of spending. Therefore, they would like to see, if anything, that spending increase. Invariably Members who are interested in environmental issues will ask that more spending be undertaken on environmental issues. Last week we had a concern with respect to forestry. Members who are interested in forestry spoke in favour of more spending on forestry. Perhaps there should be spending there, but that is not to say there should not be.

If we are ever to come to grips with spending, what must have an over-all budget committee of this House of Commons that deals with spending in totality, that somehow priorizes that spending, that insures the estimates sent to standing committees have a priorization in terms of the total amount going to those committees. Unless we do that, we will never come to grips with control because we have nobody trying to control it. The present system leaves the foxes in charge of trying to control the hen house. They control it all right. They keep on eating the chickens and the eggs and they are eating us out of house and home. Very soon the country will have to borrow more money than the total savings of the country.

Mr. Waddell: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) who sits right in front of me. Why is the Hon. Member proposing an amendment to his own motion? I do not understand why the Conservative Party does not have its act together enough that its two Members could not talk to each other and move a proper motion. I know this way not be unusual; they seem to have differences in policy every day. I just read a book on the Conservative leadership race and I am beginning to be struck by the kind of incompetence in the Conservative Party that claims to have a sort of business competence. Why could the two Members not get together and present a united resolution? Why do we have to have two resolutions? Is it because, like most things these days, we have two policies from the Conservative Party?

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I am most impressed with the Hon. Member's ability to read. The reason the motion is separate is so there are two votes. First, we are voting on whether this House agrees with the Prime Minister who in 1969 suggested that there be serious limits on expenditure. Second, as a result of the amendment we can vote separately on whether we should support the seventh report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure. What could be clearer than that? If the Hon. Member can undertand the procedures of this House he would understand why there are two votes. First, he will now be entitled to vote separately on whether there should be a committee of this House to deal with the priorizing and controlling of the expenditures of the nation. And, second, he will be entitled to vote on whether he should support the Prime Minsiter of Canada when he made that statement in 1969 that forms the critical part of this motion.

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) on a very reasoned, logical and sensible presentation this afternoon. I was rather struck with his very good idea that what we should be doing instead of adding up each departmental estimate and then presenting the House of Commons with a bill for all these things we would like to spend is that we should be finding a maximum that we should impose on the Canadian public by way of taxes—presumably a percentage of the Gross

National Product. Ideally, what would he suggest should be taken away from Canadians in the form of taxation? What percentage of the Gross National Product?

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased the Hon. Member has given me an opportunity to answer that question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member should answer that question in about a minute and a half.

Mr. Blenkarn: I will not take long, Mr. Speaker. In 1968 all governments in this country spent 33.7 per cent of the Gross National Product governing us. At that time the Prime Minister said that if we did not control spending we would be in trouble. We were spending 33.7 per cent of the Gross National Product in 1968. In 1982 we are spending 47.3 per cent of the Gross National Product. The answer is clearly that what the Prime Minister said in 1968 is what we should be spending. Our trading partners spend about 35 per cent of their GNPs governing themselves. We are trying to spend well in excess, if you add in the Crown corporations, of 50 per cent of our GNP governing ourselves. No wonder we have horrendous unemployment. No wonder we have distress and economic problems.

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to join in this debate. First, I presume the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) will rise and ask me a question at the end of my speech as he usually does, but I was interested in his amendment. From the way he described his amendment, he does not know what he did. The seventh report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure does not in any way set up a committee which would establish spending priorities for this Government. Committees of this House do not do that. Parliament does not do that. The Government sets priorities. Committees hold the Government accountable.

The Hon. Member for Mississauga South was talking about this committee setting the priorities for government spending. Clearly the Hon. Member does not know what he is talking about. That is the beginning of a long litany of sins committed in his speech. It seems to me that when one puts forward an amendment, one should understand what the amendment is supposed to do with regard to the main motion.

We heard today from the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) and the Hon. Member for Mississauga South a litany of comments from history to the effect that great problems have occurred in this country as a result of deficits, as though there was some insidious plot to nationalize the entire economy, and so on and so forth.

Mr. Blenkarn: Isn't there?

Mr. Evans: We should take this whole question of deficits into perspective. The Hon. Member for Mississauga South did speak about what he called a structural deficit and a cyclical deficit. I think we have to understand, and the people certainly understand, that we have just gone through the most massive recession worldwide that has occurred in the past 50 years. This Government did not want to impose or see imposed upon its people the kind of suffering that occurred in the 1930s. In talking to my senior citizens, I asked them what happened in the 1930s and whether they could compare the current recession with the 1930s. They told me there is no comparison. There is no comparison because we put in place a highly sophisticated, highly effective social safety net that has protected Canadians in a way that was simply unknown and unhoped for in the 1930s. There is no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker. We have protected Canadians who were struck by unemployment. We have protected Canadians who were unable to work because they were senior citizens and because they were infirm. That social safety net is there. It is strong. It is doing the job it is supposed to do. However, it costs money. I am asking the Opposition Members during this debate to stand in their place and say that the deficit is more important than the social and financial security of Canadians. If I hear that, I will know where the Conservatives stand. I do not know where they stand now.

• (1530)

We hear the great rail about the terrible deficit, "Oh my God, the deficit has to be brought down immediately." In another part of my speech I will bring forward statements by Members opposite, Members who out of one side of their mouth cry for a reduction in the deficit and out of the other side cry for increased expenditures in their own riding. You cannot have it both ways. Either you believe in reducing the deficit at all costs, or you do not. You cannot stand up one day and say the deficit is too high, that it has to be reduced and there has to be greater fiscal responsibility in this country and the next day stand up in the House and say that the Government must spend billions more on job creation, billions more on research and development, billions more on national defence, billions more on forestry and billions more for fisheries. You have to come down on the issue. Either you believe in it or you do not.

The clear, unequivocal answer to that question is that the Tories do not really believe it. They are putting up the deficit and pulling scare tactics on the Canadian people. However, when it comes right down to the bottom line, the Tories will not be dealing with that deficit. To do so, they would have to attack programs that Canadians have come to hold dearly, programs that have supported Canadians well during the worst recession the world has known in 50 years. That is the bottom line. It is a bottom line to which these Tories will not respond.

We have heard that Canadian Governments in general, but the federal Government in particular, have allowed the deficit to run away, almost as though it had accelerated continuously during the 1970s. The facts are here. The Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) was talking about the total government sector. With regard to the total Government sector, the deficit in Canada as a percentage of GNP peaked in 1978. It declined steadily until 1981. In 1982-83, we went into a recession. If the automatic stabilizers have any meaning at all, it would imply that when you go into a recession and the revenues of the government fall, people are thrown out of work, social expenditures rise, the deficit as a percentage of

GNP is going to rise. Precisely that effect is what is intended. When the economy is crumbling, the social safety net takes up the slack, substitutes income to people so that they are not thrown out on the street in destitution. That is what the safety social net is all about.

Yes, the deficit as a percentage of GNP rose during the recession. Thank God it did. If it had not, people would have been thrown out on the street. They would have lost their homes by the thousands. The Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) is going to rise in great indignation, but the point is that the deficit peaked in 1978, declined steadily until 1981 and then rose again.

Let us look at some comparisons. We heard a lot about comparisons, how Canadian Governments had run-away deficits unknown in any other part of the world. Let me quote some figures. In the period 1975-1981, the Canadian deficit averaged 2.1 per cent of GNP. In the United States it was 1.3 per cent, in Britain 3.7 per cent, in Germany 3.4 per cent, in Italy 9.7 per cent and in Japan 4.1 per cent, compared to 2.1 per cent of GNP in the Canadian deficit average.

During that period, the Canadian deficit was declining. We all admit that it rose during the recession, but there is not one Member opposite who has the intestinal fortitude to talk to his or her constituents or any other constituents in this country and say that he does not think the deficit should have risen during the recession and then tell Canadians how he would have stopped it from rising. When the world goes into a recession, being a trading nation, we are going to be affected by that. There is no doubt about it. That is clear, straightforward fact.

How was that rise in the deficit to be avoided? How was the rise in unemployment insurance to be avoided other than cutting it? How was the rise in the payments to the Provinces under the Canada Assistance Plan to be avoided other than by cutting? How were the moneys that went to Canadian industries to help keep those jobs and keep industries alive to be stopped from increasing other than by cutting those payments?

Miss MacDonald: By not creating unemployment in the first place.

Mr. Evans: The Hon. Member talks like a Member with a paper head. Not creating unemployment. Has she been outside this country? Does she know what has been going on? Has she seen the three million unemployed in Britain? Has she seen the 30 million people in the western world who are unemployed? It was not just here. It was a world-wide recession. Canadians know this. It is time that the Tories not only knew it but admitted to it and started to take a realistic position.

The way to get the deficit down is not by taking the approach that some on that side of the House would have you believe, namely slashing away at things. It will not happen by increasing taxes. The way to do it is by growth. We can stimulate the kind of growth that is necessary in this country. Members opposite say, "The Liberals cannot do it, nobody trusts the Liberals", but during the last year we have had higher growth than was anticipated by any of the private forecasters and lower rates of unemployment. In other words, unemployment is coming down faster than anybody forecasted. Our inflation rate has come down faster than anyone predicted. Interest rates came down faster than was predicted.

That is a darn good record. We have created jobs faster than any of the other OECD countries. There were 350,000 jobs created in our economy in the last year. That clearly indicates that when the Tories say the people have no confidence in a country run by the Liberals, they are all wet. The facts fly in the face of the Tory statements because Canadians are investing, spending and are buying houses.

Mr. Gamble: Because they expect a new Government.

Mr. Evans: It is not because they expect a new Government because that will not happen.

Some Opposition Members have said that we have to put priorities on our spending, that we have to reduce spending and bring Government expenditure under control. This has been expenditure-related because none of them will talk about possibly increasing taxes. They only talk about expenditure control. Let us look at what some Members opposite have said. When talking about controlling expenditures and bringing down the Government deficit, this is what we have. The Hon. Members for Calgary Centre (Mr. Andre), Northumberland (Mr. Hees) and Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney) have all called for increases in defence spending. In fact, over the weekend, the Hon. Member for Calgary Centre said that we should be increasing defence spending from 2 per cent of GNP to 3.5 per cent of GNP, its being the NATO average. That would mean, Mr. Speaker, an increase in defence spending of $4 billion to $5 billion. Where is that $4 billion to $5 billion going to come from?

● (1540)

Why do we not talk to the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) and the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) about reducing the PIP grants that are supporting oil exploration off Newfoundland? What about cutting back on the East Coast fishery agreement? Perhaps Hon. Members opposite would like to talk to those two gentlemen about those issues.

Are the Hon. Members on that side of the House really concerned about reducing spending? What about the statements made by the Hon. Member for Annapolis Valley-Hants (Mr. Nowlan) and the Hon. Member for Central Nova regarding maritime freight rates? Perhaps we should talk to them about reducing those freight rates. In the House the other day, the Hon. Member for Central Nova said: "Only 67 million for maritime freight rates? That is a pittance, it needs to be much more." That does not sound like a reduction in spending to me, Mr. Speaker.

While we are hearing the calls for the reduction of the deficit, what is happening? Hon. Members on the other side are saying: "Wait a minute, why do we not increase spending in my area?" This happens day after day as evidenced by the speeches, oral questions and statements under Standing Order

21 that are recorded in *Hansard*. We hear the litany of cries not for reduced spending but for increased spending. They want increased spending here and increased spending there.

The Hon. Member for Scarborough East (Mr. Gilchrist) has called for massive increases in research and development funding. The Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser) and the Hon. Member for Surrey-White Rock-North Delta (Mr. Friesen) speak about West Coast fishing subsidies. That can be found at page 28679 of *Hansard*. The Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River (Mr. Oberle), as can be found at page 28891 of *Hansard*, spoke about a forestry policy that would greatly expand Canada's role in reforestation. All of the things I have mentioned are very good public policies but all of them are totally inconsistent policies for a group that says it has a deficit fetish and will reduce that deficit.

I shall go on. The Hon. Member for Hillsborough (Mr. McMillan), the Hon. Member for Kingston, the Islands and the Hon. Member for St. John's East have all spoken about new and expanded employment programs which call for more government spending. The Hon. Member for Richmond-South Delta (Mr. Siddon), the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), as evidenced on page 28892 of *Hansard*, and the Hon. Member for Prince George-Peace River, as evidenced on page 29172 of *Hansard*, have all spoken of increased support for the mining industry.

We should speak to the Hon. Member for Portage-Marquette (Mr. Mayer) and the Hon. Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gustafson) about the possibilities of a Conservative Government reducing support to the prairie grain farmers. Where did those Hon. Members stand on the Crow issue when we were attempting to free up moneys in order to improve the western rail system? They were voting against us. What would happen if all of the money needed for the western rail improvements came out of the federal Treasury? I ask the ladies and gentlemen on the other side of the House, what that would mean for the deficit? Where were they during that debate? No, they do not want us to talk to them about that.

How would the Hon. Member for Calgary West (Mr. Hawkes) feel about eliminating the $200 million for the Winter Olympics in Calgary? That is one way of reducing the deficit. Would he like to hear about that, Mr. Speaker? Oh, no, he would not. What about the Hon. Member for Halton (Mr. Jelinek) who, as reported on page 28677 of *Hansard*, has called for increased support for small business? What about the Hon. Member for Rosedale (Mr. Crombie) who, as reported on page 29081, of *Hansard*, has called for the introduction of shelter allowances? What about the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) whose riding is benefiting from the program of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Lumley) designed to build helicopters? It seems that Pratt & Whitney, the company that builds engines for those helicopters, is located in the riding of Mississauga South.

Mr. Blenkarn: Show me the place where.

Mr. Evans: Would he say that he would give that up in the interest of reducing the deficit?

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not mind being criticized, Mr. Speaker, but I ask that the Hon. Member refer to the time when or the place where I made any suggestion for increased expenditure.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry if I did not do that. I was referring to a situation which had occurred in committee. He was asked to stand up and say that he was opposed to spending money on the helicopter plant and he very kindly declined to do so. He was quite embarrassed by one of his colleagues who was decrying this situation.

Mr. Blenkarn: Read your committee report.

Mr. Evans: The Hon. Member can stand up after I have spoken and say that he would not like to see that money spent.

Mr. Blenkarn: Sure, will do.

Mr. Evans: He will do that. We have all heard him say that he will do that and, of course, we will send a copy of *Hansard* to Pratt & Whitney.

The fact is that day after day, we hear in the House about how terrible the deficit is and how a Tory Government would tackle that deficit with vigour. However, Mr. Speaker, day after day the truth comes out. A Tory Government might spend that money in a different manner but it would spend it nonetheless. That is the fact, Mr. Speaker. I have indicated a litany of comments to prove that and I only read through *Hansard* for the month of November to find that proof. If I were to go back over the 30,000 pages of *Hansard*, there would be a stack of 8½" by 11" pieces of paper standing taller than I do containing suggestions for new spending and additional spending and condemning the Government for not spending more.

We must face the facts. The fact is that a government with a philosophical bent similar to that of the Party opposite took power in the United States. In 1978, there was no deficit in the United States. By 1982, the deficit had grown to 3.8 per cent of Gross National Product. That occurred under a government that was going to put things back on track.

As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, from 1975 to 1981, the Government of Canada has a deficit which was, on average, 2.1 per cent. Japan's deficit was 4.1 per cent, Germany's was 3.4 per cent and Britain's was 3.7 per cent. That does not indicate to me that this Government has been out of line with reality in terms of government expenditure and macro-economic policy.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not have the best social safety net, we certainly do have one of the best social safety nets of any country in the world. During the recent recession, that system was tested and tested hard and it stood the test. That system was put in place by a Liberal Government. It is being maintained by a Liberal Government and a Liberal Government will fight like hell to make sure that

that group on the other side does not get into power and rip that system apart, because that would rip the social conscience out of the country.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gamble: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans) made one excellent point and then failed to expand upon it. He indicated that the salvation of the nation did not lie in increased taxes, and with that I am sure he will find agreement from all Members of the House. He did say, however, that that salvation lay in growth and then significantly failed to mention how that growth was to be developed.

The Hon. Member did say that the actions taken by Members on this side of the House were all directed toward increasing expenditures and then proceeded to refer one after another to certain Hon. Members who may have spoken, as he indicated, in favour of expenditures for a specific purpose. Let me ask him how significantly the incurring the obligations by the Government to the extent of $1,700,000,000 earlier this year for the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and how significantly the incurring of obligations to the extent of $900 million earlier this month for the same organization under an amendment to the Bretton Woods Agreement will benefit the taxpayers of the nation and the people from whom he has spoken when in fact none of those funds are tied conclusively to the purchase of any goods or services in Canada.

• (1550)

While he is answering that question, he might explain whether he believes that the massive deficits we currently suffer from have had any effect on the value of the Canadian dollar. If they have, is that effect, as explained by the Minister of Finance, the need to keep interest rates in Canada equal to the interest rates in the United States? If that is the case, could the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council indicate to the House whether, in his view, that unfortunate following in terms of interest rates had a beneficial effect upon the business community, home owners and ordinary consumers of the country who for too long have suffered the blight of excessive interest rates?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. This is not an opportunity for another 20 minute speech; it is basically an opportunity for roughly a 90 second question or comment period. May I take it that the Hon. Member is asking a question? I think he has asked several so I will recognize the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has asked so many questions that I cannot remember them. One question was whether the deficit was the main cause of the decline in the value of the dollar. No. That is straightforward. Many other factors were involved such as productivity or wages and salaries, which got out of line. That is not a function of the deficits. There were many factors that caused the value of our currency to drop vis-à-vis that of the United States. I might add that our currency, relative to other currencies in the world, has gone up, not down. There was a very strong U.S. dollar relative to ours and that caused ours not to rise as fast as the U.S. dollar relative to other world currencies. So relative to the U.S., our currency is down a bit. If you look at relative deficits—

Mr. Gamble: Deal with interest rates.

Mr. Evans: The fact is that the United States is the biggest capital market in the world. Money moves in and out of the United States, in and out of Europe and in and out of Canada. When interest rates in the United States are forced up by policies followed in the United States, they are going to rise in Canada as well. That is a long-established fact. If you have an open market, if you are a trading nation, you are going to be subject to the whims of the monetary policy of a massive nation that you do business with. That is what happened to interest rates.

The Hon. Member asked the first question and I would have liked to respond; I had the answer but I cannot remember the question.

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member indicated that he felt that Government handouts to business were a good thing. I suggest to him that we do not necessarily agree with that. If somebody is going to hand out money, then I suppose every businessman in the country is going to line up to collect. If the Government is establishing a reputation for giving handouts, then I suppose my constituents will be there, with others, with their bushel baskets, ready to collect. The question is whether that is a priority for Government spending in the first place.

Does the Hon. Member agree with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who said on August 13 that we would soon be on the road to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control. Does he believe spending is under control? If so, how would he rationalize the structural deficit described in the statement of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) filed in the House on April 19 last?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, in 1968 I would have agreed with the Prime Minister. I would ask the Hon. Member if in 1983, specifically a few days ago, he would have agreed with his Party's finance critic who said that the Finance Minister had little choice this year except to plan for a deficit in the $30 billion range, and who added that the large deficit this year is necessary to encourage economic recovery.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Parliamentary Secretary if he does not consider it pretty serious that Government borrowing to cover the annual deficit now stands at 51 per cent of all net new security issues placed in Canada? Does he realize that the interest being paid on the debt of the federal Government now takes all of the income tax paid by taxpayers earning $50,000 and less in Canada; that it is now $1,600 per taxpayer or some $700 per capita in Canada? Does

he not consider that a calamity and an impending disaster? Does that interest charge against our revenues not interfere with the delivery of good social services?

The Hon. Member talks about expanding the Armed Forces to play our part in defending freedom and the tensions in the world. Could that money not be moved from some of the $8.5 billion spent on UIC and so put people into meaningful work and training programs?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about a near doubling on defence, which would go from 2 per cent of Gross National Product to 3.5 per cent of Gross National Product, that is not primarily an increase in manpower although one Hon. Member spoke about an increase in our NATO equipment back to 10,000.

I am sure that an increase in defence spending would in some way increase employment but I suggest that there are more effective ways of doing that than by spending on defence.

The Hon. Member has raised other issues. According to what he has said in the past, I believe he is seriously concerned about the size of the deficit. I am concerned about it and I am concerned about the size of the interest payments because that is money that is not being spent to provide good social services and other goods to Canadians.

We have gone through a period of very high interest rates but we have been able to bring down the world economy and we have contributed to bringing interest rates down substantially. As those bonds are refinanced, the interest cost of the debt is going to be reduced. If we can keep inflation down, and I think we can, interest rates will come down further and the interest cost of the debt will be reduced.

If we can get growth going and the deficit is reduced as a percentage of the Gross National Product, then we will be in a position where the interest expense and the size of the deficit will be manageable. The nub of the issue today is whether, during a period of serious recession, the Government should be condemned for doing what a Government with a strong social conscience should do, and that is, protect the people who need protection the most. That is precisely what we did during the recession that we are coming out of now.

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Kingston and the Islands): Mr. Speaker, I listened with utter amazement and some despair to the Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans). I do not know where he has been this last while. Perhaps, being isolated in Ottawa, he does not understand the suffering and the problems that have been created in the country for the millions of people who are unemployed. He passed that off as if there really were no problem for them. If he had seen the reports in the weekend newspapers, he would know what one organization after the other is saying is the terrible social cost borne by millions of Canadians as a result of the policies of the Government. Canadians are being thrown into despair, anxiety and anguish because of steps which his colleagues took which he backed up. I do not know where he has been when he stands up and makes statements like he does.

• (1600)

Mr. Evans: What policies?

Miss MacDonald: He should take a look at headlines in the papers which say what the Government has been doing over this last few years. "Lives of millions in jeopardy" reads the weekend edition of the *Kingston Whig-Standard*. From the Ottawa *Citizen* we have "Unemployment destroying lives".

Mr. Evans: Tell us how the Government caused that.

Miss MacDonald: From the Saturday Toronto *Star* we have "Jobless rate spells ruin, group warns." The Canadian Mental Health Association, the Family Services Association, both say it was the unemployment policies of this Government which have thrown those people into the despair they are in today. They are afraid to listen to the truth; that is what is wrong with Members opposite. Every time Canadians try to bring home the difficulties they are in, those Members get up and run.

The motion before us today, Mr. Speaker, addresses the financial disaster precipitated by Members of this Government—

Mr. Evans: Name them.

Miss MacDonald: These policies have led not only to financial disaster, Sir, but also to human suffering and misery for millions of Canadians. The policies of this Government have led to widespread lay-offs, falling incomes, a decline in productivity and sharply reduced employment opportunities for many hundreds of young people. The failure of the Government to recognize the impact of its sterile economic policies has, in turn, generated massive social costs which could have been averted if proper economic policies had been adopted.

There are a number of direct ways by which we can calculate the tremendous and escalating costs of the double-digit unemployment which, over the past two years, unfortunately, has become the norm for Canada. We can look at the cost of unemployment insurance benefits, which will total $11 billion this year. Two years ago that cost was $5 billion. We can look at the revenues of the federal Government, which are down 3 per cent so far this fiscal year from two years ago. We can look at the 1.4 million Canadians officially counted as unemployed and looking for work. We can look at the 100,000 Canadians who have given up looking for work, and the 400,000 trying to make it with part-time jobs when they want to get full-time jobs. These are the direct costs, Mr. Speaker, and they are staggering. They come out of the 1981 budget of the former Minister of Finance, the National Energy Program and a whole host of other programs which this Government foisted on this country.

Mr. Evans: Nonsense. Where have you been?

Miss MacDonald: Those are the direct costs. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that while you can put more or less

realistic dollar figures on them, there are other more frightening costs which are all too often ignored.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the social suffering resulting from the unemployment, the despair of people who have lost their jobs and their homes, young people who have never been able to find regular employment. Add to this the state of hopelessness and utter despair that leads to family break-up, violence, increases in crime, and mental and physical sickness. These costs are rarely calculated. In fact, it is probably impossible to do so, but they are there just the same. Who can put a figure on the cost to a family, to a son, daughter, husband and wife who have been looking for employment for weeks or even months without success and where the situation has become almost intolerable? Last week, the press reported that according to a Gallup poll, three out of ten Canadians, which means 30 per cent of the people of this country, are still suffering from the pain associated with unemployment.

[*English*]

In case there is any doubt, Mr. Speaker, as to the connection between unemployment and the agony and cost to a family, let me refer to two major reports which were released in the past week. The first is by the Association of Family Service Agencies and it was released in both Canada and the United States. That Association said that unemployment has become the greatest threat to family stability in Canada and the United States in the past two years. It goes on to cite the tremendous social costs which will have to be borne as a result.

The Canadian Mental Health Association over the past weekend cited the direct links between unemployment and the disastrous consequences to Canadian family life. It said that family life in Canada is becoming filled with anger and despair, and child abuse, suicide, alcoholism, disease, divorce and crime are soaring as a result of unemployment. That unemployment was triggered by this Government.

Mr. Evans: Nonsense.

Miss MacDonald: Earlier this year, Sir, the officials of the Ministry of State for Economic and Regional Development had the courage to own up to what was taking place. They knew where the responsibility lay for this. They produced a paper which showed this. They frankly conceded that policy-induced high interest rates were one of the major causes of the recession here in Canada and explained why it has been deeper in this country than in any other industrialized country. Policy-induced high interest rates, the Minister's own advisers have said, have led us to the depths of this depression. Yet the Government abdicates responsibility for the recession, while at the same time, if there is any hint of recovery, it goes out and says, "Look, we are responsible for that." That is the double standard which Government continually foists on both the economy and the people of Canada.

Hon. Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, want Canadians to develop amnesia, to accept the current situation as normal, to forget that three and one half short years ago, when that Government returned to power, the prospect of a million or a million and a half unemployed Canadians would have sent shudders down the national spine. They would like Canadians to forget it was normal, just a few short years ago, for high school and college graduates to find work within weeks, not months, after graduating; that it was reasonable for a young couple to expect to own their own home and for the poor to be able to count on a growing economy to produce sufficient revenues to improve their lot. However, I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that Canadians are not prone to self-induced amnesia, they cannot and will not easily forget the losses they have suffered and are still suffering, losses of income, of jobs, of homes, of hope, of opportunity.

This Government has failed, Sir. It has failed in its policies and in its commitments to the people of Canada, and the failure of the Government in the first place was in not having avoided the recession which it created. In the second place, its failure was in not having diminished the calamity of a world recession, and its third failure was in not having found a way out of the mess into which it has plunged us all, but especially the poor of this country.

We have before us, Sir, in the Supplementary Estimates, an item of $291 million under the Canada Assistance Plan. That item is in addition to the forecast of just six months ago. It is statutory, not discretionary, because of federal-provincial arrangements. It is needed because the welfare costs incurred by the Provinces at this time are $291 million higher than forecast by the Minister just six months ago. Since inflation has not risen in that period, that means there are about 10 per cent more people on welfare than the Minister forecast. They are on welfare because they have no jobs and their unemployment insurance benefits have terminated.

● (1610)

Let us be under no illusion about this amount, Sir. This is not a magnanimous gesture by a generous and compassionate Government to make life a little easier for the present recipients of social assistance. The money is going to new recipients. But, Sir, there is a cost far greater than this dollar figure would indicate, the human cost. It is the cost represented by the tens of thousands of our fellow Canadians who are just not making it. It is the economic cost to all Canadians of rehabilitation programs, of psychiatric care, of privation, of police services, courts and prisons, costs we will not truly come to know until the lives of the children deprived through the recession unfold before us. The Canadian Mental Health Association and the Family Services Association say that we are foisting costs on the children of the unemployed which we will simply not know for years to come. These children are deprived by and penalized through the policies of this Government.

There is a further cost we may never be able to calculate, that of the thousands of Canadians led into ways of survival beyond the system, outside the pale of what we call civilized society. They are outside the welfare system, outside unemployment insurance benefits, outside of social assistance or

insurance, and into crime and the underground economy. Every Member of this House knows from his or her correspondence and from constituents what it means to be broke, out of work and out of luck in this great country of ours as we approach the winter of 1983. That is what is so tragic, Mr. Speaker. We know the social consequences of hopelessness and poverty. If we have any compassion at all, we can understand the despair and the cries for help which have been triggered.

What concerns me is that when we raise questions with the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin), the Deputy Prime Minister or the person they put up to answer these questions today, the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Lapointe), we seem to get no comprehension at all of the tremendous social costs being created. The Social Planning Council of Toronto has outlined it very clearly in its recent paper "The Poor Get Poorer". They say that poor people generally have less access to adequate nutrition, clothing and housing. They tend to experience more serious health problems and stresses relating to discouraging personal circumstances. The National Council of Welfare directs its attention to the effects of poverty on children. They say inadequate family incomes not only results in material deprivation for children, but increases the likelihod that they would suffer from poor health, malnutrition and family conflicts. Poverty was also linked to poor school attendance, low educational and career aspirations and conflicts with the law.

These people are paying the price, because the people managing the economy, the Government of Canada, have failed consistently and continuously. Most of all, the Government is failing to respond to the indicators which point to a social crisis of enormous magnitude in the future. Currently the income of those on social assistance falls anywhere from 20 per cent to more than 50 per cent below the poverty line. We know that while the poor are getting poorer, they are also getting more numerous. Last year another 550,000 Canadians fell below the poverty line. We know that those hardest hit by the loss of jobs, the reduction of hours, wage cuts and wage freezes, were young families and families headed by women, people who would be the last to benefit from any recovery. The recession has been cruel to all Canadians but cruelest of all to those least able to bear its hardships. How can we hope to face the new challenges ahead of us, the challenges of technology, if we cannot meet the problems before us now?

This Government stands condemned, Mr. Speaker, because it cannot deal with the problems of today. It certainly cannot cope with the problems of tomorrow. It cannot deal with the problems of today because of a lack of foresight which brought us into this recession and which created the widespread human suffering and despair seen on every side. The human suffering and despair which the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre simply does not seem to comprehend. The symbol and evidence of that lack of foresight, Mr. Speaker, is with us here today in that increased estimate for the Canada Assistance payments. The Government did not see that once again its policies were going to escalate that payment. How much better if that kind of money could be put into jobs, to create meaningful occupations for these people. It would give them some dignity, allow them to feel they are not living as second-class citizens in their own country and that they are contributing to the betterment of this country.

It is true, Sir, that we will pay that additional sum, because of course we must. Our fellow Canadians need it. But much more than the basic survival which this gives them, they need a Government committed to the economic recovery and prosperity not just of the lucky few in this country, but of all Canadians. It is well past time that they got that kind of Government, and it is not to be found over there on the Government benches today.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member's message is one that many in this House would not disagree with. We cannot tolerate poverty, we cannot tolerate high unemployment, we have to do things to resolve that situation. The problem I have is that today's motion condemns the Government for running deficits. It has nothing to do with expanding programs but has to do with a Tory policy of contracting deficits which means cutting spending. How does the Hon. Member square the circle of being in favour of enhanced spending on new programs, which she and many in this House are for, with the intent of the motion to condemn the Government for doing precisely that during a period in which we face a world-wide recession of enormous proportions and to which this Government responded by allowing the deficit to rise? How can she stand there and condemn this Government for doing something and still say that she supports the motion which the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) put forward?

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, what the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council does not seem to understand it that there is a way to bring about increased revenues into the federal coffers, that is to have more people at work; not on unemployment insurance, not on welfare, not on assistance payments, but at work contributing to the country and paying into federal revenues. If the Member would only look at it he would see that the revenues of the federal Government are down this fiscal year by 3 per cent. That is the problem that we have facing us. Naturally, when revenues fall you are going to have greater deficits. We are saying that a Progressive Conservative Government would bring in programs which will create jobs and not ensure, as this Government does, that people remain unemployed and out of the labour force.

● (1620)

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, let us get down to brass tacks. Does the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands agree with the defence critic of her Party who says that we should be moving toward and increase in our defence expenditures from 2 per cent of GNP to 3.5 per cent of GNP at a time when she is saying that we need to put more money where the need is greatest, and that is with the people who have the greatest need in this society? Does she agree with the policy of the critic?

Mr. Crosbie: Naturally.

Miss MacDonald: As Minister in the former Government I can say that I certainly agreed with the strengthening of our Armed Forces. It is this Government that would not follow through on what we had decided. Apart from that, let me mention the $1.4 billion which that Government spent on Petrofina, money it sent out of the country. What about that $1.4 billion which could have gone to provide jobs for Canadians in Canada? Think about those expenditures once in a while.

Mr. Evans: It was an investment in the future.

An Hon. Member: Exporting our money.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Hon. Member to elaborate on her answer to the question from my colleague. She said that if she were in government they would have concrete programs to create jobs. What would those programs be?

Miss MacDonald: With regard to job creation I would ask the Hon. Member to take a look at where we should be in the next five years. I will give you an example of my own riding, Kingston and The Islands, which has the basis to provide jobs in new technologies. They are not being created there because the training programs for people have not been started by this Government. In this country we are not equipped at all to take advantage of the technological age. That is another example of failure on the part of this Government. We are being surpassed by Japan, France and Singapore in the technological age. That is where jobs would be created. However, before they can be created we need trained human resources.

Mr. Peterson: I think we are getting somewhere. Now we have a concrete expenditure program that the Hon. Member wants. She wants the federal Government to get directly involved in a much higher level of training in terms of the new technologies. Have you put a cost estimate on it? Have you realized that training and education is basically a provincial domain and that your condemnation in this area is aimed directly at your provincial Premier?

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, now I know why this country, under this Government, will never be able to compete with any other industrialized country as we enter the technological age. If it does not realize that leadership has to come from Government in co-operation with industry, unions and the educational system, he is not talking about the same world that most other countries are living in today. That is going to require a kind of commitment that the present Liberal Government is certainly not prepared to make, and which, properly handled, is going to bring the kinds of revenues into this country and create the kinds of jobs of which unfortunately they, over on that side, do not seem to have any grasp.

Mr. Evans: You were singing a different tune during the constitutional debate.

Mr. Kelly: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member said that the Government of Canada should introduce policies similar to those of a number of other countries, such as France, Japan and Singapore.

Miss MacDonald: That's right.

Mr. Kelly: What are the deficits of those countries? How relevant are those deficits to the debate that we have this afternoon? We are not debating job creation; we are debating deficits and the way in which they impact on the economy. If we are to emulate those countries, does that mean we have to spend more money? If you have followed the policies of those countries closely, you should be able to tell me what those deficits are.

Miss MacDonald: Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am far more interested in providing jobs for Canadians. I know that in those countries, where the unemployment rate is so very low, they do not have to pay out billions and billions of dollars in unemployment insurance to add to the deficits. In Japan, France and Singapore that cost is just not there. We have to pay it here because we are not prepared to do the same kind of training. That is the unfortunate aspect of our country today. The Government believes that it can run the country on deficits. We happen to believe that you run it by putting people to work. You put people to work when they are properly trained and when they are able to take part in the new technology.

Mr. Kelly: Mr. Speaker, that means that Governments spend money. Since we are talking about deficits this afternoon, I asked the Hon. Member what the deficit of those states are. I think her answer says very clearly that she frankly does not know. A leading Member of the front benches of the Conservative Party does not know what she is talking about. I think that is regrettable.

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, *mea culpa*. I do not know the deficit of Luxembourg, Liechtenstein, Uruguay and a number of other countries. I have got to state that. I do know that there are a 1.5 million Canadians out of work. I do know that as long as they are out of work our deficit will keep soaring because they are not productive members of our economy and able to contribute to the growth and development of Canada. That I do understand, and that is something which, unfortunately, the Hon. Member does not.

An Hon. Member: Oh dear, oh dear, that really hurts me.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Debate. The Hon. Member for Willowdale.

Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that makes me sick as a politician it is the fact that Members on the other side will stand up and bleed in public to the extent that blood runs over the green rug in this Chamber, and yet will not come up with specific solutions.

An Hon. Member: What have you done?

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, we on this side care as much, if not more, about the unemployed, the poor, the senior citizens, the people who suffer the ravages of inflation, and the people who have lost homes, property and income during this recession. The difference is that we are prepared to do something about it. We have seen from the opposite side today motions proposed by the Tories condemning the amount of Government expenditures. That is a condemnation of this Government. Yet we hear the Member for Kingston and The Islands (Miss MacDonald) proposing one concrete program involving training in the new technologies, one program that is going to require additional federal expenditures. She did not say that that would immediately reduce the deficit, because she knows it will not. Training is a long-term investment which we make in our young. It is a necessary investment. It is a very valid one. It is one that we are making. I will go on to give you some figures on that. You might disagree and say we are not doing enough. Then I would applaud you for coming forward and saying it is a good program, we should do more of it. That would be an honest approach to dealing with the problem of people out there, rather than trying to make cheap policics on the back of the people who suffered from this recession.

● (1630)

Let us get on to what this resolution really calls for. The resolution states that the lack of the Government's ability to deal with expenditures has caused our financial situation today. According to the Opposition, it is a situation which should be condemned.

I want to establish the basis for the policies that we have adopted and have had in effect for some time and that we see taking us a long time into the future. They are policies which, I feel, represent a responsible way to meet the current economic realities.

Our White Paper, which was published on October 14, 1975, said:

> The federal government shares the view that the trend of total spending by all governments should not rise more quickly than the trend of the gross national product.

The basis for this policy was then, as it is now, a wise one. It is the philosophy and approach of this Government to adhere to it and to emphasize the primary role that the private sector must play in our country in terms of generating wealth.

Let me go forward eight years from that statement in 1975 to the budget of April, 1983. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) said, "This commitment", which we made in 1975, "was met until the recession last year." Since there was a recession, a world-wide recession of which we were a part and in which we suffered severely as Canadians, we broke that policy for a brief period of time. However, our commitment to maintain that trend still remains and we are still within the trend. Let me quote from the budget:

> By 1986-87, federal spending will be virtuallly the same size relative to the economy as in 1981-82 before the worst of the recession.

We have taken a very serious approach to dealing with Government expenditures, making sure that Canadians receive value for the money for which we are the custodian and trustee of the public to spend on their behalf.

I go back to the Glassco Commission on Government Organization in 1962 wherein the primary principle adopted was that we have to let our public servants who are the managers get on with the job of managing. We appointed the Lambert Commission on Financial Management and Accountability. It reported in 1979 and urged that managers be required to manage. It is not only their job but we should be sure that they do it. They should be obliged to pay attention to their respective assigned and acceptable responsibility and to understand that it matters.

We have followed up on what Lambert recommended. I refer Hon. Members and all Canadians to the report issued by the then President of the Treasury Board in 1981 entitled "Accountable Management". Briefly, the conclusion of this report was that the Government has taken the steps necessary to reaffirm control of the public purse. The Government has generated a momentum for continuing reform in financial and human resource management. As well, managers will be required to manage and attention will be paid to results. The Government will be better able to give Canadians value for their money.

We are doing this through a seven point program. First, it involves fiscal plans. We have introduced long-term fiscal plans which are contained in our budgets. They project the results of our initiatives and policies over a five-year period so that Canadians can see where we are going and so that we are not just focusing on the moment but looking for the long-term effects.

Second, we have introduced discipline in the resource allocation process related to the fiscal plan. In other words, we have introduced an envelope program so that various committees of Cabinet are required to have their expenditures kept within an envelope. If we want to introduce new plans within an envelope system in one particular Cabinet committee, the funding must come from the existing programs in that area. In this way we continually renew and get rid of the deadwood. It is a very sound system of financial control within which a Minister, in order to introduce a new program, must go to his fellow Ministers to request funds from their programs in the belief that his program is better for the people of Canada.

The third point concerns a new sense of accountability of the Government to Parliament. We are seeing this through the revised committee system and in the progress of the report on the regulatory reform. We have consultation with the private sector in which it is asked to get involved.

We have a new system of accountability within the Government itself, not only within the envelope program but in internal controls that we have brought into play, including the office of the Comptroller General, which is our creation, and an enhanced role for the Auditor General. Again, it is a Liberal Government that is bringing these tools for fiscal responsibility to bear, to make sure that Canadians are getting value for their tax dollars. We have also introduced accountability and effectiveness in the administration of our financial

systems. As well, we have brought in accountability and efficiency in our human resource management and a continuing strategy for reform.

Let me give an example. Opposition Members are continually citing the size of the Public Service. They condemn it and are the ones who are on record as wanting to slash it. They think that the way to achieve efficiency is to chop off large numbers. They would do it by percentages and by eliminating 60,000 public servants.

I believe we have acted more constructively. In spite of the recession and the need to have programs in place to help those who need the social net during these difficult times, we limited the growth in the public sector, through sound management, to a maximum of about one per cent per year. The size of the Public Service under Treasury Board control today is the same in 1983 as it was in 1976-77. That is not a bad record considering that the expenditures of the federal Public Service have had to increase during that period. I do not know of any other Public Service, provincial or federal throughout the world, that has had this type of record.

Of course, a very important aspect of this debate concerns the size of our total economy that is occupied by governments in Canada. Is government becoming too pervasive? Is it taking over functions which the public sector should not be doing and should be leaving to the private sector? Are we decreasing opportunities for Canadians because of our role as a federal Government? That must be the issue to be addressed by the convoluted resolution of the Opposition today.

Let us look at the size of the involvement of all governments in the Canadian economy. In 1969 in Canada, governments occupied 35 per cent of our gross domestic product. This figure was up to 41 per cent in 1980, which is an increase of 6 per cent. During that period of time our increase was among the smallest of the western industrialized countries. Countries such as Italy, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden have their governments play a much more pervasive role. We are not talking strictly about the federal Government's role but about governments at all levels. With regard to federal Government outlays, as I said earlier, the federal Government has respected that trend line in terms of growth of our expenditures. In 1981-1982 the federal Government's share of the GNP amounted to 20.8 per cent. In 1982-1983, because of the recession, counter cyclical measures to help Canadians during those tough periods, measures which I strongly support, rose to 23.1 per cent.

● (1640)

Mr. Blenkarn: To 25.8 per cent.

Mr. Peterson: In 1983-1984 they will rise a little bit again to 23.6 per cent.

Mr. Blenkarn: To 25.8 per cent, according to your own figures.

Mr. Peterson: We will then see a decline, according to our fiscal projections, according to the plans which we responsibly laid before Parliament, to 22.7 per cent.

Mr. Crosbie: Try honesty for a change.

Mr. Blenkarn: Use the national account figures.

Mr. Peterson: Going on to the next year, they will be 22 per cent, and in 1986-1987 that figure will go down to 21.3 per cent.

Mr. Blenkarn: Use the national account figures.

Mr. Peterson: I am here to say that I am glad we have made the federal intervention at this time to help Canadians who need help most.

In our last budget we devoted $2.4 billion in new expenditures to the Special Recovery Capital Project to help Canadians bring on the infrastructure, accelerate implementation of capital projects that will benefit all of us over the long term but would not have been brought on because of the recession or would not have been brought on as quickly. These were brought on to create that type of economic wealth building system which we need in Canada. The amount of $2.4 billion was allocated to create employment immediately. What I think is even more important, and what I am even more proud of, is that we have brought on another $2.4 billion in tax expenditures, tax incentives to the private sector, tax incentives to business to go about doing the job which it does best and which it can do better than any other body in Canada, namely that of creating jobs. That $2.4 billion in tax incentives is being expended in a variety of ways.

I want to go through some of them because I want Canadians to know where their tax dollars are going. I am proud of where they are going. The Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) was talking about having to bring Canadians up to scratch in terms of the new technologies. We projected R and D expenditures of 1.5 per cent of GNP in 1979, and we will meet that commitment probably one year ahead of schedule. Many of us might have the feeling that we should have set a higher target. I would not disagree with those who argue for a higher target, but what have we done in terms of R and D expenditures?

In 1980 our tax incentives for research and development, scientific research, amounted to about $181 million. These benefits were enjoyed by about 343 firms in Canada. They cost us in lost taxes about $120 million. In our 1983 budget we took R and D tax incentives to the private sector, ones which were the most generous of any industrialized nation in the world, and we enhanced them even further in such a way that small business can use them and attract new capital investment. We made a tax shelter available so investors in new enterprises involved in high-tech can attract the equity capital necessary. Those firms that want to go out and increase their expenditures and increase their physical plant and equipment can do it now and get accelerated write-offs.

What have we done in scientific activities alone? We increased our expenditures last year as a federal Government from $2.9 billion to $3.2 billion, a ten per cent increase. That is a very constructive way of meeting some of the problems which the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands was talking about. But did she give us credit for that? No, she just stood up and bled all over the floor without coming up with anything concrete or constructive.

Mr. Jarvis: I think I have heard you say that already. That was on page 1 of your speech, Jim; you forgot to turn the page.

Mr. Peterson: Let us look at the deficit. We have a problem, and we all agree with it. All of us wish we did not need to have a deficit.

Mr. Blenkarn: We don't have to either. You are spending more than you take in.

Mr. Peterson: What caused that deficit? It was caused essentially by a decline in tax revenues during the recession. For the 15 year period prior to 1981—

Mr. Blenkarn: Prior to 1975.

Mr. Peterson: —business profits contributed about 11.2 per cent of our Gross National Product. In 1981 that figure declined to 10 per cent. In 1982, the worst year of the recession, we reached a post-war low of 6.2 per cent. In other words, during the recession businesses did not have the profits and, therefore, did not have the income to pay their taxes. This recession was marked by very high inflation, high interest, falling demand and dwindling profits. What have we done about it? I have talked about the $2.4 billion in Special Capital Recovery Projects. I have talked about the $2.4 billion to the private sector through tax incentives to get it going. We have also done some other things. We have the Indexed Securities Investment Plan. We have tax treatment of business losses for business. We have increased the loss carry forward from three years back to seven years forward. We now have an 11-year period over which losses can be absorbed instead of a seven-year period. We have cut back on some of the energy taxes, including the IORT and the PGRT taxes. We made mining depletion allowances available. You could write them off against other income. That is an incentive to increase investment in that sector.

Let me come to small business. Here we have the special recovery refundable investment tax crecit, a 40 per cent credit for small business.

Farmers get a 14-year period during which their losses can be absorbed—three years back and ten years forward. The Farm Credit Corporation has its resources expanded to $150 million. This was a $100 million increase in its time of difficulty and it means that farmers will be able to bet loans at 4 per cent below the going rate.

What did we do in the housing area? I am very proud of the initiatives of this Government. They were worked out in consultation with the Toronto Home Builders Assciation, HUDAC Ontario and the Canadian housing industry. This is the way programs should be worked out. They were worked out to meet the needs of that industry. It was demonstrated to us that for every new house going up, a very desirable social objective, we create 2.1 person years of work. How was this done? We did it through a series of $3,000 grants. For each $3,000 grant, not only did we get 2.1 person years of direct employment and a home but we generated $10,600 of new tax revenue in the first year of construction of that house. That is a creative use of public money in order to create jobs and achieve the socially desirable results. I am very proud of the housing programs we have undertaken. I thing that in the future if we want to be constructive we will look to creating even more social housing for Canadians. This is a very pressing need. I am very proud of the programs we have introduced that give Canadians who cannot otherwise afford good housing the types of things we have demonstrated we are capable of doing in the past and that we are going to devote even more resources to in the future.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Kelly): I regret to interrupt the Hon. Member but his allotted time lapsed some time ago. I had assumed he was concluding his remarks and that is why I let him continue. Are there any questions, comments, answers?

Mr. Blenkarn: We must congratulate the Hon. Member as Chairman of the House Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Would he agree with the Prime Minister's statement in his press conference on August 13, 1969 when he said:

> We'd soon be on the road to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control.

● (1650)

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, of course I agree with that. This is the whole gist of why this debate has been so unfounded. We have been doing things since that comment in 1969 to bring Government spending under control. We have a whole new system of fiscal management; the five-year plans we have been projecting, the six-year plans in our budgets. We have brought into effect the office of the Comptroller-General. The Auditor General has an enhanced role to play. Parliamentary committees, through the revised estimates, have better access to every type of expenditure being made so there is accountability of the Government to Parliament. We have the enveloped system, which is one of the most effective ways of ensuring that we do not bring in new programs just to be filed on top of old ones. We have a way of eliminating poor programs and replacing them with better ones.

The size of the federal Government's role in our economy, as demonstrated by the figures, has held pretty well firm throughout the period 1969 to now, hovering around 21 per cent of our GNP. Barring a recession, we had hoped to have it down to about 19 per cent by now. Because of that recession, we have undertaken to create social nets to protect people. Without them, it would have been a travesty in human terms and many people would have suffered. If you came to me and said, "Peterson, the Liberal Government has not created

enough social nets, it should be spending more to protect people during this difficult period", you might have received a little sympathy from this side with that type of resolution.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Willowdale is totally misleading when he says that the Government is not building on old programs. One of the tragedies we face today is that there is no zero base budgeting going on. The A base in the estimates is the old program. If you go to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray), he will tell you there is no zero base budgeting going on in old programs. That is why we are out of control. This House and our committee system is not doing the work it should be doing, examining and forcing zero-based budgeting. The only zero base budgeting is in the Department of National Defence. The rest of it is incremental additions of indexing CPI on top of old programs. That is what the debate is all about. When the Hon. Member for Willowdale tries to imply that we are going back and examining old programs, he is totally wrong. That is not true to fact.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I hate to inform the Hon. Member for Capilano that under the envelope system, if we are going to add a new program, we have to get it out of the same envelope. If you have an envelope with X number of programs and you want to add X plus one, you have to take it out of an existing program. That is the discipline that is imposed.

Mr. Blenkarn: You have not done that.

Mr. Peterson: The Hon. Member says we are not doing that. If Members opposite want to see a big cut in the federal role being played, I challenge them to come forward to us with concrete programs that we can cut out. I have heard nothing about programs that they want to add. I suggest they come to us with programs they want to cut out. If they feel they are wasteful, they may find a very receptive audience on this side, but stop coming forward to us with increased expenditures such as the Hon. Member for Kingston and The Islands did, saying we have not spent enough to help those who have suffered.

Let me respond to what we have done in this period in terms of job creation. I will never tell any person that it is acceptable that we have an unemployment level that exceeds 11 per cent in Canada. This is our greatest challenge. Instead of just bleeding about it, we have been doing something.

Miss MacDonald: You created it.

Mr. Peterson: The Hon. Member for Kingston and The Islands says we created that position. The fact is that we have created the best record of job creation in this country of any western industrialized nation since 1970. In the last 12 months alone we have created 350,000 new jobs. Since 1970 we have created 50 per cent more jobs in Canada than we had 13 years ago, this during a period when West Germany has suffered a 2 per cent decline in the number of jobs.

If you are comparing us to our neighbours, bring in those facts and recognize the fact that all the private analysts are now saying that Canada is better poised to come out of this recession better than any other western country, that our record has been very good. Those are the facts. Interest rates are down. Our six and five program has done something about inflation. We are creating jobs, even though they are not being created fast enough. Tell us how to create more jobs more quickly without increasing the deficit. Tell us how to do it by increasing the deficit reasonably so that we get value for our dollar. That is the type of constructive debate Canadians deserve in this House rather than the petty politics I have heard here today.

Mr. Huntington: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have to correct another very misleading statement made by the Hon. Member for Willowdale.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. The Hon. Member for Perth.

Mr. Jarvis: Mr. Speaker, if I understood the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Peterson) correctly, he said that the Government has taken steps to assume control of Government expenditure. I think that is what he said, amidst the rhetoric. I am about to receive my twelfth or thirteenth Auditor General's Report since coming to this House. Unhappily, every one of them has been a litany of horror stories with respect to the non-control of Government over expenditure. If the Hon. Member has inside knowledge, am I to expect that this next Auditor General's Report will finally concur with his proposition that the Government has assumed control and accountability over expenditures? The last 12 that I read said exactly the opposite to what the Hon. Member for Willowdale alleges.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): A brief reply by the Hon. Member for Willowdale.

Mr. Peterson: Mr. Speaker, I have two points to make. Yes, the Auditor General will be doing a job that we asked him to do by pointing out where we have mismanaged funds. If anyone in this country thinks that we are not going to make mistakes, they are absolutely wrong. The question is, what are we doing to try to avoid making mistakes. That is why we appointed an Auditor General and a Comptroller General. This is why we are prepared to make these mistakes public. This is why we have enhanced the role of Parliament in making us accountable. This is why we have introduced the expenditure control system involving the envelope system.

Mr. Jarvis: We did that.

Mr. Peterson: Before you were elected in 1979, we had virtually developed to completion the envelope system. You are the ones who brought it in and we are the ones who are using it. If you are against the envelope system that you brought in, based on the work we have done prior to 1979, then tell us. We are very much in favour of the envelope system. It is a good system.

We are pleased to have the constructive input of Members of Parliament as to where they feel we can cut back expenditures. I heard one suggestion today from the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn). He said that Pratt & Whitney should not have received a grant under one of our programs to start building engines in his riding. I hope more Members will come forward with examples of what they think is blatant Government waste. We can then take steps and act constructively to deal with the type of situation that we all want to eliminate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I did indicate that the Hon. Member for Willowdale ought to be brief. The time allotted for questions and answers has now expired. Debate. I notice the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell) is standing. I think the proper order of speakers ought to be the Hon. Member for Ontario (Mr. Fennell), followed by the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway and then followed, if there is one, by a Member to my right.

• (1700)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 45, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Fleming)—Criminal Code—Provisions dealing with hate literature; the Hon. Member for St. Catharines (Mr. Reid)—Shipbuilding—Criteria governing contracts—Unemployment at Port Weller. (b) Subsidy to marine industries in Sorel, P.Q.; the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—External Affairs—Cyprus—Declaration of independence by Turkish Cypriots. (b) Suggested withdrawal of Canadian Ambassador from Ankara.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—S.O. 62—GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Huntington:

That this House agrees without reservation with the prediction of the Prime Minister made on August 13, 1969, in a nationally televised press conference when he said, "We'd soon be on the road to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control" and calls upon the government to initiate policies which would avoid the Prime Minister's prediction.

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I can always tell that we have had an effective Opposition Day when we hear a lot of noise, a lot of defensive statements and a lot of poor points from the other side. I would like to point out to the Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Peterson) who just spoke that I have a great deal of respect for him in committee. He runs a good show as chairman of a committee. He does the job well and with leniency. However, I would like to ask him if he knows who set up the new form of the estimates. If he does not know, I will tell him. It was the person who was the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee before the 1979 election.

Mr. Evans: That's nonsense.

Mr. Fennell: It was done during that term of office and he was responsible. I would also like to point out to the Hon. Member that most of the ideas for estimates, public accounts and Government expenditure have come from this side of the House and most particularly from the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington).

Mr. Peterson: We respect them.

Mr. Fennell: But why does he not follow them? I would like to follow up on some of the comments made by the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Evans) and particularly to the questions he asked the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald). The Hon. Member is missing the point that the Government has failed to address the change that is occurring at this time and the structural unemployment that has resulted from this change. It has done absolutely nothing in that regard.

The Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston) held a great three-day conference to advertise to the public that he has done something worthwhile. Everyone I have spoken to from the private sector who attended that conference said it was a waste of time but it gave them an opportunity to get together at Government expense and chat with their friends outside of the conference hall. I feel that that is only one example of how the Government has missed the point.

I have recently had the opportunity to review the 1983 report of the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry. If someone from our Government were to take the time to find out about the tax incentives and the methods followed in Japan which put Japan so far ahead of us, he would learn something that would perhaps help the country out of its dilemma.

We are arguing that welfare and social programs are not enough. We must develop policies and programs that create jobs in order to eliminate the unemployment that draws on society and that, according to the Canadian Mental Health Association, will take $50 billion out of the Canadian economy. The unemployment rate is not 11 per cent as was stated but is 19 per cent when those people who have lost hope are included.

The Government has done just about everything to destroy the country, discourage the investment sector and remove the incentive that will get the country moving. The Government should have listened to the words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on August 13, 1969, when he said of programs:

> Do they now serve their purpose? Should they be curtailed? How do we cut the pie to make room for today's new priorities? These are questions whose answers will affect the nature of our expenditures. These are questions whose answers will determine the distribution of expenditures in years to come.

The Prime Minister did not listen to his own speech.

This morning, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) made a number of statements that were rather interesting. He mentioned the recommendations of the Lambert Commission. The Government has really sidetracted the excellent Lambert Commission study. If the Government had followed the recommendations contained within that study, we would not find ourselves in the dilemma we are in today. That is only one example.

This morning, the President of the Treasury Board went on to state that the costs of handling the programs and the operating expenditures were minimal. The operating costs for expenditure programs amounts to $12 billion. That means that close to 15 per cent of the cost is spent on the programs themselves. That amount is spent so that civil servants may dilly-dally away their time creating bureaucracies without performing their functions. If the cost of raising money were included, it would be different. That expenditure is minimal because it is mandatory. We are not a volunteer organization like the United Way or the Red Cross, organizations which spend so much money raising money. This is money that the Government has spent trying to decide how to give it away. Most of the good ideas the Government has heard have been bypassed.

Hon. Members have spoken about the envelope system. We had good intent when we implemented that system. The Government has abused the envelope system. I think that the envelope sprung a leak, so the Government took a small envelope and put it into a bigger envelope and then into a bigger envelope. We have original Estimates (A), (B), (C) and (D) and there is a bigger envelope for each one. That was not the intent of the envelope system. It was intended to be used as a budget, and as the Hon. Member for Capilano mentioned, it was to begin as a zero-based budget. The Government does not do that. Whenever it has a new idea, it brings up another Supplementary Estimate. The Government has used the envelope system and it has abused it.

The President of the Treasury Board spoke about increased productivity in the national economy. I have spent quite a bit of time investigating what has been done in other countries. We could learn some lessons about productivity from the Government of Japan. Japan was defeated after World War II and does not have any natural resources. As a result, the Japanese had to use their brains. This Government opposite has not used its brains to increase the productivity of our country.

Mr. Evans: What about the Americans?

Mr. Fennell: I hear Hon. Members opposite asking about the Americans. We are not Americans and we are not Japanese. We have much greater advantages than either of those nations and we should be far ahead of them right now.

The President of the Treasury Board went on to mention the productivity of Government programs. When we look at the large increases, we can see that the Government's own programs have not increased productivity.

I am happy to see that the Minister of State for Economic Development has entered the House because there are a number of questions which I would like to ask him. I hope he is the next one to speak on this subject.

The President of the Treasury Board went on to speak about efficiency and effectiveness. We have not seen any effectiveness in the Government since 1980. Its budget and costs are out of control and it has not implemented efficiency and effectiveness. Government Members give us only dialogue and do not give us the facts.

The President of the Treasury Board mentioned how much the Government has reduced the cost of delivery of programs. No matter how effective it is, the cost of a program always seems to go up. He states there is a strong framework for controlling expenditures. Perhaps the framework cost more than the expenditures. The Government is not keeping an eye on things and has no hesitation in bringing forward Supplementary Estimates that make the original Estimates look ridiculous. We pointed this out to the Minister of State for Economic Development at a committee meeting last week. We asked him why so many items in Supplementary Estimates (B) were over 100 per cent greater than in the original Estimates. The Government has lost control.

● (1710)

I wish the President of the Treasury Board were in the House. When he had the portfolio of Industry, Trade and Commerce, he authorized a study of the steel bar mill in the Windsor area, which I understand cost about $750,000. That is an example of waste. At the time he requested the study, Stelco and Co-Steel the other major producers of steel bar in Canada were operating at 40 per cent capacity; today they are operating at between 40 and 60 per cent capacity, but that will slide back to 40 per cent during the winter months. How can the present Minister say that the government is still studying that problem when he knows that the industry is in a surplus position at the moment?

Let us deal now with the aerospace industry which the Government thinks is a winner, although it has been incredibly bad at picking winners and losers. Last year it blew $2 billion on Canadair and de Havilland. It produced a toy jet for corporate executives at Canadair and a small airliner at de Havilland. The two airlines that were the largest purchasers of the Dash 7 aircraft have gone into bankruptcy. That speaks well for a small number of passenger airplanes.

We have seen the Government pick the wrong things, and now it has decided to pick on helicopters. Why does it think it can be successful in this after the losses it has shown? Not only

did it pick helicopters but it put the original one up at Mirabel in an effort to justify, for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. LeBlanc), that the expropriation in that area was a good idea in the first place. Imagine building Mirabel in order to land helicopters there! Imagine having that much runway for a helicopter! The Government spent hundreds of millions of dollars building a great industrial park that no one in the private sector will go near, even at a subsidized cost.

Mr. Tousignant: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Perhaps the Hon. Member should give us a few explanations about the Arrow program that was turned down by the Conservative Party. He should give us an explanation for that.

Mr. Fennell: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what year that was. I know that when the Hon. C. D. Howe was a Cabinet Minister in the House he indicated that the program would be scrapped. Imagine how many billions of dollars the Government would have blown on the Arrow program by now. Our deficit could be 10 per cent higher than it is today.

Mr. Tousignant: Don't rewrite history.

Mr. Fennell: The Government is always trying to justify its past expenditures, but it has not made any sound expenditures as yet. It put the Bell helicopter at Mirabel, surrounded by farmers. There is no technical expertise in that area and the people do not want any industry there. They just want to run their farms in an area which contains 1 per cent of Quebec's class one arable land. The Government wants to put the helicopters there so that it can justify the $1 billion that was spent to build a surplus airport. These must be dandy helicopters if they need that much runway.

I support the point made by the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn) in relation to the $500 million that is going to Pratt & Whitney. It is amazing how well that company has done in East Hartford, Connecticut, United States. I happen to have gone to school there. That company was very successful post-war and it still is. It is amazing how much it has done without Government subsidies. I admit it has had National Defence contracts to develop new technology. That is why the Americans are so much further ahead than we are. Our Government does not even contemplate that.

The Japanese leave it to the private sector to decide who should win and who should lose. I wish the Minister of State for Economic Development would read papers such as the *Japan Robot News* and that published by the Yano Research Institute. They would give him some lead information about where to go. I do not believe he knows how to get out of this dilemma.

We have to create jobs and we have to create wealth. The redistribution of wealth has not worked because there is none left to redistribute. We have to create wealth for jobs and new industries, and we have to stop these give-away programs wherever the Government sees fit.

Since 1968, manufacturing productivity in Canada has increased at the second slowest pace of any industrialized nation. There are no incentives. Since 1979, $16.5 billion of investment capital has left the country because the Government is hostile to the private sector which has not been provided with incentives. From 1977 to 1982 productivity stood still and since 1982 it has been reduced by 2.8 per cent, the worst rate of any country in the world.

I should like to remind Hon. Members opposite of what some Members of the Government have said. In 1980-81, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), in his former capacity, said that in order to achieve the essential reduction in the deficit great restraint over expenditures had been required. Hon. Members opposite speak words but they do not mean anything. In 1981-82, the same Minister said that "we must reduce our deficit and our borrowing requirements substantially". You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that it was the National Energy Program that brought this country to a standstill. In 1982-83, the same Minister said that interest rates would rise even more and that Canada would price itself out of world markets.

Our export sales of manufactured goods have decreased so dramatically that we are no longer competitive, Mr. Speaker. We are not highly productive and we have lost our sense of innovation and of private enterprise.

In April, 1983, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) said that he was presenting a fiscally responsible budget. Mr. Speaker, no budget that has increased our expenditures by up to $100 billion where the deficit is $31 billion, is a responsible budget. In 1968-69 our national debt was $18 billion; today it is $150 billion, and next year it will be ten times that or 1,000 per cent of what it was.

In 1968 Canada had 5.744 per cent of world trade, but in 1981 it had 3.8 per cent. In 1968 we exported more than Japan did; today we export half of what Japan exports. That is because Japan put plans and policies in place. It did it with thought. It did it with policy. Particularly, Mr. Speaker, it gave initiatives to the private sector which this Government has failed to do and, as a result, we do not have the jobs. We have this tremendous deficit because we do not have the industry. We have two million people unemployed who are drawing on society. Their costs, according to the Canadian Mental Health Association, could amount to $50 billion.

• (1720)

I believe this debate today is very important in order to make the people aware that this Government is misguided and misdirected. Its priorities are not where they should be. It is our responsibility, as the Opposition, before we form the next government, to let the people know what damage this Government has done to Canadians and the debt it has built up for every man, woman and child in Canada.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions, comments. Debate.

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this debate. The Conservative motion is that the House agree without reservation with a statement made by

the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in 1969 about the country being on the road to financial disaster if nothing is done to bring spending under control. The motion goes on to call on the Government to initiate policies to avoid that prediction. In other words, it calls for tight fiscal restraint. I have a question I would like to put to Hon. Members of the House, especially to my Conservative colleagues on my right. I see the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands (Miss MacDonald) looking up. I will put the question to her. Who said, "In spite of the very substantial deficit with which we are confronted, programs in very important areas necessary for the development of the country are being cut"? That speaker gave five examples, medicare, post-secondary education, scientific research, funding for the arts and international aid. Who was it who stood in this House and said that? I will give you a further hint, Mr. Speaker. The speech was made within a year of that quote from the Prime Minister. I will ask the last Hon. Member who spoke. Who said that?

Mr. Fennell: I bet I did not say it.

Mr. Waddell: I will tell you who said it. It was the Hon. Robert L. Stanfield who was the Leader of the Conservative Party and Leader of the Opposition. Is it not incredible that the Conservative Party offers a motion today which relates back to 1969? That was the era when "Wacky Bennett" had just won an election in British Columbia, Jean Lesage had just resigned in Quebec. There was a federal-provincial finance conference in Quebec which was supposed to be a watershed that year. The motion goes back to 1969 and quotes the Prime Minister, who was supposed to be against further federal spending, suggesting the Prime Minister should live by that today, when around the same period Robert L. Stanfield stood up in the Commons and said, "You really cannot cut federal spending because if you do, you are going to cut back medicare, post-secondary education, scientific research, funding to the arts and international aid." Is that not incredible? Why does the Conservative Party not get its act together?

The previous speaker said that the Government is misguided and misdirected. I cannot think of a Party which is more misguided and more misdirected than the Conservative Party when it has speaking for it, supposedly, a Red Tory, the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands, who would agree, I believe, with what Robert Stanfield said, and the ultra-blue Tory, the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington), and the ultra rightwing Tory, the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn). That Party cannot have it both ways if it is going to govern Canada. Which is it going to be?

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the spending of this Government is not under control. The question surely is, where is that spending going? The motion is simply designed to embarrass the Liberal Government—and that is pretty easy to do—and it has backfired and embarrassed the Tories. If one looks at Robert Stanfield's speech, one will see that it really makes the Official Opposition look silly in introducing this kind of text today, when there was so much more it could have put in a motion. I suggest that that Party look at the previous motion which the Hon. Member for Kingston and the Islands brought forward. She talked about unemployment and the new kind of economy we have to face in Canada.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are incompetent in managing the economy, but that does not have to be said in the House of Commons. One can ask a cab driver down the street, he will say the same thing. The method of the Liberal Government is really, "If it moves, throw money at it. If if has votes, throw more money at it. If it is one of your friends in an industry which is in trouble, give it more money". We give $2 billion in petroleum grants in this country. For what? For companies to have 105 per cent write-offs. We give money for unemployment insurance in this country, and the reason we do that is because of Government policy. That is how it tackled inflation, by slowing down the economy completely and by creating unemployment.

We are really dealing with a Government which has run out of ideas. Modern North American Liberalism is finished. It does not stand for anything. It zigs and it zags and it tries to build on the old programs. The Throne Speech which is coming up will tag a few things on to the Unemployment Insurance Program, move a little bit here, have a commission on medicare. But it is failing. And I say this to the Liberals who are listening: watch what the Conservatives are saying in North America. I disagree with them, but they are getting some support because of those Hon. Members have been saying what they believe in strongly, and they are not zigging and zagging. It falls to us on the left, as a Social Democratic Party, also to say what we believe in strongly. If that happens, you will find that there will be two major political Parties in Canada come the next election, the Conservatives and the New Democrats.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Tousignant: Could the Hon. Member give us some explanations regarding the *Arrow* the Progressive Conservative Government dismantled?

Mr. Waddell: Absolutely! It is the same in Quebec.

An Hon. Member: Really?

Mr. Waddell: Yes . . . wait and see!

[*English*]

I would just like to say one more thing to the Conservatives and let them consider whether they are for Mr. Stanfield or for the Hon. Member for Capilano. Perhaps as a little forerunner of what we may see from a Conservative government, I will quote from a book called, "The Contenders—A Tory quest for power". On page 86 of the book, I notice the new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) says, in terms of what his government is going to be like, the spending of his government and the political appointments of his government, and I quote:

> I am going to dance with the ones who brung me.
> That means Tories that's what this is all about.
> Ya dance with the lady what brung ya.

That means, of course, that he is going to continue the same patronage-infested system in Canada. The harbours will be built in a different riding in the Maritimes. It is the same kind of old system which we have to get away from. There may be a few changes, less money on social service, more money for armaments.

Mr. Epp: Tell us about Manitoba!

Mr. Waddell: I can see the new Leader of the Opposition now, who really is just a poodle for Conrad Black and the boys in Toronto. Is that not who is really calling the shots? When Conrad wants to take Brian for a walk and tell him what the new policy will be of the government, that is what the policy will be. He is simply the poodle. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Robert Stanfield is not back in this House, because there is a man who understood what a deficit meant. There was a man who understood that you did not focus on a deficit. You focused on the programs. What does it matter, really, what the public debt is, although we should be concerned about that. If people are working and if the economy is prosperous, will people lose sleep over whether the deficit is $10 billion or $11 billion? No, Mr. Speaker.

We are faced with a high technological society, with rapid technological change. The previous speaker might want to listen for a minute. If he hopes to get into Government he will have to deal with the fact that we have a society which is rapidly replacing people with machines, not just blue collar workers but white collar workers, middle management, secretaries and so on, especially women. We are going to get more of this.

• (1730)

The Hon. Member for Willowdale (Mr. Peterson) said "we have created jobs". But what kind of jobs? "We have spent money", he said, but what have we spent that money on? The jobs being created are low-paying service jobs. We are losing the middle rung jobs. In five years we are going to have a society in which a few people at the top make big money and the great mass of the people are down at the bottom. We are going to lose the middle class. It is not just a question of bleeding for the unemployed or special groups who have problems. We are in real danger of losing our middle class, and I would think Members of Parliament would be very interested in that.

What can be done, Mr. Speaker? I do not think we should focus on cutting the deficit. We should focus on an industrial policy for Canada. We need economic democracy. It seems to me the Conservatives and Liberals have adopted the philosophy of "leave it to the magic of the marketplace". As I say that, I am looking over at the Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston). Let me suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that will not happen. First of all, Canada is a mixed economy. When you have problems at the public level, the civil service or Crown corporations, you do not throw them out like the baby with the bath water, you reform them. You do not stand up and attack Government per se. We saw in British Columbia that people were very politicized as the general strike approached. Like the Hon. Member for York North (Mr. Gamble), people attack the whole notion of the Public Service. They say it is not a job if you are a public servant. It is not a job if you are a garbage man, police officer, fireman, a clerk sending out cheques or a nurse looking after old people. Somehow that is not a job. Well, it is and we should talk about that. You cannot say these are not jobs.

Getting back to my theme, Mr. Speaker, you have to have an industrial policy. We have to get labour, government and industry together. Not at that conference that the Minister had, the Canada Tomorrow Conference, although it was well intentioned. But if you want to get labour into it, you have to assure the working people of this country that they are going to be protected in some way from change. They are not stupid, they know they are going to suffer from change and there will be job lay-offs. But they have to be protected. The Government should look at some of the work of Robert Reich, a Harvard economist. He said:

> Unless members of a democratic society are persuaded the benefits and burdens of change are being allocated more or less evenly, they will resist change, and their resistence will prove extremely powerful.

I saw that in British Columbia where the Government tried to come in with draconian restraint measures and the people resisted. They were pushed to a point at which they resisted. Why should the worker not have a say in technological change or safety in the work place? Why should the worker not have some say? Why should he not be put into a training program which will take him to a new level? Why should the safety net not be expanded? That is what the Canadian middle class is worried about. They are prepared to accept change, they know it is coming. They do not want to sit here and debate deficits or debate 1969 quotes, especially one which goes one way and to which Robert Stanfield takes exactly the opposite viewpoint. That is silly. They want us to make it easier for them to leave their homes and go where the jobs are. They want us to look for policies where the human virtues of participation, equality and security can be brought forward. That is the direction of the future economy of Canada. But let us not go back to look at what Trudeau said in August, 1969. Let us look ahead. Let us look to policies which will deal with this high-tech revolution which is coming fast. Let us make sure that it is not just Conrad Black and the boys who benefit from change. Let us make sure there is a recovery for everyone.

I suggest the Government look at some of the ideas I put forward today. I hope that in their next motion the Conservatives will give these people something to shoot at rather than these silly motions which really do not have very much substance to them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): May I remind Hon. Members that debate will terminate, according to a House order made earlier, at 5.45 p.m. The Hon. Member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Kelly).

Mr. Norman Kelly (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, saving the best for last, as it were.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. The Chair has not been apprised of a point of order, but I will gladly accept one. My understanding is that debate ends at 5.45 p.m. If there is some indication to the contrary, would an Hon. Member please stand and indicate why?

Miss MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, there was agreement among the House Leaders that the vote, which would ordinarily take place at 5.45 today, will be deferred until 5.45 tomorrow and debate will carry through until six o'clock, the normal hour of adjournment. That is my understanding.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair is not informed of any agreement that the question might be put at 5.45 and the debate might continue until six o'clock. The information I have is that the Chair is obligated to put the question at 5.45. If some Hon. Member wants to seek unanimous consent of the House to permit debate to continue until six and the question put then, that is at variance from what I understand to be the existing order of the House. Everyone is clear that the vote is deferred until tomorrow, but normally a vote to be deferred is taken at 5.45 and then we move on to other business.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, in view of the comments you made, could there be agreement that debate end today at six o'clock? There are a number of Members who want to speak and we might be able to divide the time, as we have done in the past, through unanimous agreement.

• (1740)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I am not going to attend too much to the essential formalities. The Hon. Member has risen on a point of order and cannot put a motion in that regard. I think he seeks unanimous consent, and that issue ought to be cleared up. I will repeat. The situation is that the Chair would, under House order made earlier, put the question at 5.45, which would then be deferred until tomorrow, unless of course the question is negatived. The Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp) has sought unanimous consent of the House to change that House order and to have debate continue until six o'clock. Is there unanimous consent to have the debate continue until six o'clock?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, we agree to that, assuming that at 5.45 you would call it six o'clock. In other words, you would put the yeas and nays at six o'clock rather than at 5.45. I think we could agree to that.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): I seek unanimous consent. Is there unanimous consent to see the clock at six o'clock for purposes of putting the question, the yeas and nays?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Agreed and so ordered. The Hon. Member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Kelly).

Mr. Kelly: Mr. Speaker, I have been handling the debate unofficially on this side of the House, and my understanding is the same as yours, that the vote was to have been called at 5.45. I have no trouble accommodating the hon. gentleman for Provencher (Mr. Epp). I will speak for ten minutes and then relinquish the floor to whoever may want it on the opposite side of the House.

The Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) mentioned in his address that the esteem of this House in the eyes of the public has fallen to an all-time low. Most Canadians find that this House is irrelevant, not only to the life of Canadians in general, but to their lives specifically. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that the reason for that does not lie with the spiralling deficit, which he attacked so vigorously this afternoon, but can be found in the type of motion which has absorbed the valuable time of this House all day. The deficit is an archaic political issue. It was raised about four or five years ago. It tended to shape political behaviour or attitudes in the 1979 election. Since 1980 not very many people are paying attention to it. The reason they are not paying attention to it, quite frankly, is that they know that in a recessionary period you cannot eliminate the deficit or roll it back to any significant degree.

The Opposition, nonetheless, has decided in its wisdom to resurrect this issue and parade it once again before the House and, hopefully, before the media and the Canadian public, in an effort to try to recapture some of the lost political ground that will be revealed in the next Gallup poll.

Mr. Waddell: We are hoping.

Mr. Kelly: If this argument worked once, four or five years ago, then, by golly, it just might work again. If we can revive it, if we can renovate it, if we can still address it as forcefully today as we did originally, then maybe we can hold on to those voters that we feel slipping from our grasp because we really do not have any specific, concrete policies in this Party or in this leadership. Mr. Speaker, I think the ploy is that transparent. They are desperately looking for the old winning issues that brought them victory in the old glory days of 1977, 1978 and 1979, when it felt good to bash Grits and finally win an election. It just might win again. Why, we even have more facts and figures this time. We have different and better speakers. Who knows, we may be able to ride this again into another electoral victory.

I wish the Opposition could see themselves as others see them when they try to make political points with this archaic, rusty old rhetorical issue. For heaven's sake, they cannot even agree on the nature of the debate in this House. One person gets up and says, "Cut." The other person gets up and says, "Well, perhaps cut but, by golly, we should be thinking of spending too." So you have got cutters and spenders in the same Party.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Kelly: Not only are they inconsistent in where they are coming from and where they want to go, Mr. Speaker, but they do not even know their facts in this issue. The Hon. Member gets up and asks why this Government does not act

more like the Governments of Japan, France, Singapore and Governments like that. Why do they not? When you point out to her that those are high deficit Governments, she did not know that. Someone else gets up and asks if we realize that Government spending has gone from 33.7 per cent to 47.3 per cent of disposable income. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, he fails to inform the House, and presumably the Canadian public, that that increase in expenditures did not result exclusively, or even primarily, from the expenditures of the Government of Canada. If he had read the fine report produced by the Simon Fraser Institute, he would have found out that those increases have emanated from provincial Governments, most of whom are Conservative.

As the Tories develop the argument, Mr. Speaker, after making their first point that this Government is spending tons of money, they then go on to say that not only are we spending a lot of money, but we are spending a lot of it wastefully. They ask the Canadian public, through the media that reports the deliberations of this House, what they have as a result of those expenditures. What have you received? Nothing. All is decay around you. We live in a wasteland. You have got nothing. You have been robbed. Mr. Speaker, they say it with such passion, with such conviction, with such vigour in their voices that most Canadians say, "By God, they must be right. No one could speak like that. No one could speak with that authority if that were not the case. By golly, we must not have got very much from them. They are right."

I invite you and others, Mr. Speaker, to look at the society around us to see what is out there. You do not have to be a brilliant academician to test the validity of that argument. Just open the door and walk around your neighbourhood and see what it is like and how it has changed in the last 10 or 15 years while the Liberals were in power. What do you find? You find beautiful senior citizens' residences everywhere paid for by, in large measure, the Government of Canada. You find one of the best educational systems anywhere in the world funded primarily, at the post secondary school level, by the Government of Canada. Walk further and you will find the finest hospital system in the world funded again, through provincial authorities, by the Government of Canada. Everywhere you look, Mr. Speaker, no matter what part of Canada or what community you live in, you will find tangible, concrete evidence of what that deficit has given Canadians. It has given Canadians the finest social system in the western world. That is something that all of us in this House can be proud of.

After they talk about the wastefulness, Mr. Speaker, they then say, "We have solutions. We are not negative carpers or shrill harbingers of doom and gloom. We have solutions." The first solution proposed this afternoon was to have this House adopt the report of the Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure. If somehow you can have special committees of this House with special obligations to review, monitor, curb and cut Government spending, then this House will bring to Government spending the rigour that has been hitherto missing. Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that there is a political system which already has that type of committee. That is the United States. But the deficit down there is far larger than it is here. I would argue that committees of that sort, however well intentioned, are quite frankly not the issue.

• (1750)

Another solution is to elect a Tory government. The Tories say to elect them because they know the value of a dollar. But every Conservative leadership candidate went into debt during his or her leadership campaign.

Mr. Gamble: I beg your pardon? That is a Liberal lie.

Mr. Kelly: I take that back, Mr. Speaker. I stand corrected. Everyone of them but one. But all the major candidates, the serious ones, were in debt. They went hopelessly and shamefully into debt.

The only time the Tories have elected a Government recently was in 1979. What did they do with the deficit? They called it a stimulative deficit. But it did not matter how one called it, it was a deficit nonetheless. If Canadians entrust the Government of this fair land in the hands of the Party that now forms the Official Opposition, Mr. Speaker, they will be making the gravest and most irresponsible mistake they could ever make, if they think that electing them would solve the economic problems of the country.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The Chair heard earlier that the Hon. Member for Scarborough Centre (Mr. Kelly) wanted to leave time for Opposition Members, but there is no House order to that effect. I must put the question as to whether there are questions, comments or answers. If there are not, of course I will recognize the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie).

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, there are no questions with which we have to bother the Hon. Member because we heard nothing that would cause us to ask questions. What we heard, we wondered at. We have heard the same kind of Liberal serene talk as the people of Canada have heard since 1965.

The quotation which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) gave us on August 13, 1969, was: "We would soon be on the road to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control." That is one of the few accurate statements the Prime Minister has made in the last 14 years.

I have just two other statements which he also made. This statement was made in January of 1980 when he made a solemn commitment. I quote from the Prime Minister in Toronto—the fountain of financial rectitude is Toronto, of course—when he promised to, "manage more rigorously the nation's finances in order to make more effective use of the taxpayers' money."

A final quotation of the Prime Minister is from the Toronto *Star*, the Liberal Bible, on February 10, 1980. The Prime Minister said, "I want to manage the economy in such a way that interest rates would in fact come down because the economy would be administered in a sounder way ." Well,

interest rates after that went from 11 per cent to 23 per cent before they started to come down again.

Those are three of the economic statements of the world's elder statesman who is now going about the world making statements in another field. If his statements on this other interest of his, the peace interest, are as accurate and as full of fruition as his statements have been with respect to the Government's finances in Canada, the Canadian economy and interest rates in Canada, all I can tell you is, God help the world.

The worst advice I could give the Hon. Member who just concluded is to be himself or to continue to be himself. This country has been operating in the red for so long under the Government that the public accounts resemble a slaughter house. Not only is its deficit this year $31.3 billion, three times what it was in 1979-80, when we were in office and having to deal with the results of Liberal deficits for that year and the previous year, the Auditor General finds that there is a $5.3 billion hidden deficit. I am not making it up. It is in a quote from the Ottawa *Citizen*. We have to add to the $31.3 billion another hidden deficit of $5.3 million.

I point this out to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Government House Leader, although I am not sure whether he reads or not. The article in the *Citizen* states that if appropriate accounting procedures were taken, the Government's final deficit figure for last year of almost $24.7 billion was understated by $5.3 billion, one reason being that it did not properly report unemployment insurance transactions and so on.

Is the Government spending money wisely? I hold up another clipping of just several days ago entitled "Kaplan accused of spending $43,000 to spruce up image." The unthinkable sprucing the unspruceable. There is $43,000 being spent by a Cabinet Minister to spruce up his image. We multiply that by the total number of Cabinet Ministers, because they are all sprucing up their images as well. They are trying to spruce up the unspruceable. They are trying to goose the ungooseable, not only spruce the unspruceable. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola) is shocked by the ungooseable or the unspruceable. I do not blame her.

I want to refer now to the Government's greatest growth. The greatest growth it has had in the 18 or 19 years it has been in power is shown in the fiscal plan that was presented by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) on April 19. I refer you to page 3 where it states:

> Debt grew 26.6 per cent in 1982-83 and it is projected to grow a further 26 per cent this year.

That is the Government's record in growth, not the economy. The economy has not grown in the last three or four years. We are now in a worse position than we were three years ago but the debt has grown 26.2 per cent in 1982-83 and is supposed to grow at least 26 per cent this year.

The Minister of Finance goes on to say:

> Declining deficits thereafter imply somewhat slower debt growth, but total net federal debt is projected to rise progressively as a percentage of GNP, from 34.4 per cent in 1982-83 to 46.0 per cent by 1986-87.

The financial requirements, which is the borrowing the Government makes to meet these deficits, will be approximately 6.9 per cent of the GNP this year. That is the record of the Government. Everything else declined except the public debt. The total amount of goods and services produced by the country's economy declined over the last two or three years. The total number of people working declined savagely over the last two or three years. But the debt continues to grow. For what purpose? It has not achieved either growth in the economy or growth in employment.

This is a 7D government. There are seven Ds comprised of equal parts; debt, deception, duplicity, deviousness, desperation, despotism and finally decrepitude. When one looks across the Chamber at the end of an Opposition day, one sees, in all its splendour, decrepitude unfolding before one. The Government is decrepit. Its policies are decrepit. Its debt is decrepit.

It is now engaging only in duplicity and deviousness in the desperate attempt to prevent someone else from forming a government to try to make this country one of growth, promise and hope. Again, it does not have the decency or good will even now to get out of office and call an election. It is clinging by its fingernails, toenails and its hangnails, afraid to go to the Governor General and ask him to dissolve the House, while half the crowd is out travelling around the world in the hope they will be forgotten before they return home so that people will forget what they have and have not done.

I just have enough time to remind the House of one area of growth, which is loans and loan guarantees. We now have 19.1 billion in loans to the private sector by this Government and provincial Governments, 74 per cent of which is federal. There is $29.4 million in guarantees and loans to private bodies around this country by all 11 Governments, 97 per cent of which is federal. They include such fantastic companies as the Maislin Corporation—amazing Maislin. The friends of the Minister of Finance are among the latest to receive guarantees. One can only marvel that the Canadian public is not in here today ignoring the rules of this House and applauding us, making the Chamber rock with applause, as we attempt to point out how this Government has broken its promises in public spending, in public debt incurment, in every area we care to look at. The disastrous, decrepitudinous collection of twits that only an election can give the Canadian public—have I unanimous consent to continue, Mr. Speaker?

● (1800)

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: —that only a dissolution of the House can give us the chance to rectify this wrong.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The House agreed by unanimous consent a few moments ago that at six o'clock I ought to see the clock as 5.45 p.m. Accordingly, I must do so.

Adjournment Debate

It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 62(10) to interrupt the proceedings and to put forth with every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply. Accordingly, the question is on the motion of the Hon. Member for Capilano (Mr. Huntington) and on the amendment of the Hon. Member for Mississauga South (Mr. Blenkarn).

All those in favour of the amendment will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Pursuant to the Order made Thursday, November 24, 1983 the division stands deferred until Tuesday, November 29, 1983 at 5.45 p.m.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

CRIMINAL CODE—PROVISIONS DEALING WITH HATE LITERATURE

Hon. Jim Fleming (York West): Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure of participating in this debate tonight as a result of the question I posed to the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) on November 22, 1983 as recorded on page 29079 of *Hansard*. The question arose from *The Globe and Mail* news story that morning which suggested that Criminal Code omnibus amendments due early this year or early next year would include changes to deal more effectively with hate propaganda in our Criminal Code.

In asking the question of the Minister of Justice whether those reports were true, I also wanted to know whether the need for an Attorney General to give permission for the laying of a charge of hate mongering would also be withdrawn from the Criminal Code. I must say I was rather disappointed in the vagueness of the response from the Minister. I do appreciate the constraints he faces as a member of cabinet, that he cannot at random announce decisions that have been taken, although regretfully the suggestion was there in the newspaper and yet here in Parliament we were not graced with a response. However, I do hope that as he indicated the Government is moving in this direction.

This issue, the way our law can deal with hate in our country, is of great importance to our society, particularly following the establishment of our own Charter of Rights. The sooner these amendments we hear spoken of in the press, that may well be under consideration by cabinet, are acted upon the better.

I should say, and I believe most Members of this House would agree with me, that this is a country of immense tolerance, and yes, there are other countries that have records of tolerance for intolerance far worse than our own but I believe we have no reason at all to be complacent about the current situation in Canada. Certainly our history points out discrimination by the state itself—Government and Parliament—as well as by Canadians. For example, the Chinese people who originally immigrated to this country to assist in the building of the railway were not allowed to have women accompany them, including wives; there was the need for a fee in order to have a man's wife join him in this country, and there is the fact that women of Chinese origin were not allowed to vote in Canada until well after the second World War. We had black slaves in this country in the nineteenth century. Japanese-Canadians, faithful, good citizens who happened to be of Japanese origin, lost all their worldly possessions except what could be carried in a suitcase at a time of crisis during World War II, and were removed to camps. That is just one more example.

• (1805)

Even more important in contemporary terms, there are indications in Canada of a serious problem involving the hate of some Canadians for other Canadians based simply on race. Canada today is a major source of hate literature, distributed around the world as well as here in Canada. That material has been brought to the attention of various Members of Parliament by the Canadian Jewish Congress. In our newspapers, almost daily, there are examples of incidents of racism against Canadians, largely those who are visibly obvious to the larger society which is white. This country can only work if governments take the lead in breaking down barriers in education, in helping people understand each other better in order to get along as Canadians, and also in changing laws that now aid and abet intolerance to the point of creating real anguish for many good Canadians.

As a former journalist, Mr. Speaker, I agree that freedom of speech is fundamental to a healthy democracy but, no more than society would allow the preaching of insurrection of our state itself should it allow the preaching of insurrection to the principles of tolerance in our society and in our new Constitution. Hate that tears at the ability of honest, good Canadians to live in peace and without fear is every bit as damaging and wrong as attacks on our democracy itself.

If free speech is the freedom to tear away the principles of our Charter, then in the name of one freedom we will destroy the others in that Charter. Individuals must remain free to express their views, no matter how unpalatable those views may be to another, so long as that freedom of expression does not in itself lead to pain and real suffering for other Canadians

who are innocent of any wrongdoing. That is the essence of my concern. I hope the Government will not be long in responding to a situation that scars the very essence of our new Charter of Rights.

Mr. Paul-André Massé (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) to reply to the question raised by the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Fleming) regarding Criminal Code provisions dealing with hate literature. I think his questions are quite appropriate and timely.

Canada is a multicultural society. This is an undeniable fact which is now formally recognized in our Constitution and one which is welcomed by a vast majority of Canadians. Nevertheless, this reality is one which some individuals and groups find distressful. This attitude may result in overt or covert discrimination, and even acts of vandalism or violence. Many federal and provincial agencies are working to demonstrate the important values which flow from the multicultural nature of our country. They seek to bring about a progressive change in the views of those individuals who are prejudiced against visible minorities and other groups in society. This objective is yet to be attained. Therefore, the law continues to play an important role in the protection of various disadvantaged groups against discrimination.

There are several statutes which provide protection and relief to the members of visible minorities who have been discriminated against. This evening, however, I would like to discuss the provisions of the Criminal Code which deal with hate propaganda. These provisions are found in Part VI, Offences against the Person and Reputation, of the Code. More specifically, 281.1 and 281.2(1) and (2) deal with hate propaganda. The first section makes it an offense to promote or advocate genocide. The second makes it an offence to publicly incite hatred against an identifiable group, and the last section is directed at those who promote hatred by communicating statements in public.

Recently, minority groups have expressed their concerns about the lack of prosecutions under the hate propaganda provisions of the Criminal Code. They point to a growth in the prevalence of hate literature and suggest that the protection offered by the Code be improved in several ways.

● (1810)

Some of these suggestions include removing the element of wilfulness in the offence of promotion of hartred; doing away with certain statutory defences currently available to individuals charged with a hate propaganda offence; allowing prosecutions for promotion of hatred without the prior consent of the provincial Attorney General; and, as has also been suggested by some, that historical misrepresentation or the denial of historical events be made an offence if used to promote hatred. With the exception of the last suggestion, the Minister is currently giving careful consideration to all of these recommendations.

I am inclined to believe that the maintenance of harmonious relationships between the various racial, ethnic and religious components of our society warrants a strengthening of the protection against incitement to hatred found in the Code.

With respect to the last recommendation, the issue of historical denial, we are somewhat hesitant to expressly incorporate this notion into the hate propaganda provisions of the Code. The implications of such a proposal are far-reaching. First, historical facts frequently depend upon the perspective from which one views the past. There are numerous incidents in history which are disputed by individuals and groups. Many of these incidents are not clearly defined or cannot be proven. That is why we believe that the courts are not the appropriate forum in which to resolve questions of this nature. Second, we believe that a prosecution under the existing provision could now be attempted against anyone who promoted hatred against an identifiable group on the basis of historical denial. Last, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression.

As you already know, Mr. Speaker, Cabinet approved the creation of a special parliamentary committee to deal with this matter, and I believe that we should wait until that committee presents its report before making further recommendations.

SHIPBULDING—CRITERIA GOVERNING CONTRACTS—UNEMPLOYMENT AT PORT WELLER. (B) SUBSIDY TO MARINE INDUSTRIES IN SOREL, P.Q.

Mr. Joe Reid (St. Catharines): Mr. Speaker, on October 31 last, I raised two questions with respect to the awarding of the six Class 1,100 icebreaker contracts. The Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Lapointe) responded by saying that the lowest bid is the criterion which is always used by the Government in a public call for tenders. However, the Minister was contradicted by a statement which came from his own office that very day.

That release clearly stated that national socio-economic considerations had to be a factor in virtually any contract the Government awarded. Of course, socio-economic considerations have to be factors in order to be consistent with the budget speech made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) in April of this year. He said that earth will be moved, steel will be rigged and concrete will be poured in all parts of the country. The $630 million spent to upgrade and modernize the Canadian Coastguard fleet was to relieve regional disparity. However, nothing was said about the Government's selectivity program.

Adding insult to injury, the Minister's statement concluded by citing the reduction of unemployment as a key objective in the awarding of federal contracts. If unemployment is a factor at all, then St. Catharines-Niagara should be a prime candidate for favourable consideration.

For the past two months, St. Catharines-Niagara has led the country in urban unemployment rates. Last month, 26,000 people were out of work in the Niagara area and that figure is expected to rise over the next few months. Port Weller dry-

docks, once the most efficient and competitive yard in the country and once an employer of some 950 ship workers, now employs less than 200. That Port Weller drydocks was not included in the new ship program was the final straw for the area and for an industry which has been neglected and discriminated against far too often by an uncaring Government.

Despite the fact that there are three Liberal Members who represent the Niagara region, that area was overlooked and bypassed by the ILAP program. The response from the Minister remained that the Niagara region was being monitored closely. We are now being tantalized by a program which calls the area a qualifying centre for special Tier 1 designation.

• (1815)

Following on ILAP came the Industrial and Regional Development Program designed to promote industrial renewal and modernization in areas where long-term employment strategies are needed. Unemployment rates are said to account for 50 per cent of the weight when assigning tier designations.

St. Catharines-Niagara was given a tier one rating, the lowest possible. Mr. Speaker, there can hardly be much credibility in an employment program when the area with the highest urban unemployment in Canada fails to qualify for meaningful assistance.

What is more, the Government's own bureaucrats point out in a confidential report to the Minister of State for Economic Development (Mr. Johnston), that meaningful recovery in St. Catharines, utilizing the existing local economic base, cannot occur. It went on to say that "it is within the urban centres of southwestern Ontario and the Niagara Peninsula that much of the industrial renewal and export development efforts will need to be directed." Those views and conclusions, Mr. Speaker, were submitted to the Minister last February.

How well received was that economic advice? From that time, the Niagara region has essentially been bypassed in the Special Recovery Capital Projects; it has received the lowest possible tier designation for the IRDP; it did not receive any LEAD funding and no shipbuilding contracts.

Consequently, when I hear Minister after Minister talking about bold initiatives to combat unemployment, I am led to ask—where? Why are unemployment needs elsewhere addressed more rapidly than in Niagara?

I am struck by the irony of the Minister's response. After having been granted a contract, a further $2.2 million advance had to be made for yard improvement, but the Minister says that there is no relationship. It all depends upon who is signing the contracts. That money was advanced at least in part for shipyard renovation. Without that renovation, the bid on the icebreaker contract from Marine Industries might well have been higher. Indeed, Marine Industries received two icebreaker contracts. Fair is fair.

I would like to know which to believe as between the Minister's statement in the House that the lowest bid is the only criterion and the news release from his office which gives consideration to socio-economic factors. Which is it?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul-André Massé (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I understand the concern of the Hon. Member for St. Catharines (Mr. Reid) and I will do my best to lay to rest his doubts about the policy on Government contracts.

I would like to point out that between May and September 1983, Port Weller Dry Dock Limited was invited six times to submit tenders for the construction or refitting of ships belonging to the Government of Canada. Unfortunately, the tenders submitted by the company failed to win any of the contracts. I may add that it was mainly on the basis of the principle of the lowest bidder that the Port Weller proposals were not chosen. As the House is aware, this is one of the basic rules of our policy on Government contracts.

I also may remind the House that the concern for regional balance which was maintained in awarding the contracts demonstrates the Government's clear intention to act in the best interests of the country and its various regions.

The point I am trying to make is that Port Weller was not in any way discriminated against, compared to other Canadian shipyards. Moreover, the company was able to benefit from assistance under the Shipbuilding Industry Assistance Program administered by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lumley).

To get back to the criterion of the lowest bidder, I would like to add the following information. In May 1983, Port Weller Dry Dock submitted the highest of ten tenders received for the construction of a 72-metre patrol boat. In June 1983, we had the same situation for the construction of a 69-metre hydrographic survey ship, and during the same month, Port Weller Dry Dock refused to submit a tender for refitting the *HMCS Protecteur*, since its technical department could not handle any more work.

In July 1983, Port Weller Dry Dock submitted the fourth highest tender out of six from Eastern Canada—and only from Eastern Canada—for the construction of the type 1100 icebreakers.

In September 1983, Port Weller submitted the ninth highest tender out of ten for replacement of gas turbines and modifications to be made on the ship *Norman McLeod Rogers*. Finally, Port Weller submitted the highest of six tenders received for the refitting of the *Sir Humphrey Gilbert*. On Tuesday, November 15, the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Lapointe), his colleague, the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Gray) and the Member for Welland (Mr. Parent) met with representatives of the company and the unions to examine the situation. Together they considered various contracts the Government would be letting to shipyards within the foreseeable future, and for which Port Weller would be asked to submit tenders. Mr. Speaker, I hope this answers satisfactorily

the question raised by my hon. colleague from St. Catharines, and I hope the Niagara region will continue to benefit from the Government of Canada's recovery program.

● (1820)

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—CYPRUS—DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY TURKISH CYPRIOTS. (B) SUGGESTED WITHDRAWAL OF CANADIAN AMBASSADOR FROM ANKARA

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the recent declaration of independence on the part of the Turkish Cypriot community is a matter of grave concern to Greek Cypriot Canadians in my riding, Broadview-Greenwood. My predecessor, Bob Rae, took a great interest in the Cyprus issue, raised these as concerns forcefully in the House and defended the continuing Canadian presence of our peacekeeping forces in Cyprus. I intend to carry on in the same way to raise Cyprus issues, new and old, as long as is necessary.

The Cypriot Federation of Canada has made clear what it considers needs to be done. Let me quote:

> We condemn without reservation the Denktash regime for its illegal declaration of independence of the Turkish occupied part of Cyprus. We call upon the Canadian Government to do whatever necessary to nullify this breach of the London-Zurich Agreement including the imposition of sanctions on the Denktash regime and on the Turkish Government, which is responsible first for the invasion in 1974 and now the attempt at illegal partition of the Republic of Cyprus. We further ask the Canadian Government to condemn this illegal declaration of independence in all appropriate international forums of which Canada is a member.

Well, Canada has condemned this action. It has protested diplomatically. The Government has made clear it will not recognize the pseudo state so illegally declared. Canada has spoken strongly at the United Nations; all this is to the good, but it is not enough.

On November 17 I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) if he would show the disapproval of our Canadian people of the Turkish government's role in recognizing the new regime, such as by withdrawing our ambassador to Turkey. This has been a request of the Cypriot Federation of Canada, among other organizations.

The Minister's reply was wholly unsatisfactory. He noted that the Turkish government has stated it was not behind the unilateral declaration of independence. So be it. But the Turkish government was the first to recognize the illegal regime, despite its responsibility in guaranteeing an independent Cyprus back in 1960. The Turkish government should not have recognized the new regime. Indeed it should have told the Denktash regime to withdraw that declaration.

It is well known that intercommunal difficulties in Cyprus are of long standing. Nevertheless there has been a considerable time in which the two communities have lived fairly well and peacefully side by side. I believe it can happen again, but not while one community has the Armed Forces of another country to back it up.

The sad fact is that Cyprus was invaded in 1974 by Turkish armed forces. The result is that 18 per cent of the population is occupying 40 per cent of the land mass. Some 6,000 Greek Cypriots were killed in the war of invasion. There are 200,000 Greek Cypriots who are refugees from their homes, and some thousands of Turkish Cypriots had to go in the opposite direction. Turkey now has some 25,000 soldiers on Cyprus. About 2,000 Greek Cypriots are still missing from the war of invasion. There have been sightings of these people. There is enough to suggest that some, if not many, are still alive in camps in Turkey.

On October 3, I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs to put pressure on the Turkish government to seek release of these people as a humanitarian concern. The Minister replied that he would investigate. He subsequently said he would not take any action on behalf of Canada. He did not consider it appropriate for Canada on grounds of our role as a member of the peacekeeping forces. In my view this answer is inadequate. The people are still missing, we have reason to believe they are in Turkey, and the pressure has to be put on there.

● (1825)

The Minister said in his letter that a solution to the problem of missing persons in Cyprus will only be possible through an ongoing dialogue between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities, and that in view of the sensitive relations between the two sides this issue can be dealt with most effectively through appropriate UN channels or intercommunal talks rather than on a bilateral basis. I do not agree, Mr. Speaker. UN channels have been tried for years. Naturally we should continue but further action is also needed.

This is not just a Greek-Turkish Cypriot problem. The missing persons have been seen in Turkey, another country, not in Turkish occupied Cyprus. They were captured by the Turkish Army. In keeping a strict neutrality on Cyprus affairs, Canada has been too neutral, in my opinion. The missing Greek Cypriots constitute a humanitarian issue on which any country should feel free, indeed duty bound, to speak. Yet Canada abstained on the UN resolution on the grounds of its participation in the peacekeeping forces. Other peacekeeping participants have taken positions on the missing persons issue, including Australia, Austria, Denmark, Finland and Sweden, without hampering their effectiveness.

Cyprus is a situation in which there is an aggressor and a victim. No one is suggesting there is an equal number of Turkish Cypriots missing in Greece. The Cypriots are being held in camps on Turkish territory. Turkey is a much larger and more powerful country with a massive standing army. When it comes to an issue like missing persons, a human rights issue, we must not let some arbitrary principle rule. We must stand up and speak forcefully on a matter of injustice.

On the issue of Canadian peacekeeping forces, I was pleased to see the reassurance on the part of the Canadian Government to keep our forces in Cyprus. We need them there as long as foreign troops are on the island. At the same time I must express considerable concern with the statement made by the Conservative critic on external affairs. That spokesperson has used the latest crisis to raise the possibility of Canada with-

drawing our peacekeeping contribution. In my view this is the worst time we should be raising this issue. Certainly we want to get our troops home, but only when the need no longer exists.

I am sorry to have to note the Conservative hypocrisy on this matter. On Sunday, November 20, I spoke at a rally organized by the Cypriot Federation of Canada in Toronto to protest the illegal declaration of independence. The Conservative representative at that rally said the Conservative Party was with the Greek Cypriot community, but where is it when we have to talk about peacekeeping forces? They have either been silent or on the wrong side.

To conclude, I just want to express the concern of all Canadians to the families of people who have members missing or refugees. We will continue to work to see that these people are returned to their homes. I will certainly, and I can speak for my Party, continue to work for justice in Cyprus.

● (1830)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul-André Massé (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I really did not intend to monopolize the adjournment debate today. Nevertheless, on behalf of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen), I shall be glad to answer the questions raised by the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Mrs. McDonald).

The position of the Government of Canada on recent events in Cyprus was made very clear in statements made in the House by the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, and more recently by Canada's intervention in the UN Security Council. The Government of Canada deplores the unilateral declaration of independence of the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, made on November 15, 1983. Canada recognizes only one Cypriot state, the Republic of Cyprus, and it has no intention of recognizing the new state that was proclaimed unilaterally. We firmly support action being taken by the Secretary General of the UN with a view to reconciling the Greek and Turkish communities in Cyprus. The unilateral declaration of independence by Turkish Cypriots can only obstruct such action and compromise any chances of arriving at a fair and durable settlement.

When we intervened in the debate on Cyprus on November 15, in the UN Security Council, we reiterated our firm support for the efforts of the Secretary General to arrive at a negotiated settlement and urged other countries to do the same. The resolution adopted by the Security Council clearly reflects international reaction to recent events in Cyprus. In addition to its intervention in the UN, Canada has made its position known to the parties directly concerned by the Turkish Cypriot proclamation, including the Governments of Turkey, Greece and Cyprus. Turkish Ministers stated that the unilateral declaration of independence had taken place without the consent or knowledge of their Government. Nevertheless, Canada expressed its concern about the recognition by Turkey of the new Cypriot state and asked the Turkish Government to use its influence on Turkish Cypriot leaders in order to promote a settlement of this dispute.

The Government of Cyprus has, in fact, expressed its satisfaction with Canada's attitude. Canada, which for nearly twenty years has taken part in the United Nations peacekeeping forces in Cyprus, is very anxious to see a negotiated settlement. The Government of Canada believes it is essential that there should again be a dialogue between the two communities, and we shall do our best to make this happen. However, we do think a measure of the kind suggested by the Hon. Member would bring about a reconciliation between the two parties.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): The motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted.

Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

At 6.33 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 29, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (1105)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ATLANTIC FISHERIES RESTRUCTURING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring fishery enterprises, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Hon. Members will note that there are 13 motions on the Notice Paper at report stage of Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring fishery enterprises.

The Chair is prepared to rule on the procedural acceptability of these motions. However, if need be, the Chair would give an opportunity to Hon. Members who wish to comment at this stage. Perhaps the Chair could be useful to Hon. Members by indicating in a preliminary way the direction in which the ruling will be made.

There are two motions standing in the name of the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) which the Chair is prepared to accept; all other motions the Chair is prepared to reject. However, the Chair will hear any Hon. Member who wishes to contribute to the procedure at this time.

Mr. Rompkey: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to put the case for the particular amendment which I placed on the Order Paper. It will amend the Bill in order to change the mandate of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation to allow it to become the instrument for the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation.

• (1110)

I would simply put to you, Sir, and to the House that this Bill before the House now flows from the Kirby report. Indeed, a recommendation in the Kirby report was the setting up of a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation to administer those plants in the area north of 50 degrees, in northern Newfoundland, on the coast of Labrador and in Quebec.

Kirby examined various options, Mr. Speaker, rejected some and made the recommendation. The Kirby report, which included that recommendation, was approved by the Government of Canada. Indeed, the Government of Canada approved that particular recommendation and, I understand, wants to proceed with that course of action. My point is that this Bill which is before us now gives effect to the recommendations coming out of the Kirby report and, I submit, could very well, and should, give effect to that recommendation of the Kirby task force to create the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. I submit the relevance of the amendment on those grounds, Mr. Speaker.

I would further point out that the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation was accepted by both Governments in the restructuring agreement. Both Governments agreed to a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. Indeed, that was contained in the memorandum of understanding. Therefore, both Governments want to put this into effect.

I would further submit to you, Sir, that if the Governments agree that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation is the vehicle, there will be no other time, I believe, when we can give legislative authority for that in the House of Commons other than now. The reason I submit this amendment now, Mr. Speaker, is that if the Governments want to use the Canadian Saltfish Corporation as a vehicle hereafter, it may be very difficult to permit us to do that in the House of Commons, bearing in mind the legislative timetable after Christmas.

I would further point out to you, Sir, and I would like to put on the record, the concern in the north over this particular vehicle. I have telegrams which I shall not—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Chair hesitates to interrupt the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador. I have been listening to the Hon. Member very carefully and so far he has failed to indicate in what way, procedurally, the Chair could accept the Hon. Member's amendments. The Hon. Member may, as is his privilege, in normal circumstances make a case for the acceptability of the amendments. However, he has not so far enlightened the Chair as to whether or not those amendments should be procedurally acceptable. Those are the arguments the Chair would like to hear.

At this moment I would caution the Hon. Member about reading telegrams which I am sure have nothing at all to do with procedure. I will hear the Hon. Member out for a while yet; however, I would seriously invite him to come to the matter of procedure. This is what the Chair is concerned with at this moment.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, when the Hon. Member rises to speak to his amendments, he would deal with all of them. There are 11 amendments standing in his name. From what I have been hearing, he is addressing himself to "an amendment"; he is using the singular. I suppose it is a purpose which he is speaking about, but I would like to know where his amendments fit into the purpose so I can comment intelligently at the end of his submissions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Chair should perhaps have indicated further, during its initial statement, that it proposes to deal with the Hon. Member's amendments in a group. I will rule on the acceptability of Motion No. 12. All other amendments presented by the Hon. Member are consequential to Motion No. 12; therefore there is really no value—if I may be allowed to say so—in the Hon. Member indicating to the Chair how each other motion individually may be acceptable. I ask the Hon. Member to discuss procedure but in a general way as it pertains to Motion No. 12, all other motions being consequential to it.

• (1115)

Mr. Rompkey: I appreciate the question of the Official Opposition House Leader, Mr. Speaker. I simply reiterate what you said, that indeed the motions leading up to the last and substantial motion are really technicalities in order to change parts of the Act to make the substantive motion read properly, which is Clause 7.1(1), which would allow the corporation to own or operate plants north of 50, basically St. Anthony and the Labrador coast, and to harvest fish for processing at those facilities; to own and operate vessels for the harvesting of such fish; to market fish processed in the area; and to carry on, for any purpose in respect of any fish processed at a facility, the activities it has the power to carry on under Section 7 or Section 8. Otherwise we change the definition of fish in the Act to mean not only groundfish but indeed shellfish, crustaceans and other forms of marine life.

I appreciate your position, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the technicalities of this amendment, but as a Member of Parliament I want to use this time and this vehicle to lay on the floor of the House the concerns of the people I represent. I say to both Governments that it is not good enough to say, and we must not say, to the people of the north that we will deal with their case at some later point. The people in the south, if I may describe it that way, have been looked after by this Act.

I will not read them into the record, Mr. Speaker, but the town council from St. Anthony—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. I have an obligation to cut off the Hon. Member at this time because he is obviously not contributing to the procedural debate in any way, shape or form.

Mr. Crouse: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I share the concern of the Hon. Member for the problem he faces in his riding. We have been made aware of his request for an extension of the powers of the corporation and I know from personal experience that in this area of Canada it is practically impossible for private enterprise to function in a viable, profitable manner. We viewed with some concern the establishment of the corporation in its initial stages and the fact that it was given the right to control all of the saltfishing industry in Atlantic Canada—which is in effect what it ended up to be, the control of the saltfishing industry in Newfoundland. But when it was established it had the effect of putting two of the largest and oldest saltfish companies in my Province of Nova Scotia out of business. This was simply because these companies were in the habit of going to Newfoundland to purchase what we call Labrador slob, bring it back and dry it in the large driers owned by A.M. Smith and Company in Halifax and by Zwicker and Company in my home town of Lunenburg.

The amendment proposed by the Hon. Member seemed to extend the powers of this company. I wonder if he has given any thought to impressing upon the Government the necessity of bringing in a separate Bill. The Member stated this was the only opportunity he would have to bring forth changes which would empower the Government to purchase not only salt-fish north of 50, but all other species caught and landed in that area. This would imply that there is not going to be any future time at which this measure could be brought forward.

• (1120)

The concern that we have here is that the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member is, in effect, one that should deal with the Saltfish Marketing Corporation, while Bill C-170, presently before the House, deals with the restructuring of the fishing industry, basically in Atlantic Canada and Quebec. I see here a conflict of interest between these two Bills. While we are not intending to oppose the amendment, if it were acceptable to the Chair, I would like the Member, if he may, Mr. Speaker, through you, to explain to the House why he stated that this would be the only opportunity available to him to seek an amendment of this type.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. Before hearing another Hon. Member, I should point out to the House that in the Chair's opinion what is going on now is debate on the substance of the Bill. I have not yet heard comments which would help the Chair procedurally.

Mr. Nielsen: I have a brief comment which might appeal to Members, Mr. Speaker. I can see by virtue of the last paragraph of the amendment that the Chair would have some concern about it since, by our practices normally, that part of the amendment at any rate would have to be accompanied by a message from His Excellency. I can see that there may well be some serious defects in it. Might I suggest though, in order to provide a vehicle for the Hon. Member to speak to the subject, that the Chair may wish to delay ruling on the amendment until the Member is heard, and perhaps one on this side is heard, with respect to the principle being expressed in it. In other words, I am suggesting that, notwithstanding any rule of relevance, the Member be free to discuss his amendment, to address the concerns that he has, and perhaps after that the Chair might be disposed to rule on it.

Miss Campbell (South West Nova): Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee, I suggest that what the Hon. Member is asking for is certainly contained within the powers of the Bill before us. I am sure that the problem existing at St. Anthony in particular could be incorporated under the powers that are so wide in this Bill, even to the restructuring in Newfoundland. It could have been brought into the agreement with Newfoundland one way or another unless there was a reason. We did not hear that in Committee at the time. Looking at the Bill and the powers within the Bill, it seems to me that what the Hon. Member is looking for could be incorporated under the powers given to the Minister in the Bill.

Mr. Rompkey: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I would simply like to thank the House Leader of the Official Opposition for his intervention and the possibility of an opportunity to debate the substance. I would like to say to you, Sir, that during the second reading debate I laid out before the House my arguments as to why this should take place. I recognize the technical difficulties that you have and the technical difficulties that the House has. As a Member of Parliament I wanted to take advantage of this opportunity, bearing in mind that we do not know when another opportunity will come. How many times have we had fisheries Bills before the House of Commons?

The concern is, Mr. Speaker, that there may be fishermen and plant workers who do not have jobs in the spring. I am concerned about that. I am concerned about plants opening in the spring and about fishermen who are working and are productive in the spring. There is concern in these communities now. Since there is insecurity and uncertainty, people are not investing money and not spending. I am sure that the Hon. Member for Yukon understands that because he represents the north and has lived in the north. He knows what I mean.

● (1125)

I simply want to bring to the attention of the House, governments and the public in general the concern north of 50 for bringing stability, security and certainty to the fishery in that area. If this is not the time—and, of course, I accept your ruling on this amendment—it would at least be a vehicle to bring to the attention of those in the position to do something the necessity to act quickly in order to put those plants in their proper order and to get them working by this spring.

I want to thank Members opposite for their support. I also know there is support on this side of the House, including that of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans who I know supports this in principle and wants to do everything he can to help those people. I want to say again, as I said at second reading, that I appreciate the efforts of the Minister in this whole restructuring effort. I accept your ruling on this, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): I wish to thank Hon. Members for their contribution to the procedural matter. I have heard the Hon. Member for Yukon as well. I could perhaps remind him that this period for initial comments, before the Chair makes its ruling, should be taken as an opportunity for Members to make the sort of comments that the Hon. Member for Yukon suggests we do at another time. It would hardly be procedurally acceptable for the Chair to allow debate on motions which it feels are very much out of order and then make the ruling after that debate has taken place. In my opinion, that would create an unacceptable precedent in the conduct of the affairs of the House.

Therefore, I am prepared to rule. Motions No. 10 and 11, standing in the name of the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse), are acceptable and should be debated and voted on separately.

Motion No. 12 gives the Chair serious misgivings. All of the other motions in amendment offered by the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) are consequential to Motion No. 12 and therefore I propose to consider them as a group. Motion No. 12 appears to propose an amendment to the Saltfish Act which is not part of the Bill now before the House. As well, the motion infringes upon the financial initiative of the Crown in that it provides for the expenditure of public funds. In fact, the Hon. Member recognizes this in the last section of Motion No. 12. This section does not alter the fact that the amendment infringes on the financial initiative of the Crown, and there are many rulings which confirm that provisions of this kind are not sufficient to make this kind of amendment acceptable.I refer Hon. Members particularly to a ruling by one of my predecessors in a similar case on May 17, 1972, which can be found on page 307 of the *Journals*.

May I also refer Hon. Members to Citations 540 and 543 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition. Citation 540 states in part:

> The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the Royal Recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down once for all (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of the charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. In relation to the standard thereby fixed, an amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown not only if it increases the amount but also if it extends the objects and purposes, or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge.

Citation 543(1) states:

> If any motion or bill or proceeding is offered to be moved, whether in the House or in a committee which requires, but fails to receive, the recommendation of the Crown, it is the duty of the Speaker to announce that no question can be proposed upon the motion, or to direct the withdrawal of the bill, or to say that the problem may be rectified by the proposer obtaining a Royal Recommendation.

● (1130)

Finally, the Hon. Member proposes to add an entirely new proposition to the Bill which is foreign to it, as agreed to at the second reading stage. Such an amendment is quite beyond the scope of the Bill. In this regard, I would refer Hon. Members to Citation 437 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition.

For all these reasons, I must find Motion No. 12 out of order.

As I stated a few moments ago, Hon. Members will realize that Motions Nos. 1 to 9 and Motion No. 13 are consequential

to Motion No. 12 and, as such, are, without that motion, irrelevant to the Bill and hence out of order. Accordingly, the question before the House is Motion No. 10.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I have had consultations and it seems there is unanimous consent to dispose of the Bill today, notwithstanding Standing Order 78(13) which prescribes:

When a Bill has been amended or debate has taken place thereon at the report stage, the same shall be set down for a third reading and passage at the next sitting of the House.

Notwithstanding Standing Order 78(13), I think there is unanimous consent that all questions necessary to dispose of the report stage and third reading stage of Bill C-170 be put today before 5.45 p.m. in order to dispose of this legislation completely.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, there is consent. I am perhaps a little confused by the final words of the Government House Leader. I assume he meant not later than 5.45 p.m., because I think we had a House order last Thursday to the effect that all questions will be put at 5.45 o'clock. In other words, I would not want to see the question put before 5.45 p.m.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, our intent would be the contrary, that the necessary questions to dispose of report stage and third reading be put before 5.45 p.m. so that we can dispose of Bill C-170 before proceedings are interrupted to deal with and vote on supply business. If the Hon. Member wants, we could specify 5.45 p.m. in the order. That is why I said "before 5.45 o'clock", it being understood that we would dispose of Bill C-170 completely before 5.45 o'clock.

Mr. Nielsen: I understand, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The House has heard the proposal put by the Hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard). Is there unanimous consent for the proposal?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Agreed and so ordered.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore) moved:

That Bill C-170 be amended by adding immediately after line 36 at page 4 the following new clause:

"9. The powers and authority authorized by this Act shall be withdrawn on a date five years from the proclamation date of this Act unless they have been re-authorized by Parliament prior to that withdrawal date."

He said: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity at report stage to move Motion No. 10 to amend Bill C-170. This amendment is moved in the hope of alleviating the concerns of the representatives of independent companies as well as those put forth by spokesmen of the Governments of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick during hearings at the committee stage with respect to the excessive powers granted to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) and the federal Government in this Bill.

If there are any doubts about that statement, I could present literally volumes of documentary evidence as presented to the marathon sessions of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry hearings which began on Monday morning, November 21, 1983, and which concluded in the wee small hours of Friday morning at approximately 4.30 a.m.

For example, the representatives of the Seafood Processors Association of Prince Edward Island stated, among other things, that the:

—impact and implications of this Bill will be most detrimental—if not, indeed, totally disastrous—to the development or continuance of a viable Atlantic fishery.

A spokesman for the Government of New Brunswick's Fisheries Department asked for the following specific terms, namely:

We would like a guarantee that our fishery will receive a fair share of resource allocation. We would also like to be assured that the restructuring will not interfere with our markets. We are particularly concerned that we are not subjected to a bureaucratic marketing agency that would interpose its bulk between our processors and their customers.

In addition, we would like to participate with the federal Government in a development agreement so that we can continue the innovative, the progressive programs that have assisted the development of our industry, helping it adjust yet again to changing conditions.

The spokesman for the eastern fisheries federation based in Halifax, Nova Scotia presented an excellent brief to the committee. Among other things, he stated: that the Department of Fisheries and the Government in general must be more accountable. Mr. Billard's words:

This Bill leaves absolutely no provision for discussion, debate or review. Bureaucrats will have discretionary powers heretofore unparalleled—

That is his word, "unparalleled".

—in the fishing industry.

He also stated:

If small investors are unable to take risks in the fish processing sector—without fear of government take overs, then there will be no investment. If there are no investments then there will be far fewer fish plants—and that means less fish sold to plants and less competition.

In his view, our fishermen need strong fish processors as much as they need strong fish stocks. I am not so sure they need a Government this strong in the fishing industry.

This is the collective voice of the inshore fishermen. For anyone who attended the committee hearings last week, there is no doubt about the almost unanimous voice from the industry and the Provinces expressing the fear that government intervention as authorized by this Bill will not just be a minor aberration in the life of the fishing industry, and that it will not find itself privatized within a few years. Their fear, and it is deeply founded, is that the powers given to this Government will be permanent and, of course, they will be detrimental.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I move this amendment in the hope that it will strengthen the Bill and alleviate the fears of the many spokesmen representing literally thousands of plant workers and fishermen who came before our committee throughout the entire period of last week.

Mr. Brian Tobin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments

in reply to the amendment of the Hon. Member for South Shore. As he knows, we had a number of days of hearings and in particular very long sessions, one that lasted nearly 20 hours. The Hon. Member is correct when he said many witnesses came before the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry and indicated a concern that the injection of public capital into the fishing industry did not give rise to a kind of permanent solution to the fishing industry in eastern Canada; that is to say, we would not be taking the first step today toward long-term nationalization.

As the Hon. Member knows, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) had on many occasions publicly as well as on a number of occasions before the committee indicated that that was not our intention. As I said a few days ago, if there are a hundred things the Government could list it wanted to do, injecting capital into the fishing industry would not be one of them. We are there because there really is no alternative.

The Hon. Member will recall that we rejected this amendment in committee because of the idea of saying that on a certain date at a certain time five years hence automatically government authority to be involved in the fishing industry will be dissolved. To suggest that at that particular point in time we would have to sell off our equity would be a very bad business practice, because we would find ourselves advertising to all potential buyers in the marketplace that in approximately three years, on such and such a date, we would be forced by Parliament to sell off the industry and a very good deal by anybody in the market could be had.

● (1140)

I put a question to Mr. Ron Burmer of the Fisheries Council of Canada who appeared before the committee. I said: "From a business point of view, if you were planning on selling an asset, would you predetermine the day and announce it to all potential buyers in the marketplace?" He said: "No". Then I said: "We want to run this on a businesslike basis, so from that point of view would the Government be wise to predetermine a date on which to sell off its assets? Would it not in fact be akin to cherry picking?" Mr. Burner looked at me and said: "Yes, in that circumstance we would all engage in cherry picking"; that is, buying off because we must sell the lucrative pieces that are up for sale, leaving in the hands of the Government those chunks of an industry which do not make money.

I have a great deal of respect—and I say that sincerely—for the concerns of the Hon. Member that when this industry becomes profitable we privatize it again and get Government out. I also agree wholeheartedly with his concern. However, I disagree that the most appropriate and businesslike way to do it is to predetermine five years down the road a particular day, time and place on which these assets will be disbursed. For that reason we do not support this amendment.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I wonder whether the Hon. Member who just took his seat could address his comments to my amendment. He failed entirely to do that. I just want to point out to the Chair that the amendment does not mention forced sale or privatization of the assets of any restructured company within a five-year period. The amendment seeks—I am sorry the Hon. Member either misread its intent or used this period in order to make a strong pitch of his own—to return to Parliament a measure of control over the restructured companies and over the Government.

I point out that the amendment indicates that the powers and authorities authorized by the Act shall be withdrawn on a date five years from the proclamation date of the Act unless they have been reauthorized by Parliament. That is the wording. There is no mention that they must be sold, which the Hon. Member sought to imply. I think his comments with regard to the point he raised are valid and there should not be a cut-off date, as he so properly stated. That would simply be a signal sent ahead to everyone to sit back and wait because on day X the axe will fall and all this will be sold. That is not the purpose of the amendment. If the Government finds after five years that it cannot privatize or offer it back to the private sector in that five-year time frame, the amendment seeks to ask the Government to return to Parliament for reauthorization.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The Chair is prepared to recognize the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary. However, I cannot agree or disagree with the comments of the Hon. Member for South Shore. I gather he was addressing himself to the rule of relevancy, in the sense that the Parliamentary Secretary did not address the specific purpose of the amendment. Certainly the Chair must enforce the rule of relevancy; it is a difficult rule to enforce. The Chair cannot oblige an Hon. Member to relate to certain specific points which in another Hon. Member's mind are of the utmost importance. However, with the indulgence of the House the Chair will recognize the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary on a point of order, because he has already made his contribution.

Mr. Tobin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I want to acknowledge the fine line of difference which has been drawn by my hon. friend opposite. My comments were made in the vein that the amendment itself arises out of a concern which has been expressed repeatedly that the Government reprivatize the industry.

As to the specific motion, the committee accepted an amendment put by the Hon. Member opposite that the Minister holding the shares of the company be required to report to Parliament once a year on the operations of the new company. It is my contention that that annual report to Parliament meets the concern outlined in the proposed amendment. Again, for that reason we do not support the amendment.

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to speak very briefly on this subject because when we debated Bill C-170 at second reading I spoke at some length on the necessity of imposing a time limitation on the awesome powers of the authorities which are to be granted to the Government pursuant to this Bill. I am very pleased the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) was able to

formulate such an amendment as this one. I hope it will find favour with the Government.

What we are doing with Bill C-170 is very much the same type of thing we did with the Grand Trunk Railway and other railway companies many years ago when we established Canadian National, something into which Parliament was very much forced. It did not really want to do that, but things got to such a sad and sorry state in the railway business that it became a necessity. Such is the case with the East Coast fishery. If I might paraphrase the Hon. Member for Egmont (Mr. Henderson), he said that the so-called solution proposed in Bill C-170 was probably the least bad of many poor options. As was said by the Hon. Member for South Shore, it gives unparalleled power to the Government, awesome and unparalleled power, which we know will be delegated to the bureaucracy because the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané), who is present today, is unable to keep day to day control over these matters. Therefore his authority over these matters must be delegated to the people on his staff.

At the hearings of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, every representation indicated distrust of government on the part of people in the fishery business. No one appeared to be more distrustful of government than fishermen themselves, as represented through their unions. Normally we can expect unions to be of a more socialist frame of mind than perhaps the majority of the population, but in this case it appeared that the people who make their livelihood on fishing vessels or in fish plants more than anyone else were distrustful of government and wanted to see a time limit placed on the authorities we were to give to government.

One problem with which we in the House are faced is that whenever we establish a new governmental institution, a new department or branch of government, a Crown corporation or any other entity, the entity always sees its first order of priority as being able to maintain itself. Also, it is very difficult to get rid of such an entity. There is always a problem with dismantling government institutions. If we pass this amendment and it becomes part of the law, there will be an incentive right from its inception for the people concerned with the new institutions, because just a few years down the road the Government will have to set aside its powers and authorities and we will of necessity have to put the fishing business back in private hands where it rightfully belongs.

● (1150)

I disagree with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Tobin) who said that having a set determination date will be a major impediment if assets are to be sold at the end of that period. I do not disagree with him entirely when he says that this will naturally flow from the motion, because surely the idea is to dispose of the assets that will be owned by these new companies and get them into private hands. There might be some difficulty with that, but I do not think it is an overriding difficulty. That it will be necessary for people involved in the new fish companies to begin planning a system of privatization right from the start will, I think, work to the benefit of the East Coast fisheries.

If all else fails, Sir, my colleague, the Hon. Member for South Shore, has included in his amendment the concept that the Government can come back to Parliament and ask for an extension of that five-year period. If improvements have not been made and if there is real difficulty disposing of the assets into private hands, that option is always available to the Government. However, it does mean that Parliament will again have to look at the situation and approve any possible extension.

Miss Coline Campbell (South West Nova): Mr. Speaker, I agree with the amendment proposed by the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse), but I would have liked to see it provide for a period of less than five years. The purpose of this Bill is simply to restructure the two super companies. The agreement the Government has reached with the Province of Newfoundland, according to the letter submitted by Dr. Kirby to the Bank of Nova Scotia, provides that at the end of a ten-year period the bank may offer the shares to the Government and the Government will have to purchase at par the Class A preferred shares which are then held by the bank in Holding Company "Y".

Once those two super companies are restructured and once the Quebec Pêcheurs Unis is restructured, I do not see that there is a need for the continuation of the Bill. First, the $100 million which has been guaranteed in the Bill must be approved by Parliament in the future. It must be included in the estimates. That could be done under another program or through the Department of Fisheries.

That would happen if the development program designed to aid the small processors we have heard about, which is a part of the agreement to co-operate between Nova Scotia and the federal Government, comes under that part of the Bill? Once that agreement is arranged, only then will we know how that developmental program will help the small independents. I agree with Mr. Crouse when he says that those small independents came before us last week and told us that Newfoundland independents are protected by $12 million worth of guarantees from the Province of Newfoundland. In Quebec, the Pêcheurs Unis is being nationalized. The Government will not touch the rest of the independents but has made an offer of assistance to them for upgrading and modernization in the amount, I am told, of 60 per cent.

Under this Bill or in the arrangement made between the Government and the Province of Newfoundland, there has been nothing given to independent processors from Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. That was a concern we heard from independents like Fishpac and from the exporters group who asked us what would happen to them and who would they have to deal with in order to accomplish the $400 million worth of sales that we were told about.

I agree with Mr. Crouse about the duration of the powers of this Bill. I have concern with the fact that written into the agreements will be the enterprise allocations for fish for these

two super companies. The companies that will now be restructured had for the last two years an enterprise allocation. However, in my view what will hurt the inshore fishery even more is the percentages of those enterprise allocations which will be written into the agreements for the next five-year period. Those percentages, even for five years, will hurt the inshore fishery. The inshore fishery has negotiated with AGAC its total allowable groundfish catch and how that catch will be divided between the two sectors, offshore and inshore. I am sorry that the amendment proposed by Mr. Crouse does not curtail the powers—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The Hon. Member should refer to the other Hon. Member as the Hon. Member for South Shore.

Miss Campbell: I am sorry, I mean the Hon. Member for South Shore. You can tell that I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and would like to support his proposed amendment. However, I am even more concerned about the powers of this Bill. We will only see those powers in the restructuring of the super companies and the only protection that is included in the Bill, in my view, is Clause 4(2). I will read that clause into the record because I think that this is the same concern as the concern of the Hon. Member for South Shore. The clause reads as follows:

The Minister shall dispose of such portion of any interest in a fishery enterprise—

That is something we must bear in mind. Does that clause mean that the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) who is in control of resource allocation will now be able to give to these new super companies a certain percentage of that allocation? We have heard the concerns about the redfish. Understandably, the redfish was of prime concern to the Provinces in the Gulf. However, what about the other groundfish? We heard the Deputy Minister of Fisheries for Nova Scotia state that he thought the percentages should be written into the agreement. This does not take into account the ups and downs of groundfishing for the inshore fisheries. This does not allow for further negotiations through AGAC. What is the purpose of this proposal?

Today I spoke with an inshore fisheries representative who had attended AGAC meetings for years and I learned that there will be a meeting tomorrow. Will these percentage allocations be brought up and incorporated because of the powers of this Bill? The Bill will be passed today. Are we passing the Bill today so that tomorrow morning at the groundfish advisory committee meeting percentage allocations under the powers of this Bill can be incorporated without any consideration for the concerns of the inshore fishery?

I agree, Mr. Speaker, that there are concerns about the duration of the powers of this Bill. The Bill should be used only to restructure those companies. However, there is an inconsistency in the words of the Hon. Member for South Shore because, through the agreement with Newfoundland, we are already tied in for ten years. The bank is allowed ten years to get rid of its shares if it in fact wants to get rid of its shares.

There is a contradiction, Mr. Speaker. Under this Bill we are allowing unlimited powers to the Minister of Fisheries without any restrictions other than the one contained in Clause 4(2). I recognize the concerns of the Hon. Member for South Shore, but if we are going to pass an amendment, it should provide for a shorter time limit. I will agree with any time limit, but I am afraid that a time limit of five years will totally destroy the inshore fishery through the allocation of the AGAC quotas on a percentage basis to the new super companies in order to make them economically viable.

In my mind, two of the reasons this Bill cannot be supported is the concerns for the power it gives the Minister and the concerns aobut the groundfish allocations. I also have the ultimate concern that in five years' time, with this injection of $138 million into the super companies—that time is too long—we do not know what effect this will have immediately on the independents in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. This is a one-time injection of capital which I shall have more to say about later because I do not believe it will be a one-time injection. The Minister or a future Minister of Fisheries may find that he will have to go back for more money because under the terms of the arrangements it is now known who will take up the excesses and how they will be dealt with by those responsible. Perhaps five years are needed for that, but in my view, if it is a one-time injection of capital there is no need for the Bill after the restructuring. I agree with the Hon. Member for South Shore and support his contention that there should be a time limit set out in the Bill.

• (1200)

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I listened with great interest to the comments of the Hon. Member for South West Nova. I am a little bit puzzled that at this late date the Hon. Member has expressed these views. I have tried to recall the hearings over the last five days and it seems to me that these concerns were not expressed then.

In light of the Hon. Member's comments, we on this side would accept a subamendment to my amendment if she wished to place one on the record at this time. We could be willing to accept that, and if she can get her colleagues to agree, then it may be acceptable to the House. I throw that suggestion out to let you know, sir, that there will be agreement on this side if she wishes to amend my amendment to two or three years. We would accept that subamendment.

Miss Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I feel that there is conflict in this amendment, just from the point of view of having chaired the committee, if we limit the restructuring of these two super companies to one year. I personally feel that the Bill will be around a lot longer, because in Nova Scotia we do not know what the time frame will be. We are told it will be five years. In Newfoundland, we definitely know that the bank, which would not appear before the committee, is tied in to not receiving any of the 5 per cent for ten years. I guess what I am saying is that I agree with and support the suggestion that there should be a limitation, but on the other side of the

question the negotiations and the Bill itself have already set it beyond five years.

As to the other concerns, I certainly questioned the Minister of Fisheries for Nova Scotia as to the enterprise allocation when he was before the committee on Thursday night, and as well I questioned the independents. The Nova Scotia Deputy Minister said that he would be in favour of a percentage of the enterprise allocation being incorporated in the agreement. I am not sure that tomorrow's meeting in Montreal on AGAC will not do that, even though there is opposition from the weaker sector, the inshore fishery.

As for the independents, I certainly mentioned and questioned them on several occasions and specifically questioned the Nova Scotia Minister of Fisheries, who said that the independents in Nova Scotia—and he referred to the Hon. Member for South Shore—were independent and that no one had come to him. I question that because I know of two cases in South West Nova who feel, regardless of this Bill, that there would be nothing for them in guarantees from either the Province of Nova Scotia, as in Newfoundland with regard to the $12 million, or from the federal Government.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the support for the concept of a sunset clause in this Bill. I have to tell the Hon. Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell) that this does not in any way interfere with the ten-year arrangement which may have been made with the banks; or at least, if it does interfere in any way, it is not an insoluble situation. If the Government does what it says it would strive to do, namely dispose of the structure to private enterprise, that undertaking should be incorporated in any agreement with private enterprise. The Government or the purchasers would then become responsible for such residual portion of outstanding debt to the bank as might exist.

I do not see any conflict between that and a five-year term for the Bill, with renewal if necessary. My experience in the House has been that if a logical case can be made that something is to the detriment of the Canadian economy in general and the Atlantic fishery in particular, the House would co-operate in the extension of time. So I do not share the Hon. Member's concern about the ten-year clause in the agreement.

I come from a constituency which the local office of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in New Brunswick advises me has 3,000 people who are dependent for full-time or part-time employment on the processing industry in the Bay of Fundy area. Probably half that number depend on the industry for full-time employment and the other half depend on it for part-time employment to supplement their other income.

This is, then, a matter of major concern to me and to my constituents. There is not a single plant that is to be operated under the nationalization structure and I am happy about that. What I am really concerned about when I see the agreements that have been made, which include the transfer of part of the scallop fleet from Nova Scotia to Newfoundland, are the constraints that may be imposed on the inshore fishermen. In this, my concerns are parallel with those of the Hon. Member for South West Nova. Fishermen and their employees are concerned about their futures should this occur.

The greatest problem is that there was no consultation in the Fisheries Committee and there was no consultation with Government. As a result of consultation within the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, a conclusion was reached which was the only solution offered to resolve the very serious social problem of unemployment.

The search for a solution to this social problem does not address the long-run consequences which may be suffered from the nationalization of this industry. This emphasizes the necessity for such an industry to operate under a syndicated directorate, under a creditors' management proposition, or any other proposition which would allow it to enter world markets in a relatively independent and free enterprise structure.

As I have said before in debate on this Bill, I doubt very much if there is any capability in the structures of Canada which can equal the marketing capabilities of the fish processing structures in Atlantic Canada. But we are going to lose those marketing capabilities, or if we do not lose them totally we are going to put them under the direction of people who may not be familiar with the process. We cannot allow this to happen any more than we can sell potatoes to 100 countries over a period of time, meet the quality requirements and make the decisions which have to be made over the telephone. That is the question which I raised in committee. I would like to see this Bill have a sunset date. I see no problem of renewing it in the House of Commons if and when an urgency arises which does demand that extension.

• (1210)

I am concerned that there is an opportunity for the Government to have controlling shares in both intergovernmental arrangements for the operation of the fisheries in the two Maritime Provinces of Canada. I believe that there should be an element of balance between the fishery people themselves, the provincial Government and the Government of Canada in the distribution of voting shares in that company. The Government of Canada will find itself in a very serious conflict of interest—no matter who may be the Minister who heads the corporation—when it has at its disposal the allocation of quotas, the enterprise allocation, which has been a proposition and a partial policy of government, and all the other aspects of regulations and licensing over which it has control, while at the same time managing the sale of fisheries. There are the representations which were made to that committee in all sincerity, asking the Government do not put itself in a position of conflict of interest.

There is within this Bill the capability of loaning $100 million to the fishing industry. However, when the Minister and his staff were asked if this money in fact would be available to independents who found themselves in a difficult financial position, it was not positively addressed by either the Minister or his staff. If at this date the Minister wishes to address that question and say "Yes, in small bites when necessary, there will in fact be prompt consideration given to

the application of an independent for a loan as guaranteed under this Act", it would put somewhat of a different light on the position the independents would occupy in the presence of the elephantine-sized structure which is being put in place under public control.

By all means, Mr. Speaker, let us give favourable consideration to this amendment which does nothing to the principle of the Bill. It does nothing to contradict the objectives of the Government, as outlined by the Minister and his staff. What it does do, however, is give an element of confidence to the other people in the fishing industry that perhaps somewhere down the line business may return to normal. I think that is important. I believe the independents would then feel they could hang on, perhaps for five years, if there were guaranteed loans from the Government to replace their credit destroyed by virtue of the bank attitude toward this structure.

These things have to be resolved. If we were contradicting the Bill by this amendment, I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would deserve to be rejected, and so would the independents who asked for a sunset clause. But we are not. We do not have any opportunity really to interfere in the management of the structure for, let us say, four-plus years if there is a five-year sunset clause as this amendment suggests. It does not hamper the Government and I believe it would indicate to fishermen and to this House that the Government has the same spirit of understanding and co-operation which existed throughout the committee hearings. There was no political confrontation in those committee meetings per se. There was, in fact, the presentation of the facts as the witnesses saw them. They were given open consideration by virtually every member of the committee. Only when one tried to offer amendments which would represent the presentations of the witnesses did we seem to break on party lines.

I believe the remarks of the Hon. Member for South West Nova are indicative of the spirit in which that Bill was in fact discussed in committee. I wish it could be discussed in this House in the same spirit and with the same objectives in mind, namely, the wellbeing of the fishing industry as a whole. The objectives should not be the wellbeing of the Crown Corporation, but the wellbeing of the private enterprise structure, which has served us so well and which has remained afloat financially in hard times.

We should consider as well those who had exaggerated expectations which were never realized and, therefore, ended up in a position of bankruptcy. Let us consider them all in the generosity of spirit which I believe is intended in this Bill as it addresses the fishing industry. Let us not be divided on strictly partisan terms, but be together for the greater benefit of the fishing industry of Atlantic Canada.

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that this is the first opportunity I have had to address the House on the matter of Bill C-170, an Act to restructure the Atlantic fishery. I recognize that at this point we are dealing with a very narrow issue, in particular the amendment proposed by my colleague, the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse). At the same time I believe we have to consider that amendment in the context of the total provisions of the Bill and the background against which the Bill was promoted by the Government and introduced in this House by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané).

Let me say, first of all, with respect to the amendment that I feel it is simply an honest attempt by a Member of Parliament, who has had vast experience in the fisheries as well as in the House of Commons, to provide a safety valve to those who are concerned and suspicious about the implementation of the provisions of this Bill. I see no need to view with any degree of suspicion the motives of those who would support this amendment, because their motives are quite obvious. It provides and ensures that at some future point the provisions of this Bill will be reviewed, not at the request of anyone, not at the demand of persons who are injured or adversely affected by the provisions of the Bill, but as of right in the normal course of parliamentary processes.

That is what this sunset provision is all about, Mr. Speaker. It simply allows and ensures that the sun will not set once and for all on the provisions of this Bill, but that the provisions will again, at some future point, be re-examined and reviewed by the Chamber responsible for the enactment of the Bill, the House of Commons. I believe that is an obligation which we ought to impose upon ourselves to satisfy those who are justly concerned about the potential adverse effect of this Bill.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that we must consider this amendment in the context of what has gone on before. I want to review very briefly the background to Bill C-170, an Act to provide for the restructuring of the Atlantic fishery. We were first informed of the actions of the Government with respect to the Atlantic fishery in January of 1982. At that time the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced the formation of the Task Force on Atlantic Fisheries and indicated that one, Mr. Michael J. L. Kirby, would act as chairman of the task force. The press release which accompanied that announcement gave a very clear indication of what Mr. Kirby's task was and what he was to do, and underlined the fact that there was an urgency involved in the process. In fact, the release under the hand of the Prime Minister said that the task force was to proceed on an urgent basis to review the Government's policies and regulations which affected the fishery. It was also to consider the social context of the Atlantic fishery, particularly the concern of people in the Maritime Provinces and the Province of Newfoundland over the loss of employment which was being experienced because of disruptions in the fishing industry.

In December of 1982, that same year, we were asking in the House of Commons when we would receive the report of the task force, which was presumably given urgent priority by the Government. My colleague, the Hon. Member for South Shore, as well as myself, asked on occasion when we would receive the report. We were receiving a report by what was termed a "trial balloon". Mr. Kirby and the members of his task force on the Atlantic fisheries kept leaking out the things which they were considering doing. They were going to nationalize the fishing industry. Each time one of these trial balloons went up, the people concerned were faced with the prospect of

a dramatic and drastic change in the conduct of the fishing industry. They were faced with that possibility for over 12 months.

● (1220)

Finally, in February, 1983, approximately 14 months after the institution of the task force, its report was made public. Since that time the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada has reviewed very carefully the recommendations in the report. Much argument and discussion was generated. But when the Government finally made its decision with respect to the implementation of the report, as represented by Bill C-170, we have something very much different from the original recommendations, something which has caused elements of the Atlantic fishery great concern for their future.

The independent operators in the Atlantic fishery look at the provisions of Bill C-170 and see no assistance for them. On the contrary, there is relatively massive assistance for their major competitors, the large corporations which will be rolled into an even larger corporation in the case of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. So it is not hard to realize that after months of consideration, months of rumours and speculation, they are now faced with a Bill which does not give any real indication of what will transpire in the future.

Therefore we must ask ourselves if the independent operators and others engaged in the Atlantic fishery have a legitimate concern? The answer comes back very quickly that yes, they certainly do. In particular, the independent operators in Nova Scotia have no reason to believe that six months, one, two or three years from now they will be able to operate the businesses they have successfully operated in the past. They have no reason to believe the Government will protect them from events which will be damaging to their fishing operations. All they can do is wait and see what happens, how this Bill is implemented by the Government, and how they are affected.

All they ask us to do, Mr. Speaker, is to assure them of a future review of this legislation, which is the purpose of the amendment proposed by my colleague, the Hon. Member for South Shore. It is difficult for me to understand how anyone in this House of Commons who has the vaguest familiarity with the Atlantic fisheries could deny them that opportunity. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of this House on both sides to show some real concern for the future of those now engaged in the fishing industry and provide in the legislation the right to have their situation reviewed at some future point.

In closing, I simply want again to underline that this is a very legitimate concern of those engaged in the Atlantic fishery. Their future is in jeopardy and they want the assurance that at some future point the whole matter will be reviewed. No one can deny them that right, and the only way to implement that right is through the provision which my colleague from South Shore has proposed be added to Bill C-170.

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

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The question is on Motion No. 10. All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): In my opinion the nays have it.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion No. 10 (Mr. Crouse) negatived.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The question is now on Motion No. 11.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore) moved:

That Bill C-170, be amended by adding immediately after line 6 at page 5 the following new Clause:

"10.(1) The Auditor General of Canada shall have unlimited access to financial records, accounts, and other documents pertaining to fishery enterprises in which the Government of Canada has more than 49 per cent controlling interest.

(2) The Auditor General shall report only on the expenditure of public funds by enterprises referred to in subsection (1) of this clause, and shall have due regard for the confidentiality of all other information about such enterprises that does not pertain directly to the expenditure of public funds."

He said: Mr. Speaker, the second amendment, No. 11 on the Order Paper, will give the Auditor General access to the accounts of any fishery enterprise in which the federal Government has more than 49 per cent controlling interest. In order to protect the interest of private investors in such enterprises, the Auditor General would report only on the expenditure of public funds by the companies.

Apart from the general argument for accountability, this provision would also act as a deterrent to fishing firms accepting more federal assistance than they strictly need. We have been aware from time to time, from studying various agreements, that sometimes more is asked for than is required. This is true of Government Departments. We learn at the end of sessions that there is a carryover simply because the Department has asked for more money than it actually needed.

This is my concern with regard to this particular piece of legislation. I realize that no one actually likes to see the Auditor General coming into their office, but he is the appointed watchdog over the treasury. In our view, once the Government of Canada becomes involved beyond the 50 per cent level in any particular company, there should be some safeguard for the taxpayers of Canada.

There is yet another concern embodied in the so-called secret letter of June 24.

• (1230)

Those of us who served on the committee are aware that early in the committee sessions, I believe it was on Tuesday morning, I requested the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to place before the committee the letter of agreement between the Government of Canada and the Bank of Nova Scotia which spelled out, in some considerable detail, the actual commitment which has been made by the federal Government to the Bank of Nova Scotia, a commitment which many independents referred to as a bailout of the bank. There were many independents who said the bank should have taken its own bath. No one forced them to make these loans. They did it with the hope of securing gain from the interest involved.

If you, Sir, make a bad investment, you have to suffer the loss. In this case the Bank of Nova Scotia obviously made what appears to be a bad investment. They overreached. They overreacted to the 200-mile limit and the euphoria that went with it. They thought there would be no end. They thought everything would keep going up and nothing would ever come down. But in this case things did come down. Here we have the Government of Canada coming in and bailing out, not necessarily the companies, but the Bank of Nova Scotia.

Some Hon. Members: With your support.

Mr. Crouse: One of the Members on the other side, who I will not name because that type of comment is beneath me—

Some Hon. Members: Come on!

Mr. Crouse: It is beneath me.

An Hon. Member: We don't need that.

Mr. Crouse: No, we do not need that, that is right. I thank the Member for that. We do not need that kind of comment from the Member from New Brunswick. I will go that far. We do not need your comment. If you want to speak on the Bill, get on your feet and speak when I finish.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order.

Mr. Crouse: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I need your protection from these people.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. The Hon. Member for South Shore was given the floor to contribute to the debate. He should not be interrupted.

Mr. Crouse: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in 26, soon to be 27 years, I never interrupted an Hon. Member who was on the floor. I simply ask for the same courtesy when I am addressing this House. I invite them to come even close to that record to which I refer.

Coming back to what I was saying about the secret letter, the Minister at that time refused to table it. It would have been very helpful. It was only in the late hours of Thursday evening that we were able to obtain the document to which I have referred. I hold it in my hand. It was provided eventually, as I say, by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. It is part of the cause of the fears of independents, part of the cause of the concerns of those who are still trying to make a living in the fishing industry.

I would point out that there are approximately 700 independents who still run viable fishing industries. They are trying to find a way by which they will be able to compete with this monstrosity that has been put together in Newfoundland and which is pending for my own Province of Nova Scotia. I say pending because no agreement has yet been signed with the Province of Nova Scotia as it relates to restructuring within that Province. We heard some very interesting testimony before the committee about that situation when the Hon. John Leefe, Minister of Fisheries for the Province of Nova Scotia, appeared and gave his views as they applied to the restructuring industry.

I realize my time is limited but one of the concerns is found on page 4 of the letter that was finally provided by the Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. On that page we read at the very top:

(b) in Holdco Y these shares will carry a 5 per cent cumulative dividend payable at the end of ten years in Class A Preferred Shares.

Listen to this very carefully, Mr. Speaker:

At the end of the ten year period, the Bank may offer, and the Government of Canada will purchase at par, the Class A Preferred Shares then held by the Bank in Holdco Y. At the time of such purchase the Bank will assign to the Government of Canada on a pro rata basis the common shares associated with the purchased Class A Preferred Shares.

It goes on to say:

Subject to negotiations with the other shareholders of Holdco X, it is the intention of the Bank and of the Government of Canada to cause Holdco X to dispose of its assets within five years.

I will not read it all, but just one more short paragraph:

By mutual consent, the Bank and the Government of Canada may cause Holdco X to hold its assets beyond five years. If one party only wishes to cause Holdco X to hold its assets beyond five years, that party shall have the right to purchase the other party's shares in Holdco X for an aggregate amount equal to the amount which the other party would have received had the assets been sold and a distribution made in accordance with clause 8.

There is much more, but this is the very basis of the over-all restructuring agreement. It is all embodied in this letter. This is the point of debate between the Province of Nova Scotia and the federal Government, as I understand it, Sir. It is one of the requirements of the Government of Nova Scotia that no government or combination of governments shall hold more than 49 per cent of the restructured companies. That was initially agreed to by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, as I understand it, when consultations were held at Port Hawkesbury in early September. For some unknown reason, these conditions are now to be withdrawn by the federal Government. They are not being met. One of the conditions put forward by the Government of Nova Scotia is that they must be met. However, it is obvious after we read this letter that the federal Government cannot meet that particular condition because they have stated, and I repeat:

At the end of the ten year period, the Bank may offer, and the Government of Canada will purchase at par,—

They do not say "may" but "will".

There are a number of other reasons which I will quickly put on the record. There are some measures pertaining to accountability and control that should be considered as priority areas. These would include requiring that all funds used under the Act be voted on under the normal appropriation process. It would require an annual report of the operation of the Act, to be tabled no later than, say, two months after the end of the fiscal year. The appropriate parliamentary committee could then review the operations of the restructured companies. A sunset clause should be provided. There should be measures to ensure that nationalized enterprises do not become mini versions of Canadair. There should be some sort of control mechanism with respect to the "public interest" clause. Does the Government of Canada, for example, really need to be exempt from the Combines Investigation Act?

All of these, Mr. Speaker, are concerns of the independent companies and of the fishermen. I put them on the record so that you will realize the basis upon which our motion is moved. I hope it will be acceptable to the Government of Canada.

Mr. Brian Tobin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) and to the amendment which he has proposed to Bill C-170. To be clear, let me say that we on this side of the House do not support the amendment as proposed for a number of reasons.

The first reason is that this amendment, as it now stands, is *ultra vires* in the case of the agreement that has been reached with the Government of Newfoundland. That is, under the agreement with the Government of Newfoundland the company which will be set up is going to be set up under the Corporation Act of the Province of Newfoundland. This agreement would therefore be *ultra vires*. That presents a serious problem in itself.

In addition to that problem of legality, the amendment coming at this stage of the game, after an agreement has been reached with Newfoundland, could possibly, in the view of Newfoundland, abrogate an agreement that has already been reached.

The third point I would make is that this amendment, being imposed at this stage on what I would call a piece of enabling legislation, could in theory—I am not saying it would, but could—intrude upon negotiations not yet completed with the Government of Nova Scotia.

The fourth point, Mr. Speaker, is that this amendment, if accepted, would set a precedent as far as Crown corporations are concerned. According to the Financial Administration Act, Crown corporations are scheduled and the Auditor General does not have access in this way for all Crown corporations scheduled D and below. In fact, this particular quasi-Crown corporation, since the Government of Canada will hold shares in the company, would be a schedule E company. It is the intent of the Government to come before the House with a comprehensive policy under the Financial Administration Act as far as Crown corporations are concerned, in accordance with the suggestion that the Auditor General be given power to examine the books of the company in which the Government holds shares.

● (1240)

Another most important point is that the Government of Canada is not going to own the fishing industry of eastern Canada lock, stock and barrel. As I said earlier, like the Governments of Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, since the federal Government really has no other choice it is injecting capital into an industry, through equity, which otherwise would collapse. We know what the ramifications of a collapse would be.

As a result of the Government having 49 per cent of the voting shares, this amendment suggests that the other 51 per cent, or perhaps 60 per cent in the case of Nova Scotia, of the shares held by private entrepreneurs would mean that private entrepreneurs would have their shares and financial statements subject to the scrutiny of the Auditor General of Canada. It would be an incredible precedent to have that private capital subject to scrutiny by the Auditor General. There is no precedent anywhere for that kind of intrusion into the affairs of private business.

I asked Mr. Ron Bulmer, the Fisheries Council of Canada representative who speaks for the processors of Canada, what he thought of this amendment. His response was that it would set a very dangerous precedent if the Government were serious in saying that it was putting in money now through equity capital and wishes to reprivatize when the industry is sound again. If part of the process of reprivatizing the industry is to sell it off in pieces, there are very few people who will want to buy into something which will automatically expose their books and business dealings to the Auditor General of Canada.

For all of those reasons, not the least of which is that it is *ultra vires,* we cannot accept this amendment.

Mr. Dave Nickerson (Western Arctic): Mr. Speaker, in my view this amendment is absolutely essential. I do not buy any of the arguments advanced by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Tobin).

If we were to establish a precedent that federal Crown corporations be subject to the scrutiny of the Auditor General, then in my view that would be a good precedent. One of the problems that we have in this country is that Crown corporations are not subject to that scrutiny.

Just let us examine what happened with Canadair. It came back year after year for a period of three or four years and presented figures to the parliamentary committee that was studying it. These figures, presumably from audited statements done by the auditor of their choice, showed that that company was sound. In the third or fourth year we find that it needs an injection of $1.5 billion in taxpayer's money after it had assured us that it was operating soundly. This is what occurs when the Auditor General of Canada, who is responsible to the House, does not have the authority to review the books of Crown corporations.

Pursuant to Bill C-170 there is $138 million of taxpayer's money to be invested in these fishery enterprises. That is not counting the $100 million of guarantees and it is not counting any further moneys that the Government might secure through additional parliamentary appropriations.

For these reasons I reaffirm my initial statement that this is an essential amendment and that the Auditor General of Canada must be given the authority to protect that $138 million and more of public funds.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, it is not as though our Party has taken a stand against the Bill because we have not done that. We have made a plea for sanity, for a humanitarian application that is so vital to the health of the total industry.

I listened to the Member for South West Nova (Miss Campbell) who expressed the concerns that were expressed by the witnesses who appeared before the committee. We are trying and will continue to try to get the best deal for the total fishery of Atlantic Canada that can be extracted on their behalf.

Like the Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau), I attended virtually every moment of the hearings where witnesses appeared before the fisheries committee. I ask the Member for Gloucester, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) and the Parliamentary Secretary, how many witnesses out of the many we heard did in fact give unqualified support for this Bill?

Mr. Tobin: Sixty per cent.

Mr. McCain: That is a very high estimate. I suggest to the Parliamentary Secretary that perhaps he should review the recommendations of those witnesses. At best they were qualified and in several instances they gave that qualified support because of the social responsibility they felt on behalf of the unemployed fishermen and unemployed processors. However, there was objection in principle to the *modus operandi* which was proposed by the Minister in the Bill which we are presently discussing.

I think the Member for Gloucester will remember that the Maritime Fishermen's Union appeared and primarily represented the East Coast of New Brunswick along with other parts of the industry in both Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. They particularly stated that there should be adjustments made in the Bill. As well, they were one of the groups who specifically said that they recognized the social necessity of action by the Government of Canada. To that degree they supported it, but to that degree only. They recommended that there be adjustments which will protect those who do not work for the large corporations which are to be nationalized under this legislation.

Mr. Tobin: They want us to go even farther.

Mr. McCain: That was not the way I interpreted it. However, that may be the favourable interpretation which was given to it by the Parliamentary Secretary.

We are attempting once again to explain to the public as best we can how this corporation will be operated. We have suggested that the Auditor General study this in depth because the recommendations of the fisheries committee in the House which has examined the salt-cod operation from Newfoundland and the freshwater situation during my term in this Parliament have been roadblocked, deadended and made futile. The discussions which took place in committee had nothing whatsoever to do with any adjustment in management or reconsideration of policies by those companies.

There will be a report submitted to the Parliament of Canada which will, at the pleasure and leisure which may be enjoyed by the Minister, be submitted to a committee. We may find ourselves locked into the block system with a couple of meetings which will be as futile as the historic meetings on the block system when the Government wishes to stall and not give information.

The only way that the people of Canada will have a hope of knowing what takes place in that corporation and whether the fishing industry is being well served is for the Government to accept the authority of the Auditor General to make comments in his Annual Report with respect to the company. That does give the Standing Committee on Public Accounts an opportunity to examine the performance of the company. I think that is absolutely vital to the safeguarding first, of the reputation of the Minister responsible and, second, to the safety of those not directly incorporated under this structure.

● (1250)

It is my understanding, although I was compelled to be at another meeting at an earlier date, that the Government has offered amendments to this Bill and that those amendments have been declared by the Chair as not being admissible. These amendments which were introduced were not admissible. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is a rather sorry situation when either the Government or a Member of the Party which is the Government would introduce amendments with the aim of improving the structure and then find that the ruling of the Chair discarded them. I am not reflecting on the ruling, not at all; I am reflecting upon the wisdom and understanding and the capability of Government Members to be influential at the decision-making process. It is a sort of sad reflection upon the status which Members on your right, Mr. Speaker, enjoy when they cannot even get the kind of advice that would help them to introduce legitimate amendments.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. I appreciate the Hon. Member's comments in the terms he was making them. Nevertheless, he is talking to a matter or matters not before the House. In terms of the rule of relevancy, that is hardly acceptable. I appreciate the Hon. Member is not reflecting on the Chair's earlier ruling. By the same token something which the Chair has decided cannot be put to the House should not be bootlegged into the debate, if I can use that expression, by the back door, as the Hon. Member is doing. I feel strongly that he should not be commenting in any way, shape or form upon amendments which are not before the

House because they were ruled out of order. Though the Chair may be guided by the rule of relevancy, it is inspired by the principle of leniency. I invite the Hon. Member to return to the amendment now before the House.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I shall not dispute your ruling except to say that I did not discuss the individual amendments. I think I did discuss things that were pertinent to the Bill inasmuch as there was an effort to amend. There was no question about your ruling at that time, Mr. Speaker. I do think the subject matter is pertinent and important to the discussion of the Bill. However, I shall move away from that.

May I say to the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) through you, Mr. Speaker, that when Members opposite sort of get caught in their own trap they become defensive and, on occasion, offensive. He is no exception to occasional offensive interjections and subject matter of which he would know as much as I know—

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is clear that during report stage discussion should be related specifically to the amendments. Third reading will follow report stage and the Hon. Member can then run off at the mouth all he likes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. Though I would not put it in those terms, the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre (Mr. Evans) is quite right and I was tempted to add that to my earlier comments. I invite the Hon. Member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) to continue debate.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I apologize for hurting the feelings of the Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre. It is really too bad that he is so thin-skinned. However, I respect your ruling and, as I mentioned earlier, I have not interjected my comments into other speeches in this debate because it is too serious a debate. Perhaps those Members from Ontario do not recognize what may be the consequence to Atlantic Canada. Of course, there is always the possibility from their behaviour in the debate on this Bill and their impatience that they do not give a damn. I think that is closer to the truth than anything else that I can say.

It was stated by the Minister when earlier discussions took place on this subject matter that it would be impossible to have the Auditor General as a scrutineer of the public's affairs in this Crown corporation because there were other parties to it. This is a matter of negotiation. I submit that if the Government of Canada were to negotiate with the same force and take the same adamant position that was taken in the earlier negotiations leading to the Crown corporation which we now have, the Parties would indeed include in the agreement the right of the House of Commons to write into the Bill that the Auditor General be the auditor of the affairs of the company. It is not objected to, in my opinion, because of the agreement; it is objected to because it is not according to the principles of those who made this proposition to the Provinces, nor are they prepared to consider the representation of all the witnesses who presented themselves before the committee. I regret very much the adamant position of the Government on a Bill that needs amending in the best interests of the fisheries and of Atlantic Canada. I implore the Government to not throw out every suggestion of every witness who appeared before the committee.

Mr. Jack Shields (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly on Motion No. 11 which requests that the Auditor General be given unlimited access to the financial records. This is a Canadian way of doing things. We have seen in the past other Crown corporations right across the country where financial records are not available, so that this House can be accountable to the taxpayers in individual ridings. Clearly, there is something wrong when the Government of the day resists a motion so vehemently as it resists Motion No. 11 today.

Basically, all this amendment calls for is accountability to this House of Commons. I, for one, feel this is why the House of Commons is looked upon across the nation as being irrelevant. We are not accountable for Crown corporations like Petro-Canada. Another one is now being created in this Bill and we will not be accountable to the Canadian taxpayer because of it. We see this happening time and time again. We cannot get records showing where the money is being spent or how it is being spent. Every other corporation in the land must put their books forward if it is a public corporation. We owe it to the Canadian voter, the Canadian taxpayer, to be accountable in this House. Therefore, I support the motion. I urge all Members to search their consciences and support this motion.

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

Some Hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): The question is on Motion No. 11. All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): In my opinion the nays have it.

Mr. Crouse: On division.

Motion No. 11 (Mr. Crouse) negatived.

Mr. De Bané moved that the Bill be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): When shall the Bill be read a third time? Pursuant to order made earlier this day, now?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. De Bané moved that the Bill be read the third time and do pass.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT

CONSTITUENCY FUNDS ALLOCATED UNDER JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, in response to an Order Paper question from the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), information was released on Friday concerning constituency allocations under the Canada Works and LEAD Programs.

The information shows a disturbing pattern, in that funds under the job-creation programs go disproportionately to constituencies held by Liberal Members of Parliament. While the Liberals hold 52 per cent of the constituencies in the House and those constituencies account for 59 per cent of the unemployed, they receive 78 per cent of the money allocated under these programs. In my constituency the allocation per person receiving unemployment insurance is only 60 per cent as much as in the neighbouring riding of Nickel Belt, which is represented by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mrs. Erola). Where is the equity in this? How can the Government take the position that unemployed people in neighbouring constituencies should have such unequal access to these programs?

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

ITT-RAYONIER QUEBEC—POSSIBILITY OF RESUMED PROSPERITY—NECESSITY TO EVALUATE SITUATION

Mr. André Maltais (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I was at a meeting in Port Cartier last week, on Thursday, November 24, to discuss the possibility of reopening ITT-Rayonier Quebec. I have here a speech made by the Mayor, Mr. Tony Détroio, on this subject. A copy of the speech was

sent to the Office of the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and to the Office of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lumley), for assessment. I feel that the Mayor's comments at the meeting were entirely justified, and that it is absolutely essential, not only that the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce should get in touch with the Quebec Department of Energy and Resources in order to find a solution, but also that a task force should be set up in order to ensure the plant is reopened.

Mr. Speaker, the second point I would like to make is that it is also vital that the Quebec Government should provide the federal Government with all information on various negotiations and meetings that have taken place with Finland, China and other countries regarding the possible acquisition of the ITT-Rayonier Quebec plant in Port Cartier. At the present time, the main problem is that the federal Government does not have all the information since stumpage rights and power rates are not a federal matter. We cannot speak on behalf of the Government of Quebec in these two areas which are essential to any discussion about reopening ITT-Rayonier Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, for all of the reasons I have just mentioned, I would ask the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to accelerate the process for assessing the ITT-Rayonier Quebec file and to ensure that all information is transmitted by Quebec to the federal Government and that Quebec—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order! Unfortunately, the Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT

ALLOCATION OF CONSTITUENCY FUNDS TO P.E.I. RIDINGS UNDER JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS

Mr. Tom McMillan (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same subject as that raised by the Hon. Member for Timiskaming (Mr. MacDougall). The allocation of federal funds under the Canada Works and LEAD programs clearly reveals the extent to which the federal Government is using these programs to try to save the political hides of sitting Liberal Members of Parliament rather than to address the real needs of the unemployed.

In my riding of Hillsborough, for example, the allocation under the programs in question amounts to $225 per person receiving unemployment insurance. By contrast, in the neighbouring riding of Cardigan the allocation amounts to $764 per person receiving unemployment insurance, a discrepancy in excess of three to one, at the expense of the unemployed in my riding. I urge the Minister of unemployment to explain to the taxpayers and to the unemployed in my riding how he can justify such a disparity in their opportunity to benefit from

these programs compared with their neighbours in the very next riding where conditions are exactly comparable.

* * *

THE MEDIA

BROADCAST NEWS—DISMISSAL OF BROADCASTING REPRESENTATIVES FROM BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Hon. Jim Fleming (York West): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of the House and Hon. Members on all sides a recent development which again demonstrates in the most shocking manner the cavalier and even dangerous attitude of major Canadian news publishing interests. While this event took place several weeks ago, it received little if any press coverage until today. Yet its implications, and the attitude which it demonstrates, would certainly have been front-page news were it involving any other enterprise with a similar impact upon Canadian life.

Late in October at a meeting of the Board of Directors of Broadcast News, the subsidiary of Canadian Press, as a result of a conflict between the broadcasting representatives and the publishing representatives, the publishers used their strength to fire all the broadcasting representatives on the Board. The senior manager of Broadcast News was fired by the publishing interests as well. This means that while Canadian television and radio broadcasting interests contribute the largest portion of the funds which run Canadian Press and Broadcast News, the important Broadcast News division, by far the largest domestic news service to Canadian broadcasting interests, has no broadcasting representatives on its Board. They dared to disagree with the publishers. Surely this arrogance and insensitivity by the publishers' representatives is a further warning that, in the news publishing industry in Canada, with all its immense clout, there is shocking insensitivity to the need for broad and diverse input to assure a free press.

* * *

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

INABILITY TO COMPENSATE FOR MISCARRIAGES OF JUSTICE

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Mr. Speaker, we in the New Democratic Party deplore the fact that Donald Marshall was convicted of a crime he did not commit and that he lost 11 years of his life incarcerated in a federal penitentiary. The Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly) rose in the House on November 15 and November 18, urging the Government to compensate Donald Marshall for the legal expenses he incurred trying to prove his innocence, and also to compensate in some way for the unjust treatment he suffered.

In the last few days we have seen Conservative Members joining in our demand for compensation, and we welcome them. However, let us not forget the numerous statements they have made in the House over the past three years on the necessity for capital punishment. Let us learn from the Marshall incident and recognize the possibility, if not probability, of other similar miscarriages of justice occurring, with horrendous consequences for which no adequate compensation could ever be paid. Let us recognize that the justice system is not infallible and that errors can and will continue to be made.

If we had followed the advice of the Conservative Party and reinstated capital punishment, how would we apologize, let alone compensate, for the errors which would have been made? The victims would have been dead.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

ALLOCATION OF JOB-CREATION FUNDS TO CONSTITUENCIES IN ATLANTIC CANADA

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, my statement also relates to the information released on the Canada Works and LEAD programs as a result of the question placed on the Order Paper by the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath). In the Atlantic Provinces the allocation per person receiving unemployment insurance is $174 in constituencies represented by Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament. In Liberal constituencies the allocation per unemployed person is $385. Some cases are much worse.

In my constituency of Carleton-Charlotte the allocation per unemployed person is less than one-third of what it is next door in the Liberal constituency of Madawaska-Victoria. How can the Minister justify such discrepancies in these adjoining constituencies with comparable economies and comparable employment opportunities?

* * *

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

DECISION BY MR. ROCHE NOT TO SEEK RE-ELECTION

Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake): Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House, and all Canadians concerned with the peace movement, were disappointed to read in today's newspaper of the decision of the Hon. Member for Edmonton South (Mr. Roche) not to seek re-election. This Member has been a leader, both in Canada and in international fora, in the causes of global peace and international development. I have had the distinct pleasure of working with him a number of times over the last year and a half, since joining with him and others to release the minority report on security and disarmament.

It is especially of concern that there is no place in the Tory caucus for a thoughtful disarmament campaigner such as the Hon. Member, that his decision to resign is based upon the feeling that he cannot pursue his causes within the Conservative caucus and that, according to *The Globe and Mail* of today, he has been "unhappy with the rightward drift of his

Party's foreign policy position". One shudders to think of the Neanderthal direction Tory foreign policy is bound to take without the reasoned, progressive voice of the Hon. Member for Edmonton South being present to balance those in that caucus who would have the Tories become the "Republican Party North".

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

ALLOCATION OF CONSTITUENCY FUNDS UNDER JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to bring to the attention of the House the strange Liberal Party notion of justice and fair play for the unemployed. Official departmental figures for the 1983-84 Canada Works and Local Employment Assistance and Development Programs reveal that the constituency allocations for these job-creation programs are more related considerations than to the needs of the unemployed. Not only do Liberal constituencies receive 78 per cent of the funds allocated but, on a per-person basis, unemployed people who live in Liberal ridings receive over twice as much as those who live in other ridings.

• (1410)

Why does the Government consider the 350,000 unemployed persons who live in Progressive Conservative ridings to be so much less worthy of government support than the unemployed who live in Liberal ridings? Are the unemployed, wherever they live, being treated fairly and justly? That is the question the House should ask, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, and sadly, the answer is no.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY

NECESSITY FOR GOVERNMENT TO MEET DEMANDS OF INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, in my comments today I would like to make the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lumley) a little more aware of what is going on in the Canadian footwear industry.

As the House is aware, the industry has been very actively lobbying the vast majority of Members of this House—not just one side but both sides of the House. The industry is of course seeking speedy action to extend overall quotas in the footwear industry for the next five years. Considering the industry's present efforts to modernize and to improve productivity; considering the fact that the two-year arrangement approved by the Government is clearly inadequate to guarantee security and stability in the industry; and also considering the thousands of workers that are still in the industry, I would urge the Minister to respond positively, without delay, to a request that is entirely justified and that, for once, would give the Government an opportunity to save existing jobs instead of imagining them through all kinds of programs, which are often aimed at providing only temporary employment. I feel this industry not only deserves the respect of our elected representatives but also their support for the people who work there, and there are still several thousands of them. I also urge the Government to ensure that this industry, which has a great deal going for it—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order! The Hon. Member's time has expired.

* * *

[*English*]

VIA RAIL

LOCATION OF STATION IN SICAMOUS, B.C.

Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops-Shuswap): Mr. Speaker, would someone construct a covered stadium yet fail to provide any spectator seating? Would someone build a school and forget to instal student desks? Of course not, yet something of this nature is precisely what VIA Rail has done in Sicamous, British Columbia.

Sicamous depends upon VIA Rail for much of its tourist business, as well as for general transportation purposes. However, when VIA recently constructed a new passenger station in Sicamous it failed to provide any passenger access. An appropriate right-of-way to the station was never obtained, so the station is cut off from public access. As well, the station which is located in the British Columbia snowbelt is open to the harsh winter conditions of the area. It is unheated, unlighted, and has no washroom or toilet facilities. It has no telephones, and there is no way of determining if the arrival of a train is imminent. The station also lacks a parking lot. To call it a station or passenger depot is to use the term very loosely.

The people of Sicamous, British Columbia, hear and read of the Government's commitment to improving western rail transportation, yet are forced to accept a most appalling situation when it comes to VIA Rail service. The people of Sicamous need and support VIA Rail, so I would urge the Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) to intervene in this fiasco and provide the people of Sicamous, British Columbia, with the passenger service they need and deserve.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

ALLOCATION OF CONSTITUENCY FUNDS UNDER JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment very briefly on the logic, sense, and reality of the Government's approach to job creation in the country. At some point before this Session ends I would like to hear someone from the other side try to tell me

why it is that, with respect to surplus labour, Cardigan constituency gets $764 a job, the constituency of Egmont gets $794 a job, the constituency of Dartmouth-Halifax East gets $27 a job, the constituency of Hillsborough gets $225 a job and the constituency of Malpeque gets $254 a job. Is it because the Government is paying attention to its backbenchers by trying to buy jobs in their constituencies at the expense of the unemployed and those who are in desperate trouble? Is that the only answer they can give us? If so, they should quit, resign, or call an election.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

EMPLOYMENT

ALLOCATION OF CONSTITUENCY FUNDS UNDER JOB-CREATION PROGRAMS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. He will know that on Friday one of the Order Paper questions of the Hon. Member for St. John's East which was answered puts in the public domain some of the required information on constituency allocation of Canada Works and LEAD funds. An analysis of this information reveals that, while Conservative Members represent 31 per cent of the unemployed, their ridings are allocated only 16 per cent of the funds under these programs. At the same time Liberal Members represent 59 per cent of the unemployed but their ridings receive 78 per cent of the funds. Could the Minister of Employment and Immigration tell the House how the Liberal Party of Canada justifies treating the unemployed people in such a manner?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member has just revealed the basis upon which the opposition Party would make allocations if it were to be in power, that is to say, it would make those allocations on the basis of the party labels of the Members of Parliament. However, that is not the basis upon which we have allocated these funds.

The allocation of these funds, as has been explained to the Hon. Member many times, is on the basis of the labour surplus rates across the country in the various constituencies. If it is true that more money is flowing to constituencies which happen to be represented by Liberal Members, it is because the labour surplus rates in those constituencies are unfortunately higher than in those constituencies held by Conservative Members.

I would point out to the Hon. Member that the allocations to the constituency held by the Leader of the Opposition have increased very significantly. That hardly reflects a partisan bias on our side. If, for instance, the Hon. Member would care to regard the allocations going to the Province of British Columnbia where, if memory serves me correctly, we do not hold any seats at all, he will find that those allocations have increased considerably. I believe that his insinuation that partisan considerations are at the root of these allocations is clearly false.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister would like to read his own data. Not one dime of LEAD funds has gone west of the Ontario border.

FUNDS ALLOCATED TO LIBERAL AND PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE RIDINGS

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, the unemployed people who live in Liberal ridings are given job-allocation funds at an average rate of $193 per person. People in the same circumstances who are unemployed and have spouses, children, and depression to cope with, who live in Conservative ridings are given $78 on average per person. Is that the Liberal idea of justice and fair play? Are there two kinds of unemployed Canadian citizens, those who live in Liberal ridings and those who live in the other ridings?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member should also look at the figures again. He said that no funds were allocated west of Ontario. If he were to look at the figures for British Columbia he would find that there has already been an increase in funding to that Province of something like $2 million over the $11 million from last year, a very considerable increase even by the Hon. Member's extraordinary arithmetic. I would think it is an increase of something like 20 per cent.

The Hon. Member then referred to the LEAD allocations. He should know, but if he does not know he should go back and find out, that the LEAD allocations are based upon persistent rates of high labour surplus over a four-year period. Most of the areas of the country in which there has been a higher than average labour surplus rate are to be found in the eastern part of the country and not west of Ontario.

Mr. Hawkes: Mr. Speaker, I used to assign to my classes a textbook called "How to Lie With Statistics".

ALLOCATION OF FUNDS UNDER LOCAL EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, there are 28 ridings in the Province of British Columbia and not one has received a dime of LEAD money. Can the Minister tell us whether he thinks the problems of alcoholism, suicide, depression, and others that go along with unemployment, are any less severe for those unemployed people who live in Conservative ridings than for those who live in Liberal ridings? If those problems are no less severe, why is there not a fair allocation to each unemployed person in the country?

• (1420)

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, if the Hon. Member has been assigning text books on the basis of the quality of his questions, his students have my deepest sympathy. I gave him the answer to this question in my answer to his previous question, and that is that LEAD funds are allocated on the basis of a four-year term of persistent higher than normal labour surplus rates. That is clearly set out in documents which the Hon. Member has had for months, so he has had time to look at them. It is not based on partisan considerations; it is based objectively on the labour surplus rate and it does focus on the eastern part of the country because that is where the highest rates of labour surplus have been.

ALLOCATIONS TO CONSTITUENCIES IN ATLANTIC PROVINCES

Hon. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. In the Atlantic region, under the Canada Works and Local Employment Assistance and Development job-creation programs, $51.6 million is being allocated to Atlantic Province constituencies in 1983-84. Of this amount 82 per cent is going to the 19 Liberal constituencies and 18 per cent is going to the 13 Progressive Conservative constituencies, despite the fact that the Conservative Members represent 35 per cent of the persons receiving unemployment insurance in the region.

Will the Minister tell the House why those 56,000 unemployment insurance recipients in Progressive Conservative ridings are less worthy of assistance under these programs than the 109,000 unemployment insurance recipients represented by Liberal Members?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, once again we see quite clearly the partisan obsession of Ministers—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: Right on!

Mr. Roberts: —of Hon. Members opposite, and, I would add, of the former Ministers opposite. Not one of them, including the last former Minister who spoke, has had the grace to remember that it was his Government that tried to cancel the whole program when it was in office. They are obsessed with partisan concerns. They would prefer it to go to Conservative constituencies rather than to Liberal constituencies. We want the funds to go where there is the highest level of unemployment, Mr. Speaker.

INQUIRY RESPECTING ALLOCATIONS PER CAPITA

Hon. J. Robert Howie (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, let us try a very simple question. If we break down the allocations on a per unemployed person basis, the average unemployed person in a Progressive Conservative constituency get only 45 per cent as much access to these programs as does the average unemployed person in a similar riding in a Liberal region. Without his political rhetoric, can the Minister get serious and explain why this should be so? Why the unfairness?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the questions are very simple, and they are very partisan and very distorted. I have explained already, in answer to five questions, that the basis of the allocation is on the objectively established labour surplus rates. It is for that reason that the constituency of the Leader of the Opposition has received such a significant increase. It has not received a significant increase because he is the Leader of the Opposition, and it has not received a significant increase because he is a Conservative; it has received a significant increase because there is a much higher increase in the labour surplus in his constituency. That same explanation applies fairly to all constituencies across Canada.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. The Minister knows that the Canadian Mental Health Association has warned that many Canadians will suffer grave personal harm if record unemployment continues. He also knows that the Ontario Minister of Social Services has asked for an extra $100 million this winter for 35,000 new welfare applicants. As well as the 35,000 that Ontario expects, how many exhaustees does the Minister predict for 1984? What steps will he recommend to the federal-provincial conference next week, both to provide more jobs and to provide extended unemployment insurance benefits for the jobless?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I caught a reference to the federal-provincial conference. Perhaps the Hon. Member would clarify what he is referring to, in a supplementary question.

With regard to the part of his question which deals with the level of exhaustees, in our belief it is running at the mid-60,-000 level. We expect that number to decrease over the next six months. I simply do not know and I cannot make a very precise estimate of what that decrease will be, but we expect significant decreases through to the end of 1983 and well into 1984.

LEVEL OF DEPARTMENTAL STAFFING IN TORONTO AREA

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, the Employment and Insurance Division in Toronto District has cut out 48 positions this year, as I have already given notice to the

Minister, and the director's memo, which I have in my hand, forecasts more cuts in staff in 1984 and the possible closing of some service points. Will the Minister tell the House how many term and other employees will be laid off in the Toronto district, and in Canada, next year? Which points of service are being considered for closing? Does he justify cutting staff because so many workers will have exhausted their benefits that they will not be making claims?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the last part of the question is partly no, and I will touch upon that in a moment. It is true that we estimate there will be something like 96 term employees, not permanent employees, who will be laid off in the Metropolitan Toronto area. I am looking for the figure for over-all Canada but I do not have that at my fingertips. I will send it to the Hon. Member when I receive it. I do not expect that there will be any points of service closed as a result of the steps we are taking.

The Hon. Member asked for an explanation of why there is a lay-off amongst those casual employees. The answer is that there has been a marked decline in applicants for unemployment insurance. There is a decline of something like close to 20 per cent in applicants in the Toronto area, and a decline over-all in the country of something like 16 per cent. We do not need the same amount of human resources to process those applications as we have had in the past because of that very significant decline in applications, coming to almost a figure of a 20 per cent cutback.

* * *

EMPLOYMENT

ALLOCATION OF JOB-CREATION CONSTITUENCY FUNDS TO CARLETON-CHARLOTTE

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Minister will be very happy that he has been a little more generous to Carleton-Charlotte this year than he was last year: otherwise the comparative figures would have been extremely embarrassing. At the moment in Carleton-Charlotte we receive $141 per person receiving unemployement insurance. In the neighbouring Liberal constituency of Madawaska-Victoria they get $461 per person receiving unemployment insurance—over three times as much. Could the Minister explain to the unemployed people of my constituency the fairness of such a discrepancy, even in the face of a little more generous Liberal contribution this year than last?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we see very clearly the new face that the new Leader of the Opposition will put on the new Conservative Party. Not only does he boast that if there are appointments to be made when he becomes Prime Minister, and none of them will go to anyone who has not been a Conservative for 15 years, but we now see his Members rising one after the other in the House of Commons to underline that their concern is that unemployment insurance benefits go to their ridings on a partisan basis. I have explained, and, Mr. Speaker, you must be almost tired of hearing me do it, that the allocations made both under Canada Works and under the LEAD programs are based on objective statistics which relate to labour surplus. That is the explanation in response to the Hon. Member's question, as it has been to all the others presented today.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, I have to say to you that the integrity of our Leader is unquestionable, and his fairness in his approach to Canadian problems.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCain: He has not, nor has any member of this Party, had to wear the mask of deceit in order to face the public and try to lie and distort figures in defence of irrational decisions.

GOVERNMENT'S POSITION

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts cited in my first question, is it the position of the Government that unemployed Canadians in my riding require less than unemployed Canadians 20 miles from my home in a Liberal constituency? Is that rational thought? No.

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think the integrity of the Hon. Member's Leader is unquestioned as well; that is one of the problems his Leader has.

The answer to the second part of the question is no.

LEVEL OF FUNDING IN TIMISKAMING AND NICKEL BELT RIDINGS

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same Minister. In my riding of Timiskaming the allocation for Canada Works and LEAD programs is $97 per person receiving UIC. In the neighbouring constituency of Nickel Belt, represented by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the allocation works out to $168 per person.

• (1430)

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. MacDougall: Can the Minister explain to the unemployed people in my constituency the equity in that?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Same question, Mr. Speaker; same answer.

Mr. MacDougall: I am sure the unemployed people in Timiskaming will enjoy hearing that type of answer.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER ACT TO CREATE JOBS

Mr. John A. MacDougall (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. The fact remains that across the country those people who are

fortunate enough to have a Conservative Member of Parliament representing them are in the unfortunate position of having a Liberal Government which is playing politics with the unemployed. Is it the position of the Government that unemployed persons in certain constituencies in Canada should have less access to these programs than others? What is the Minister going to do to create jobs for all ridings equally?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of Employment and Immigration): I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I had some difficulty hearing the final part of the Hon. Member's question. I would suggest to him, in relation to the first part of his question, that the citizens of the Hon. Member's constituency might be interested in why it is that the Conservative Party has not come forward with one constructive suggestion for creating jobs since this session started again in September.

* * *

WESTERN GRAIN TRANSPORTATION ACT

WESTERN OILSEED INDUSTRY—REQUEST FOR MINIMUM COMPENSATORY RATES

Mr. Bill McKnight (Kindersley-Lloydminster): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. After the passing of Bill C-155 has the Minister given any consideration to providing minimum compensatory rates to the oilseed crushing industry in western Canada, east of Thunder Bay, and the same MCRs for shipments from Ontario to export, to provide markets for both western canola oil and the Ontario oilseed industry? Has the Minister given any consideration to that proposal?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, indeed we have been looking very carefully at this issue. The Minister of Agriculture and myself met some weeks ago, I believe, with the representatives of the crushers in eastern Ontario and western Canada to discuss how we might find a proper solution to the problem because there are, as you know, two very different points of view on that issue. We have taken the material they presented to us. I hope to be able to sit down very soon with the Minister of Agriculture and then get back to those two representative groups to see if we can a solution which is workable for both.

* * *

NATIONAL REVENUE

LETTER OF COMPLAINT FROM ACCOUNTANTS IN CAMBRIDGE, ONT.

Mr. Chris Speyer (Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue. The Minister will have at hand a letter which has been signed by every chartered accounting firm in the community of Cambridge. It constitutes a very serious indictment of the attitude and the behaviour of his Department. There are five points in the letter, two of which are as follows: first, Revenue Canada is using quotas whereby assessors are expected to assess a certain amount of tax in a given period; second, Revenue Canada has abandoned all sense of fairness and objectivity in order to maximize tax assessments.

In light of the fact that there is a deficit of $30 billion, and in view of the fact that the Government has a cash flow problem, have there been any directives sent by the Minister, or anyone in his Department, with respect to quotas for assessors? Second, since every accountant signed this letter to the Minister, will he take seriously the allegation that there is unfairness and uneven-handedness in his Department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, once more, I wish to inform the Members of this House that the main concern of the employees of my Department is to perform their duties while dealing equitably and fairly with all Canadian taxpayers. I may add that the work being done by Departmental auditors concerning taxpayers and their compliance with the laws of this country and our income tax laws has nothing to do with the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, we audit tax returns in order to ensure that all Canadian taxpayers are paying their share of the tax burden and that the failure of one individual to comply with this country's income tax legislation does not put a burden on another taxpayer whose compliance is 100 per cent.

[*English*]

Mr. Speyer: Mr. Speaker, in all corners of this Chamber people believe that Revenue Canada is out of hand and the Minister is shirking his responsibility in not appreciating that fact.

QUOTA SETTING INQUIRY

Mr. Chris Speyer (Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, the central question I asked, the one to which I did not receive an answer, was: has there been any directive sent, either by senior officials of the Minister's Department, or by the Minister, with respect to quotas for assessors in terms of assessing taxpayers' claims?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, as I said before, it is our responsibility to ensure that taxpayers who do not comply with the Income Tax Act are called on and, after an audit, asked to do their duty. We do not use methods that are inequitable or unfair, and in fact, we are guided by the principle that all Canadian taxpayers should be treated equitably.

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

SEXUAL ASSAULT PROVISIONS

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice, who is no doubt aware that a woman is in prison for seven days, a woman who was the victim of a serious crime of violence, because she was afraid to testify against a motorcycle gang. My question has nothing to do with the prosecution for contempt, because that is under provincial responsibility. However, I would like to know what the Minister is going to do about the sexual assault Section, the previous rape Section, in the Criminal Code. Is the Minister aware that evidence as to the past sexual history of this woman was admitted and that she had no chance to refute it? Would the Minister agree that the past sexual history of a victim ought not to be relevant to the determination of guilt or innocence in a particular case? If so, how does the Minister intend to amend the Criminal Code?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the Criminal Code has already been amended. The substantive case behind the contempt proceedings which have just taken place was a charge of rape and the trial of rape under the old Sections of the Criminal Code which were abolished by this House a year or so ago. The provisions for evidence which were in effect at that time are no longer in effect. However, of course, for cases which began before the Code was changed, procedure under the old law is followed. By Section 246.7 that kind of evidence would no longer be admissible.

CONCERN EXPRESSED BY RAPE CRISIS CENTRES

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Minister is aware that Rape Crisis Centres and sexual assault centres are not satisfied that this problem has been dealt with adequately in the new changes in the legislation. Is the Minister aware that Rape Crisis Centres feel that, as a result of the current case, they cannot encourage women who are victims of sexual assault to come forward? We may have a situation in which there have been some improvement in the law, but they do not go far enough. We are going to have victims of crime who are going to be afraid to complain because these reforms have not gone far enough. The evidence can still be admitted by another witness, for example, if not the woman herself. This is a loophole which remains in the law.

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, there may well be remaining loopholes in the law. If there are, experience will uncover them. As I have said several times in the last year, we have ongoing a study of the effect of the new law. However, Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to draw a conclusion as to the effect of the new law from a prosecution which has taken place under the old law. Therefore I would hope my hon. friend will help me in conveying to women's groups and women's centres across the country that we hope they will join us in giving the new law a fair chance. If it is not working, we shall certainly be open to changes. However, let us make sure that people across the country do not mislead women's groups with respect to the effect of the new law by prosecutions which still occasionally take place under the old law.

* * *

NATIONAL REVENUE

AUDIT AND COLLECTION PRACTICES OF DEPARTMENT

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Revenue as well. It has to do with the unfortunate and what many people believe is the tyrannical way in which his Department is behaving. There are specific cases in the farming community and business community where people have been reassessed, forced to pay, they have then appealed and won their case, and yet it takes six to 12 months for their money to be refunded. Is the Minister prepared to see that the audit and collection sections of his Department act with some consistency so they do not place undue hardship on people and tie up their funds for six to 12 months, which in many cases is putting people out of business?

• (1440)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, obviously, it is important that a Department like the Department of National Revenue should provide excellent service to the public. I can assure the Hon. Member that when decisions in favour of the taxpayer take time, we do everything we can to help expedite such cases and provide a better service to the taxpayer.

[*English*]

Mr. Mayer: Mr. Speaker, I would not say six to 12 months is expediting the situation. I certainly am prepared to give the Minister some examples.

PLIGHT OF FARMERS

Mr. Charles Mayer (Portage-Marquette): Mr. Speaker, the Graham case refers specifically to Section 31, and I want to ask the Minister if he is prepared to instruct his Department to treat this as a test case, and stop harassing individual farmers? I have on my desk cases from coast to coast where farmers are being put out of business. If the Minister is not prepared to do that, he is saying that people are guilty until they prove themselves innocent. I would hope he would be willing to listen to the Minister of Agriculture who sits in front of him, because he has apparently made those representations to the Minister, or is the Minister of Revenue going to be another Minister

who does not listen to representations made by the Minister of Agriculture?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member is confusing two things. First of all, the changes in the Income Tax Act, including, for instance, changes in the tenor of Section 31 which are the responsibility of the Minister of Finance, and I think that in this case, the Minister of Finance has a good understanding of what these representations are about, and if the Minister should decide to make any changes in Section 31 of the Income Tax Act, he will do so at the appropriate time. Second, it is wrong to believe that a decision in one specific case will necessarily lead to a different interpretation in all other cases covered by Section 31 of the Income Tax Act, and I would invite the Hon. Member to compare any cases he may know about that involve infringements of Section 31 of the Income Tax Act, with the case to which he is referring. He will realize that he cannot generalize to that extent.

[*English*]

PRINCIPLE OF SELF ASSESSMENT BY TAXPAYERS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the same Minister, who by now has to be aware that there is widespread alarm, bitterness and, yes, even fear at the Liberal Government's escalating use of third party demands on banks and others in its attempt to grab taxpayers' funds where taxes are deemed to be owed. Is the Liberal Government abandoning the principle of self assessment? As my colleague said, is the Liberal Government abandoning the principle of "innocent until proven guilty"? Has the citizen lost all protection from arbitrary measures being taken by assessors and collectors?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the present Government did not make a single change in the Income Tax Act until such changes were adopted by Parliament. It is unfortunate that the Hon. Member's ignorance of the Income Tax Act is leading him to ask such questions and to insinuate publicly certain facts that are totally false. If the Hon. Member refers to Section 224 and following of the Income Tax Act and considers current practice and the time that elapses before we put a garnishee on wages or accounts, he will realize that this practice has not changed from what it was in the past. It is just his own ignorance that is looking for ways to prove itself!

[*English*]

OFFICIAL'S TELEPHONE CALL TO MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Mr. Speaker, a year ago the manager of a small branch of a bank was unlikely to ever see or hear of a third party demand. A bank manager who saw two in the previous two years has had 18 in his branch alone this year.

On November 24 last, as reported at page 29152 of *Hansard*, between 1130 and 1140 hours I drew attention to the escalating use of arbitrary power by Revenue Canada officials. At 1235 hours, one hour later, my Ottawa office received a call from a Revenue Canada investigator in Vancouver on a personal tax matter. Can the Minister assure me that this call was only coincidence, that I was not being harassed and my right and duty to speak out on behalf of constituents was not being interfered with?

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am sure it was just a coincidence.

[*English*]

DIRECTIONS GIVEN TO TAX ASSESSORS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I have a simple question for the same Minister. It allows for a yes or no answer. Are Revenue Canada assessors in Cambridge, Ontario, or anywhere else in Canada, directed to meet a quota of tax assessed?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I can inform the Hon. Member that we are trying to ensure that National Revenue auditors do their work as equitably as possible, and that Canadian taxpayers who fail to pay their taxes are called on and invited to complete their tax returns on a voluntary basis. If they fail to do so voluntarily, we assess them according to the tax they must pay.

[*English*]

QUOTA SYSTEM INQUIRY

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I am then assuming that the answer is yes, there is a quota system in place. Is that correct?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member can draw all the conclusions he likes. What he should do is look at the answers and draw conclusions that are consistent with the premises given in those answers.

[*English*]

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Who is assigning these assessors—

Some Hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has conceded a question and supplementary to the Right Hon. Member. A final supplementary—the Right Hon. Member for Yellowhead.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO ASSESSORS

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Yellowhead): Will the Minister of National Revenue tell this House who is assigning these quotas to assessors? Is it the Minister, or is it people in the field? Who is assigning those quotas?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member needs very clear answers to his questions. I can inform him that we do not operate under a quota system, that the people who are responsible for auditing and making assessments do so, when necessary according to the need existing in their regions and not according to a specific quota system, as the Hon. Member seems to be saying.

* * *

[*English*]

ENERGY

REQUEST THAT AUDITOR GENERAL REVIEW USE OF PETROLEUM INCENTIVES PROGRAM GRANTS

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, pertaining to what appears to be building up as a very serious concern over the abuse of $8 billion in PIP grants over the last few years. Is the Minister prepared to request the Auditor General to examine these PIP grants to determine whether or not they have been applied to meet the legal objectives of the National Energy Program? Also, is he currently conducting an internal examination of his Department's use of those funds, and, if so, will he be making that investigation public through this House?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I checked into the problem some weeks ago and the information I have so far is that no one has been able to point to any abuse of this system. The expenditures under the PIP program are made according to the law voted by this Parliament. If the Hon. Member has some specific cases of abuse he should let me know, and I will certainly investigate the allegations with pleasure.

As to the Auditor General, I think the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources is the object of a review by the Auditor General. In his report he has not pointed out any abuses in that system.

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE EXAMINATION OF USE OF GRANTS

Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I would point out just one very small concern of many expressed, that is, that the diversion of $50 million from CHIP, the Conservation Program, into petroleum incentives is one of many, many abuses.

• (1450)

If the Minister is not prepared at least to ask the Auditor General to inquire specifically into the appropriate use of PIP grants, would he be prepared to put before this House a motion of reference to allow the committee on national resources to examine the entire question, to bring it out into the public eye and let the people have a look at what may amount to one of the largest scandals this country has even seen?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am always available to appear before the Committee and to answer questions on this subject. However, I have not been invited to do so. I think it would be irresponsible of me to assume there are abuses after making my own enquiries and having no reason to believe that was the case. Now, the Hon. Member is making a specific reference, namely that there allegedly was a transfer of funds from one program to another. I am not aware of that. I shall make enquiries, but I think that if there had been a transfer of funds, I should have been informed, and I assume there was none, but if there was, I shall inform the Hon. Member as soon as possible.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL REVENUE

INSTRUCTIONS GIVEN TO TAX ASSESSORS

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of National Revenue. Could the Minister explain to the House how the term, "The needs that exist in a particular region", differs from a quota system?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I said before there was no quota system and that if any failure to comply with the Act in a specific area became evident at the auditing stage, areas where such occurrences were most frequent would require more auditing.

[*English*]

QUOTA SYSTEM INQUIRY

Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. Is the quota system that is in effect in the Minister's Department based upon regional representation of political Parties, or is it ad hoc?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I think you yourself will agree that the Hon. Mem-

ber's question is not relevant since there are no such quota systems.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

DEPARTMENT'S METHODS OF MAKING ECONOMIC AND FISCAL FORECASTS

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. Has the Minister taken any steps to improve, correct, or change the methods of economic forecasting and fiscal forecasting in his Department which have been found to be inaccurate, or misleading, or inappropriate, by the Auditor General? If so; what steps has he taken? Can he guarantee the House that forecasts in the future have a better chance of being more accurate than those in the past?

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, forecasts in the private sector, as in the public sector, and as in a number of international institutions, have proved amazingly inaccurate in the last number of years, including forecasts made by my predecessor, the current Minister for St. John's West. The Hon. Member knows that forecasts have been very difficult to make on a very accurate basis in the last few years. Technical studies are being carried out in all kinds of organizations to see whether steps can be taken to improve forecasts.

My officials certainly did a pretty good job of their forecasts in my last budget. Up to now the forecasts as far as deficits are concerned, for instance, are pretty well on target. I cannot guarantee the Hon. Member that they will remain exact and that there will not be discrepancies between forecasts and realities. Forecasts are only that—projections and speculations about what the situation might be during a specific period of time. As we know, the world changes all the time.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S FINDINGS

Hon. John C. Crosbie (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance is only marginally better than his predecessor, and far worse than his predecessor before his predecessor. I put it to the Minister that the Auditor General has found that the forecasting methods of his Department, both with respect to the economic forecasts and fiscal forecasts, the fiscal framework, are inadequate and incorrect in many respects. Is that correct? What steps is the Minister taking to change the forecasting methods? The whole fiscal framework of Government depends upon the methods used and, as the Minister knows, they have had deplorable results in the last few years. What steps has the Minister taken to correct what the Auditor General has apparently found? Let us have some specificity please, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Marc Lalonde (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the most deplorable results occurred in December, 1979. It has been improving ever since.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR INSTALLATION OF NEW RADIO TRANSMITTER IN WINNIPEG

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Communications. About a week ago it was announced that CBC would proceed with a $350 million construction program in Toronto to replace its antiquated facilities. At the same time as CBC is doing that, Mr. Speaker, in Winnipeg CBC Radio is broadcasting on a transmitter which is so antiquated that very frequently there are outages. There is just no program coming on the air for anywhere from 30 seconds to four or five minutes.

Mr. Nielsen: Prime time.

Mr. Orlikow: CBC in Winnipeg has the weakest signal of any radio station in Manitoba. Would the Minister urge the CBC to put the replacement of its radio transmitter in Winnipeg on the same priority list as that very expensive change in Toronto?

Hon. Francis Fox (Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, we are going to build the Toronto facilities basically by using the money paid by the CBC for leasing space in 22 different buildings in downtown Toronto and going into a consortium with the private sector on a lease-purchase agreement, with virtually no capital funding on the part of the CBC or the federal Government. The CBC and the federal Government are concerned with the situation in Winnipeg. We have asked the CBC to examine the present situation of its capital equipment in Winnipeg with a view to try to improve that capital equipment as soon as possible.

* * *

NATIONAL REVENUE

DEPARTMENT'S TREATMENT OF JAPANESE FIRM ESTABLISHED IN CANADA

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Revenue, and I believe he is back there somewhere.

An Hon. Member: Terrorized.

Mr. Fennell: I do not know whether he is terrorized or not, but I will start with my question, Mr. Speaker. The minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is wrestling with the auto task force report. While this is going on he has indicated that he is encouraging Canadian content. What right does the Minister of Revenue have continually to harass Japanese manufacturers

who established an industry in this country? I am giving him the example of Makita Tool.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): I missed part of the Hon. Member's question, and I apologize. I did get the name of the company to which he referred at the end of his question. The Hon. Member will recall that we examined this particular case very carefully and that on certain points we agreed with the company's stand and made it possible for them to increase their investments. If I remember correctly, there was another problem which we were unfortunately unable to resolve because of the consequences it might have, but I am willing to review the matter at the Hon. Member's request.

[*English*]

CANADIAN CONTENT ENCOURAGEMENT FOR AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Revenue made a mistake in the first case and allowed them $200,000 back. He then found a second case which he attacked them on. Now he has found a third case, on a third product coming in from Japan before they started manufacturing in Canada. He is trying to recover the $200,000 which he lost in the one he gave up in the first place. Mr. Speaker, I request this Minister to lay off Japanese manufacturers whom we are trying to encourage to come into Canada to increase the Canadian content of automobiles in this country.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Pierre Bussières (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I cannot tolerate the way the Hon. Member is confusing the issue. I remember looking at this case very carefully. The Hon. Member may choose to think our decisions are arbitrary, but I would ask him to look at the facts. People who make investments must do so according to the laws of our country. We are trying to see to it that those laws are making it possible for investments to be made in this country as advantageously as possible.

* * *

[*English*]

METRIC CONVERSION

REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF MERCHANTS

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who has the responsibility for forcing merchants to convert to the metric system. Now that it has been ruled that the imperial system can again be used, will the Minister reimburse those who were forced, at their own expense, to convert?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the Hon. Member's question. There has been no enforcement. In fact in areas where traders have been encouraged to buy scales there has been a government incentive program that has been extremely generous.

• (1500)

GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the same Minister. In light of the fact that the Government has been advised to pay the court costs in the case of the two gentlemen involved in the metric conversion in Toronto, does the Government not feel some responsibility to reimburse those whom they have forced to spend thousands of dollars for nothing?

Hon. Judy Erola (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the Hon. Member is aware that this Government has launched an appeal.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

DISPOSITION OF ITEMS ON ORDER PAPER

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in anticipation of the completion of today's business and the likelihood of prorogation of the House tomorrow. My question is directed to the Government House Leader and concerns some of the outstanding matters that remain on the Order Paper of this session, in the hope that the Government will carry them over and place them on the Order Paper in the upcoming session in the same position that they now enjoy on the Order Paper.

Of course, my first concern has to be with the seven outstanding reports of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure. We would not like to see those reports die. We would like to see them resume their position on the Order Paper in the same place they are now.

The same would apply to Bill C-12, the Bill with respect to bankruptcies which has been hanging around now for some eight years and has gone through a substantial portion of the parliamentary machinery this session. We would like to see that Bill restored to the Order Paper in the same position in the forthcoming session as it now enjoys.

The same also applies to Bill C-653 with respect to the Government's intentions, as I understand them, to incorporate the sentiments expressed in Bill C-653 in Bill C-12.

The Committee on Pension Reform has been sitting and has done considerable work. It would be a shame to see that die with the death of this session. We would like to see an order of the House which would ensure that all of the evidence taken by that Committee would find a place on the Order Paper in the same position in the next session as it enjoys now.

The same sentiments apply to the Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration since that Committee has done a good deal of work which should not die.

Likewise, the Joint Committee on Senate Reform has done a good deal of work and collected a lot of evidence which should carry on in the next session in the same position it is in now so that the work of the Committee is not lost.

The same sentiments apply to the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments. There are several reports on the Order Paper now awaiting motions to concur. We believe that those motions should also find their way on to the Order Paper immediately upon the commencement of the new session so that that work is not lost.

The work and the several reports of the Public Accounts Committee should not die. As the Government House Leader knows, those reports indeed go back to 1978. Surely they should be restored and hopefully dealt with in whatever time remains in the next full session of the House.

There may be others that I have not mentioned and which the Government wants to see take their place on the Order Paper in the same position as they enjoy now. Likewise, there may be some work of the House now on the Order Paper that the New Democratic Party might wish to see on the Order Paper in the next session. I would suggest, in order that we might come to some agreement before prorogation tomorrow, that perhaps a House Leaders' meeting be held some time today to reach some common ground on these matters. That might appeal to the Government House Leader and the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain.

While the Government House Leader is answering that question, would he also indicate to the House whether we will be having a Question Period tomorrow or what time frame he has in mind with respect to the time of prorogation.

I am just informed by my colleague, the critic of the Minister of State for Finance, that the Finance Committee has recomended that the subject matter of Bill C-233 be carried on into the next session so that that work is not lost.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to indicate that I am not in a position at the moment to agree on the continuation of Bill C-12 at its present stage. I am working feverishly to get some understanding on that. I hope to be able to report on that some time in the late afternoon.

With respect to Bill C-653, I agree entirely with the Opposition House Leader in asking, as I have many times in the past, that the Bill or one reflecting the substance of that Bill should be proceeded with in the next session, because we have been trying to have it addressed for the last six months.

On the question of the other matters, I am quite prepared to see those matters carried over. I would like to suggest, in addition to those items raised by my colleague for Yukon, that the Special Committee on the Disabled and the Handicapped be allowed to continue until such time as a determination is made as to whether or not there will be a subcommittee set up to carry on the work of that Committee. As well, I would suggest that the Subcommittee on Acid Rain be given status now in order to carry their work forward into the next session of Parliament, because it has already established its winter agenda.

The Committee on Visible Minorities should—

Mr. Pinard: That was settled last week.

Mr. Deans: I am informed that that has been settled, but I would appreciate having those others dealt with and I will get back to the House Leaders as soon as I can with respect to Bill C-12.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, we have discussed most of these items in a House Leaders' meeting which we held last week. I will take these items one by one and if there is anything else left to be discussed we will have a House Leaders' meeting at four o'clock this afternoon.

[*Translation*]

First, with respect to the reports on parliamentary reform, two things must be kept in mind. The first is that it is not true that the reports will die on the Order Paper. The reports are there to stay. They are part of the public domain. They are known. They can be used at any time in the future, including during the next session.

Second thing, no, we do not agree that they should appear on the Order Paper at the stage where they are now because the Opposition wants to use them as a means to filibuster, whereas we consider that parliamentary reform is too important and that, as can be seen on today's Order Paper, there should not be 200 notices of motions to use as dilatory tactics. On the other hand, I have offered—and the offer stands—to my colleagues of the Opposition to reinstate those reports on the Order Paper under Government Business. If that is not necessary, if they agree to that, good! If they do not agree, too bad!

Second, Bill C-12 is a good suggestion. We will wait for the answer of the New Democratic Party, but that can be settled early in the new session and there is no need to move a motion in this session.

Third, if Bill C-153 is not necessary in this session, we will consider it in the new session.

Fourth, the Committee on Pension Reform is a special Committee, and I understand that a report will be tabled in a few minutes.

Fifth, we do not have to be concerned about the report of the Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration in this session because it originates from a standing committee. We can very well consider it at the beginning of the new session.

Sixth, concerning the Joint Committee on Senate Reform, I have been advised that a report will be tabled in a few minutes.

Seventh, about the Committee on Regulations and Other Statutory Instruments, the answer is no.

Eighth, with respect to the reports of the Committee on Public Accounts, the answer is no. And in the last two cases, the answer is no because, considering their position on the Order Paper, the Opposition could use them as dilatory tactics to prevent the House from proceeding normally to the Orders of the Day, particularly Government Orders.

Ninth, concerning the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs as well as Bill C-233, the answer is no, but that can be the subject of discussions early in the new session. Should a meeting of House leaders be necessary, it would take place at 4 o'clock. All my colleagues need do is to let me know.

As to a Question Period tomorrow, maybe there will be one, maybe there will not. As soon as the Senate is ready to give Royal Assent to all the Bills referred to it between now and the end of the day, we will have prorogation. If it is 2.05 p.m., we will go to the Senate at 2.05 p.m.; if it is 3.30 p.m., we will go to the Senate at 3.30 p.m. However, out of respect for the Senate, the other House, it would be presumptuous on our part in the House of Commons to predict the exact time of prorogation. But I think my colleagues of the Opposition are concerned or interested to know whether there is a possibility that we might not have a Question Period tomorrow. Theoretically, the answer is yes. And if the Senate is prepared to have Royal Assent at 2.15 p.m., we will go there at 2.15 p.m. We will then have prorogation.

On the subject of finance, since my colleague has asked me a question—

● (1510)

[*English*]

The Hon. Member raised the question of finance. He knows that we tabled a notice of Ways and Means motion last Friday, the purpose of this not being to deal with the Income Tax Act, which will follow in this next session, but to give fair warning to the Opposition to have a look at the Ways and Means motion. If the Opposition agrees with the Bill we can, with the consent of the Opposition, introduce the Bill today and its Members can look at the legislation and be in a position to debate it early after we commence debate on the Speech from the Throne in December. I am hereby giving the Opposition notice that our intent will be, unless we give another kind of notice, to try to deal with and complete debate on the Income Tax Act as early as possible this year. That is why we gave notice of the Ways and Means motion last Friday. By consent we could table the Bill today. If we do not have that consent, we will seek it at the beginning of the new session. Our purpose is to inform and to give sufficient advance notice to the Opposition in order to prepare. I am sure the Opposition will not complain about that.

Concerning the Subcommittee on the Disabled and the Subcommittee on Acid Rain, I am informed that these matters can be dealt with at the beginning of a new session.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the matter of the Bill to implement the Ways and Means resolution now on the Order Paper, the income tax Bill, I thank the Government House Leader for his courtesy. Since the Ways and Means motion itself sets forth verbatim exactly what the Bill will contain, his courtesy in giving us that Ways and Means motion is ample notice to us and we will expect the Bill itself immediately the new session comes along. With respect to any consent necessary to dispense with Standing Orders, we can meet that problem when it arises.

I really deeply regret the decision of the Government House Leader not to restore on the Order Paper the several motions to concur in the reports of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments, just as I deeply regret the Government's decision not to restore on the Order Paper the reports of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. He and I take a different view with respect to the process that applies to the life of these reports on prorogation. Under our practices here those reports and all of the evidence will die with prorogation. The Government House Leader shakes his head in the negative. He says that the reports are in the public domain. Sure, they are in the public domain. They are on the library shelf, but unless the Government decides to bring them back into the House there is nothing that Members of the House can do about them.

That applies with equal force to the decision of the Government not to allow the reports of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure to resume the same position which they now enjoy on the Order Paper. What the Government is suggesting when it says it is prepared to bring the reports back but only as Government business—only as Government Orders—is that the Opposition will not have any right to exercise the privilege of moving concurrence if that is what they wish to do. The decision will rest entirely with the Government as to whether any of these reports, and there are seven outstanding, will be adopted. That is not the spirit of reform, particularly not when we have seven excellent, outstanding reports produced by a committee with absolute unanimity on the part of all three Parties. Now the Government wants to put those reports under Government Orders, that being the only condition on which the Government will restore them to the Order Paper. That seems to me to destroy the kind of impartial approach which members of that committee took with respect to the question of reform. The reports should be restored and they should be restored as they are now.

All of the motions to concur which are set down were set down, not for the purpose of obstructing, if that is the Government House Leader's idea, but because of an unfavourable ruling of the Chair, which I do not criticize at this time, with respect to the right of a Member of the House who is present to move concurrence in a report standing by way of a motion in the name of another Member who is absent. That is the reason for the duplication and it is the kind of situation we get into when we are confronted with that kind of ruling, which I do not criticize. All of those 74 pages of Members' names would not be on the Order Paper had the ruling been, as I thought it should have been at the time, to follow previous practices of the House as they are followed in other instances.

I welcome a House Leaders' meeting this afternoon to discuss these matters in the hope that we can get the Government House Leader to reconsider these matters, particularly in view of all of the years of work that have gone into all of these reports which will go down the tube with prorogation unless they are restored to the Order Paper immediately upon resumption of a new session.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to see a mechanism worked out whereby we could actually deal with the reports themselves. Having been a member of the Special Committee, having served as one of the vice-chairmen for a period of time, I want to say that the work done by the Committee was done in good faith. I think the good faith was exemplified by Members from all sides of the House. I am hopeful, notwithstanding the decision not to restore the matter as a motion in the name of the Committee but rather as a Government motion, that some commitment might be forthcoming to allow the House to deal with and dispose of the recommendations that were made.

We have taken only one tiny step toward improving the Standing Orders of the House of Commons on the way toward parliamentary reform. Parliamentary reform is a much larger question than simply the day to day operations of the House of Commons. I would commend to the Government House Leader the thought that we should today, hopefully, come to an understanding that we will find a way to deal with those reports in the House of Commons at an early moment. We can then begin yet another series of trials on some new measures that I hope—I am optimistic—and will go as far as to say will improve the quality of the House of Commons, the committees of the House of Commons and will improve methods of dealing with matters pertaining to the House of Commons.

• (1520)

While I am on my feet and on a matter which is related to House business, although only obscurely, I would like to say on behalf of the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River that we want to withdraw Motion No. 6, our opposition to vote 55b, which may help to expedite proceedings somewhat later in the day. I just want to inform the House that we will not be calling for a vote on that particular motion later today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement of the House that the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain, on behalf of the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River, will have consent to withdraw the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nielsen: No, Mr. Speaker. I do not know on what the Hon. Member for Hamilton Mountain is attempting to get consent. I have had to notice of this. He takes me completely by surprise.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member is seeking consent to withdraw a motion of objection to one item in the Estimates, thereby making unnecessary one of the votes scheduled for this evening.

Mr. Nielsen: Let us discuss that and seek consent a little later today. I do not even know the subject matter of the notice of objection, but there is no reason we cannot come to an agreement later in the day, if necessary.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order with respect to concurrence in the seventh report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure. I just want to point out to the Government House Leader, in case he is not already aware, that five of the seven outstanding reports flow from the third report under which the House is now operating provisionally and in fact are consequential. For example, the agreement whereby committees would be reduced to ten was undertaken with the understanding that we would be moving to legislative committees, 20 in number, and thus providing an opportunity for more Members to participate in the legislative process at committee stage, especially on important Bills.

Also I point out to the Government House Leader as one who participated in the Special Committee from its commencement until the end that many hours were invested in that Committee by many Members of the House. Millions of dollars of taxpayers' money were used to finance that Committee, the calling of witnesses and trips to Washington and London. Is it the view of the Government now that it will not proceed with at least five of the seven reports which are consequential and flow from the third report under which the House is now operating provisionally?

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, the reports of the parliamentary reform committee do not die. They are in the public domain, they are known, and they may be and will be used in total or in part in the future. That could be in the next session. It is not necessary for them to appear on the Order Paper in the new session. Nevertheless, I have proposed to the Opposition that we allow these reports to be printed on the Order Paper in the new session under Government business, because there is absolutely no way we would allow those reports, on which there are 200 notices of motions, to be put before Government business every day. We went through the sad experience of seeing the Official Opposition using those important reports on parliamentary reform during the Crow debate for the purpose of delay. We will not accept the use of parliamentary reform in the future to delay again.

We want parliamentary reform to take place. We are conducting now a major experiment. We are negotiating some fine tuning of the experiment. My colleagues, the House Leaders, know that very well. We are even using some of the dispositions included in the additional reports for the purpose of fine tuning in the midst of our negotiations. However, there is no way we will allow the Opposition to have the freedom to move concurrence in those reports 200 times before we reach Government business in the new session. It is absolutely unnecessary because the reports will always be useful and will be used in the future. We are suggesting that they be put on the Order Paper under the control of the Government. It is the responsibility of the Government to establish the Order of the Day

every day in the House of Commons. I am sure that my colleagues opposite know and understand what I am saying.

To say that we are not interested in those reports is wrong. On the contrary, we think they are most important. We have accepted the ongoing experiment. We want to fine tune this experiment. I see no point in trying to have five, six or seven other reports implemented without previous experimentation, if we saw it necessary to conduct an experiment on the third report before implementing it.

The fact that we are proroguing does not kill any report. There is no need for the reports to appear on any Order Paper. I challenge my hon. colleague to estimate the number of people who read the Order Paper every day. There are no consequences at all. However, to please the Opposition, we would not mind having those motions appear under Government business or under Government Orders in the new session. If they do not want that, fine, but they will not see them in the state they appear now under 200 notices of motions to concur. They are notices of obstruction, and this is totally unacceptable to the Government.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, the Minister does not seem to understand.

Mr. Pinard: Yes, I do.

Mr. McGrath: Without the implementation of and concurrence in the recommendations contained in at least three of those reports—I believe it is the fifth, six and seventh—there is no point in continuing with the provisional rules, because they flow from and are consequential to the rules under which we are now operating. For example, dealing with the starting up of committees or dealing with legislative committees, the Minister knows that unless he deals with it there can be no consideration for extending the rules.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but this is a subjective, personal interpretation by the Hon. Member; it is not the truth. This is not what those additional reports mean. The experiment on the third report is an experiment in itself. The additional reports may be considered in our negotiations to fine tune the experiment, but it is not correct to pretend that we absolutely need to consider the other three reports in order to come to a final conclusion on the experiment we are now making.

May I remind the Hon. Member of what was corroborated by the members of the Special Committee, the Chairman, the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton and others. There was an understanding among the members of the Committee not to move concurrence in any of those additional reports. I do not understand why the Hon. Member is now complaining that we will not allow this to occur in the future, if members of the committee had a gentlemen's agreement not to move concurrence in those reports.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, in the interests of the record—and I think it is important—if the Minister examines the last recorded session of the Committee, he will know full well the understanding was that there would not be a motion for concurrence in the House while the Committee was sitting.

Mr. Nielsen: While the Committee was sitting, that is right.

Mr. McGrath: That was the clear understanding—and it is a matter of record—even by his own Members, including the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton and the Hon. Member for Gatineau. It is on the record.

Mr. Pinard: The Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton is shaking his head.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, like all Hon. Members of the House, I am quite concerned that, as a result of some bitter debate or misunderstanding, all the advances the Committee was able to make and which the Government and the Opposition agreed to change, amend and make better our rules will be lost if we continue this harangue and bitter debate. In memory of the late Walter Baker who did a tremendous job on this particular Committee, I would like to say that the House Leaders should be allowed to go about their work and negotiate what they can to keep the rules the way they are, to improve them and to fine tune them, if they can.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, there is another untruth which is now on the record that cannot be allowed to stand. The Government House Leader talked about subjectivity, yet he is guilty of it himself. For him to say that any one of those motions to concur could be moved 200 times is patently false. Once they are moved, they then shift to Government Orders when the debate expires on them. He knows that he has the power to move that motion at any time he pleases after the mover of the motion completes his address. He knows as well as I do that the reason the names of the Members of the Opposition were put down against every one of those seven motions was because of a ruling of the Chair which, for the first time in my experience, prevents a Member present from moving a motion to concur standing in the name of a Member who is absent. That was the reason for it.

Mr. McGrath: Namely, the late Hon. Member for Nepean-Carleton.

● (1530)

Mr. Nielsen: There was no intention of obstructing, as the Government House Leader has charged. What is more, the truth of this statement is borne out by the fact that no attempt was made to have those motions moved since the time of the ruling of the Chair in that regard.

I should think that the House Leader would adhere to his own adjurations to the rest of us to be objective and non-political and to move with the spirit of the members of that Special Committee on parliamentary reform and allow the House as a whole to be seized of any question of reform. The reform of our rules and practices, Sir, is not normally the unilateral prerogative of the Government. It involves the co-operation of

all Hon. Members of the House because all Hon. Member are affected. If there is any one area in which the Government should not abrogate unto itself the sole discretion, it is in the area of parliamentary reform.

Perhaps it might assist the Government House Leader if I were to say to him that we would be quite happy to have those reports restored to the Order Paper without any motions to concur left on the Order Paper at all. Just bring back the reports.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, those are the words of what we call in French "un bon vieux renard". All the Hon. Member need do is to give 500 notices of motions once he has withdrawn the 200 and we will be faced with the same old problem again.

I am not saying that the Hon. Member is being subjective. In this case, he totally misunderstood my answer. In his reply, he described the way in which he can and might delay proceedings. He said it would be easy for the Government to move the adjournment of the debate on any motion to concur in those reports come the new session and then move to Government Orders. That is exactly what Conservative Members would like us to do. Every time we would move to adjourn debate, they would let the bell ring until six o'clock and would waste as many days as there are reports.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Pinard: They are saying oh, but they have done so in the past, Mr. Speaker. They did it three weeks ago when we were debating the Crow.

The Hon. Member has just given notice that he wants to save some ammunition for dilatory purposes in the future. We will not allow that to happen. I am simply telling him that we will not agree to reinstate those reports in a way which will allow the Opposition to unduly delay the work of the House of Commons. On the other hand, our offer still stands to put those reports under Government Orders even if it is not necessary to use those reports in the future, although we do intend to use those reports in the future.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, if I may make myself clear for the record, parliamentary reform is most important to the Government. We have proven in the past that we have been able to do something in the field of reform. We have done something in that field, we are now doing something, and we will do something in the future. However, we will not allow this very important subject to be used by the Opposition for the purposes of delaying unduly the business of the House and playing political games.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I would like to bring to the attention of the President of the Privy Council a Private Member's Bill No. 684 which stands in the name of the late Member for Nepean-Carleton, the Hon. Walter Baker. The President of the Privy Council will know that my colleague, the Hon. Member for Peterborough, and others have been attempting to have this Bill proceed through the parliamentary process. It is the Bill which would amend the Narcotics Act and specifically allow for the therapeutic use of heroin primarily for terminally ill cancer patients.

I wonder if the President of the Privy Council would take that situation to the House Leaders' meeting today in an attempt to see if we might be able to move at least the subject matter of that Bill forward. I recognize that, as a Member of the House, I could put the same Bill in my name, but I do think it would be fitting if we would be able, with our best intentions, to proceed with that Bill in the name of the late Hon. Member.

I ask the President of the Privy Council to consider that matter. I know that there is a technical problem involved whereby the Bill began as a justice matter and is actually a health matter. I know there is some question as to whether or not it should proceed through that channel, but I am sure that people of good will could work those details through. I ask him to consider that this afternoon.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if my hon. colleague is referring to a Private Member's Bill on which debate has already begun.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, debate did begin on June 1 of this year and was not concluded. There were a number of Hon. Members from all sides of the House who strongly endorsed the position of the late Hon. Member.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, I will look into that matter. I will inquire about it and will hopefully be in a position to make up my mind today if I get all of the facts. If I do not, I do not know if that matter can be dealt with at the beginning of the new session, but I will see what can be done.

Mr. Lefebvre: Mr. Speaker, as one who chaired the Special Committee to which reference has been made throughout the last half hour's debate, I point out once again how important it is that we did come to an understanding while the committee was holding its proceedings. The only way we can attempt parliamentary reform is to have an understanding and a consensus among all Members. This we were able to do within the committee. We knew that once the matter got into the political arena of the House of Commons, there was a danger that there would be political arguments from both sides of the House, and Hon. Members have that right.

I am already on record as stating that there was such an understanding in the Committee and, furthermore, members of the Committee had understood that they were not to be the watchdogs of their own reports and that it would be up to the House Leaders of the Parties to come to a consensus and bring those reports forward to Parliament for final discussion. I maintain that there was such an understanding and I agree completely with the words of the Hon. Member for Sarnia-Lambton. I hope that we can come to discuss the issue in a non-partisan fashion like the example set at Committee and

that we will see parliamentary reform. It will not happen, however, the way things have proceeded this afternoon.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

SENATE REFORM—PRESENTATION OF FIRST REPORT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. Paul J. Cosgrove (York-Scarborough): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour of tabling, in both official languages, the First Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Reform of the Senate of Canada.

[*English*]

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS—PRESENTATION OF TWENTY-FIFTH AND TWENTY-SIXTH REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth reports of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Will the last two Hon. Members who presented reports please indicate whether they intend to move concurrence later this day?

Mr. Pinard: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to move concurrence today. The reports have been made and the evidence is tabled. It is there to be used in a motion at the beginning of the new session. At that time, we will be able to refer to these reports which are being tabled today and to the evidence which they contain. It is not necessary to concur in those reports today. We will not move concurrence but will be in a position, come the new session, to be able to refer to the evidence contained within the reports tabled today.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, that is true. However, it again depends entirely upon the discretion of the Government. It can only be done if the Government brings forward a motion. We on this side of the House are prepared to give concurrence to these reports that are being presented today without debate so that we can be assured that they will be on the Order Paper in the next session without having to rely on the discretion of the Government.

The Government could well decide not to bring any motion forward and we would never see these reports again. We are now prepared to concur in them today without debate if the Government wishes to proceed in that fashion so it may give all Hon. Members the assurance that we will see those reports again.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague has complained because we are acting as a Government. We are acting as a Government and we do govern. We will see what will happen come the new session. I have already told him it was my inclination to agree to that. I do not see why we would not agree to move the proper motion. I take good note of the consent now offered by my colleague to get those motions passed without debate, but we will not move concurrence today. Come the new session we will govern again.

• (1540)

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, it is about time they started to govern. We are prepared to give consent today on the basis of what we see today. We are not prepared to give blanket consent now for what we may or may not see in a new session.

PENSION REFORM—PRESENTATION OF SECOND REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Doug Frith (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House the second report of the Special Committee on Pension Reform.

* * *

CANADA MUSEUMS CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION

TABLING OF FIRST ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Jack Burghardt (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 46(2) I have the honour to table in both official languages copies of the first annual report of the Canada Museums Construction Corporation.

* * *

PETITIONS

MR. BERGER—SENTENCING OF DR. JOSEPH BEGUN IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. David Berger (Laurier): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and duty to present a petition to the House this afternoon. This petition, signed by 147 concerned Canadians, calls upon the Government of Canada to protest to the Government of the U.S.S.R. the savage sentence imposed on Dr. Joseph Begun on November 6, 1982. Dr. Begun, a resident of Moscow, was arrested and charged under Article 70 of the criminal code of the U.S.S.R. with disseminating material defamatory to the state. The charges were issued because of Dr. Begun's teaching of the Hebrew language and his desire to live in Israel. The sentencing of Dr. Begun is a flagrant violation of the Helsinki Act and the civilized norms of justice. As in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

MR. CLARK (BRANDON-SOURIS)—UNIVERSAL AMNESTY FOR PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE

Mr. Lee Clark (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House today a petition signed by many Manitobans, the majority of whom are from my constituency of Brandon-Souris. They petition the House and are of the opinion that thousands of men and women are in prison throughout the world because of their political and religious beliefs. Others are held because of their colour or ethnic origin. These people are prisoners of conscience as none has used or advocated violence.

Therefore, the undersigned petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to call for universal amnesty for all prisoners of conscience, and as in duty bound your petitioners will ever pray.

* * *

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS CONTROL ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-700, an Act to provide for the control of conflicts of interest in Government affairs.

Some Hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Crosby: Mr. Speaker, may I briefly explain the provisions of the Bill which has just been introduced. The question of what personal activity constitutes a conflict of interest for Members of the Government and officers of the Crown is obscure at best. The purpose of this Bill is to establish clear rules to determine what activity will be considered a conflict of interest for Ministers and Government officers. The Bill also directs the Deputy Registrar General to report conflict of interest cases to the Federal Court of Canada so that the court can take appropriate action to protect the public interest.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motions.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, these are the motions the Government House Leader was speaking about. May I suggest, as I have been doing ever since the ruling of the Chair, that you simply call upon Members in whose name the motions stand and ask, if they wish to discuss it today, that they rise. I might add that if I had any intention of scuppering prorogation or of obstructing, I could move one of those motions now.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are there any Hon. Members who have motions standing in their name who wish to be recognized at this point? There are none. We will proceed to Questions on the Order Paper.

[*Translation*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 4,970, 4,977, 4,978, 4,985, 5,019, 5,264 and 5,306.

[*Text*]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Question No. 4,970—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What is the composition of the Board of Directors of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority and what is the address and occupation of each individual?

2. What is the compensation and what are all the benefits paid to the chairperson, directors, president and vice-presidents of the Authority?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority advises as follows:

1. The affairs of the Authority are administered by a President and two members. These are their only occupations.

W. A. O'Neil, President, Place de Ville Tower "A", 320 Queen St., Ottawa, K1R 5A3.

W. F. Blair, member, Place de Ville Tower "A", 320 Queen St., Ottawa, K1R 5A3.

The position of vice-president is vacant.

2. The President is in the GIC-8 category ($69,530-$81,830) and the only member presently in office is in the GIC-5 category ($53,950-$63,490). The President and the member's travel and incidental expenses that are related to their official duties are paid by the Authority.

GRAND TRUNK CORP. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Question No. 4,977—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What is the composition of the Board of Directors of the Grand Trunk Corporation and what is the address and occupation of each individual?

2. What is the compensation and what are all the benefits paid to the chairperson, directors, president and vice-presidents of the Corporation?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways is advised by the Grand Trunk Corporation as follows:

1. Mr. J. H. Burdakin, President, Grand Trunk Corporation, 131 West Lafayette, Detroit, Mich. 48226.

Mr. R. S. Gillette, Chairman of the Board, National Life Insurance Co., National Life Drive, Montpelier, Vermont 05602.

Mr. James S. Hinds, Q.C., Hinds, Sinclair & Holub, Barristers & Solicitors, 18 Alder Street, S., Sudbury, Ontario, P3C 4J2.

Mr. R. E. Lawless, President and Chief Operating Officer, CN Rail, P.O. Box 8100, Montreal, Quebec H3C 3N4.

Dr. J. M. LeClair, President and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian National Railway Company, P.O. Box 8100, Montreal, Quebec H3C 3N4.

Mr. Yvon H. Masse, Sr. Corporate Vice-President and Chief Financial Officer, Canadian National Railway Company, P.O. Box 8100, Montreal, Quebec H3C 3N4.

Mr. V. G. Istock, Executive Vice-President, National Bank of Detroit, 611 Woodward Detroit, Michigan 48232

Mr. F. Ray Keyser, Jr., Chairman, Keyser, Crowley, Banse, Abell & Facey, Inc. 29 South Main Street, P.O. Box 975, Rutland, Vermont 05701.

Mr. F. D. Rosebrugh, President, Dover Corp. (Canada) Limited, Industrial Division, 31 Progress Court, Unit 10, Scarborough, Ontario M1G 3V5.

Mr. P. M. Turner, Group Vice-President, International Sealed Power Corporation, 100 Terrace Plaza, Muskegon, Michigan 49443.

2. The compensation and benefits paid to the senior executives of GTC are regarded as proprietary information because of the competition in the industry to recruit top management personnel.

CNR—BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Question No. 4,978—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What is the composition of the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railway Company and what is the address and occupation of each individual?

2. What is the compensation and what are all the benefits paid to the chairperson, directors, president and vice-presidents of the CNR?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows:

1. Hon. John Henry Horner, P.C. Chairman of the Board Canadian National Railway Company P.O. Box 8100 Montreal, P.Q.—H3C 3N4

Dr. Jean Maurice LeClair President and Chief Executive Officer Canadian National Railway Company P.O. Box 8100 Montreal, P.Q.—H3C 3N4

Mr. Giuseppe Di Battista Canadian Italian Trust 6995 boul. St. Laurent Montreal, Quebec H2S 3E1

Mr. James Sharp Hinds, Q.C. Hinds, Sinclair & Holub Barristers & Solicitors 18 Alder Street S. Sudbury, Ontario P3C 4J2

Mr. Benoit Joncas President Les Constructions Maritime du Golfe Inc. 99 boul. Dion Matane (Québec) G4W 3L8

Mr. Gary David Mandel Chartered Accountant 500 Bower Blvd. Winnipeg, Manitoba R3P 0L8

Mr. David George Alexander McLean Senior Partner McLean, Hungerford & Simon Barristers & Solicitors 555 Burrard Street Vancouver, B.C. V7X 1J8

Mr. Ewart Arthur Pratt President Steers Limited Austin Street—P.O. Box 12064 St. John's Nfld. A1B 3T5

Mr. Fred Donald Rosebrugh President, Industrial Division Dover Corporation (Canada) Limited 31 Progress Court, Unit no. 10 Scarborough, Ontario M1G 3V5

Mr. John Tulloch Sears Department of Business Administration St. Francix-Xavier University Antigonish, Nova Scotia B2G 1C0

Mr. George T. Urquhart Chairman of the Board Enheat Inc. Sackville, New Brunswick E0A 3C0

2. The compensation and benefits paid to the senior executives of CN are regarded as proprietary information because of the competition in the industry to recruit top management personnel.

AIR CANADA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Question No. 4,985—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What is the composition of the Board of Directors of Air Canada and what is the address and occupation of each individual?

2. What is the compensation and what are all the benefits paid to the chairperson, directors, president and vice-presidents of the Air Canada?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): The Management of Air Canada advises as follows:

1. See list below.

2. Compensation and benefits paid to the senior executives of Air Canada are regarded as proprietary information because of the competition in the industry to recruit top management personnel.

René Amyot, Q.C. (Lawyer) Chairman of the Board 1, Place Ville Marie Montreal, Quebec H3B 3P7

Claude I. Taylor (Businessman) President & Chief Executive Officer 1, Place Ville Marie Montreal, Quebec H3B 3P7

I. H. Asper, Q.C. (Lawyer) Chairman & Chief Executive Officer CanWest Capital Corporation 1900-Lakeview Square Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3C 3H8

Jacques Bock, B.Sc. (Businessman) President Bock et Tétreau Inc. 601 Côte de Liesse, Coin de Stinson Montreal, Quebec H4N 2N1

Harry G. Colwell (Lawyer) Partner Gilbert, McGloan, Gillis Harbour Building 133 Prince William Street, Box 7174, Postal Station "A" Saint John, N.B. E2L 4S6

Michael G. DeGroote (Businessman) President & Chief Executive Officer Laidlaw Transportation Limited (est. 1961) 110 King Street West Suite 490 Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4S6

Geno F. Francolini, F.C.A. (Businessman) Vice Chairman of the Board Chief Executive Officer Livingston International Inc. Tillsonburg Town Center Suite 100, Tillsonburg, Ont. N4G 5A7

Lawrence C. Jolivet (Businessman) President, Oakwood Holdings Ltd., & Christopher Lawrence Ltd. 8th Floor, 595 Howe St. Vancouver, B.C. V6C 2T5

Arthur J. LeBlanc (Lawyer) Partner LeBlanc, MacDonald & Pickup Barristers & Solicitors 301 Pitt Street P.O. Box 700 Port Hawkesbury, N.S. B0E 2V0

Pierre Levasseur (Management Consultant) President Groupe Levasseur 910 LaGauchetière St. East Montreal, Quebec H2L 2N4

Mr. Robert S. Lucenti (Lawyer) Senior Partner Lucenti & Rivard 108 Main Street East North Bay, Ont. P1B 1A8

Prof. Lorna R. Marsden (Professor, Graduate Studies) 563 Spadina Avenue Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1

Department of Sociology University of Toronto

J. W. McLoughlan (Businessman) President McLoughlan Supplies Limited 22 Blackmarsh Road P.O. Box 877 St. John's, Nfld. A1C 5L7

W. T. Molloy (Lawyer) Senior Partner MacDermid & Company 905-201-21st Street E. Saskatoon, Sask. S7K 0B8

Branny Schepanovich (Lawyer) Barrister & Solicitor McCuaig Desrochers 1824 Royal Trust Tower Edmonton Centre Edmonton, Alberta T5J 2Z2

PETRO-CANADA—LOGO AND CORPORATE SIGNATURE

Question No. 5,019—**Mr. Clark (Yellowhead):**

1. (a) Which agency or agencies or person or persons, and working in what city or cities, conceived and designed the logo and corporate signature of Petro-Canada (b) what amount and on what date was each agency paid for these and any related services?

2. What means were employed by Petro-Canada to protect its logo and corporate signature from use by others either within, or external to, Canada?

3. Is Petro-Canada represented by any subsidiaries, agents or offices in other countries and, if so, in which other countries and by what other subsidiaries, agents or offices?

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Petro-Canada reports as follows:

1. (a) Three companies assisted Petro-Canada in the development of the logo and corporate signature of Petro-Canada. The principal contractor was Baker Lovick Communications of Calgary. Creative Research Group Limited of Toronto and Lippincott Margulies Ltd. of Hamilton, Bermuda (an affiliate of the New York firm of the same name) acted as subcontractors.

(b) From December, 1979 to July, 1980, a total amount of $433,961 was paid to Baker Lovick Communications of Calgary who paid the subcontractors.

2. The Petro-Canada logo is protected in Canada by copyright which belongs to Petro-Canada. In addition, Petro-Canada has obtained trade mark registrations under the Trade Marks Act in Canada both for the design portion of its logo and for the words "Petro-Canada". Petro-Canada has also been granted a notice published under Section 9 of the Trade Marks Act for the words "Petro-Canada", to provide a further form of statutory protection for its signature.

Outside Canada, the Petro-Canada logo and signature are protected by copyright in all countries of the world which belong the Berne Copright Convention. Petro-Canada has also acquired through use certain trade mark rights in those countries in which it has used its marks.

3. Yes.

Country	Subsidiary
Spain	Petro-Canada Espanola S.A.
Norway	Petro-Canada Norway A/S
United Kingdom	Petro-Canada (U.K.) Limited
U.S.A.	Asher American, Inc.
	Pacific Pipelines, Inc.

In addition, Petro-Canada Inc., the principal operating subsidiary for the Petro-Canada group, has registered offices in the People's Republic of China and in Italy.

Petro-Canada International Assistance Corporation, a subsidiary of Petro-Canada, in accordance with its mandate, carries on activities in a number of countries but has neither subsidiaries, offices, nor agents abroad.

TELEPHONE FOR HEARING IMPAIRED

Question No. 5,306—**Mr. Young:**

Is the Department of Supply and Services investigating the possibility of adopting a policy similar to the U.S. General Services Administration with regard to accessible telephones for the hearing impaired?

Hon. Charles Lapointe (Minister of Supply and Services): The Department of Supply and Services does not have any specific contracting policy concerning accessible telephones for the hearing impaired. Supply and Services responds to customer department requests for equipment supplied to the handicapped through the same procurement process as used for other goods and services. For more information on the initiatives taken by the Canadian Government, please refer to the news release of November 7, 1983, issued by the Department of Communications.

"CANADA PLACE"—EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Question No. 5,264—**Mr. Lambert:**

1. Has the Government decided to proceed with the contruction of "Canada Place" in Edmonton, Alberta, as the new location for centralized federal government offices and, if so, what is the precise location of the site?

2. What was the cost of acquiring the said site including the value of any land or buildings owned by the Government which may have been swapped for Province of Alberta land or buildings and for City of Edmonton land and/or buildings?

3. Are the buildings to be erected on a lease and buy back basis by private developers or contractors, or are they to be built for and by the Government or will they be on a straight lease from private developers?

4. Have the consulting engineers and architects been named and, if so, who are they?

5. What is the projected date of commencement of work on site?

6. What is the estimated complete cost in 1983 dollars?

7. What is the anticipated date of completion with projected date of occupation?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Public Works): 1. The Government has decided to proceed with the construction of "Canada Place" in Edmonton, Alberta. The 1.5 hectares Canada Place site fronts on Jasper Avenue and is bounded by

the Nova, Sunlife and Cidadel Theatre developments to the west, 102 Avenue to the north and 97th Street to the east.

2. The Canada Place site was acquired by way of a land exchange involving the Government of Canada, the Province of Alberta and the City of Edmonton.

On March 31, 1983 a tripartite agreement was executed whereby Public Works Canada agreed to convey the former Prince of Wales and Ortona Armouries valued at $8,800,000 and $1,500,000 respectively, the former Strathcona Post Office valued at $400,000 and a vacant industrial zoned property at 170 Street and 118 Avenue valued at $2,500,000 to the City of Edmonton along with the proceeds ($20,500,-000) received from the sale of the Federal Building to the Province of Alberta in exchange for the Canada Place site. The total value of the site was $33,700,000.

3. On March 17, 1983, Treasury Board gave approval in principle to proceed with the Canada Place project by means of a lease-purchase arrangement with a private developer. In doing so, the Government will be leasing the site to a developer on a long-term basis, and the developer will contract to design, construct and finance a building to be leased back to the Government. The improvements will revert back to the Crown upon the termination of the ground lease.

4. The developer for the "Canada Place" project has not yet been named. The developer will be responsible for assembling a project team which will include consulting engineers and architects.

5. The preparation of working drawings and the project construction phase is expected to take approximately 30 months, it is anticipated that this phase may commence as early as October, 1984.

6. The estimated cost of constructing the facility (excluding land costs) is $89,500,000 (October, 1983 constant dollars).

7. It is anticipated that the Canada Place project will be completed and occupied by mid-1987. The timing will ultimately depend on when a developer is chosen and contracted to undertake the project.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I ask the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The questions enumerated by the Parliamentary Secretary has been answered. Shall the remaining questions stand?

[*English*]

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in the dying days of this session to lament and regret deeply the Government's attitude with respect to starred questions. I will simply ask the Parliamentary Secretary again if he has any intention of answering my question and if so, could he give me an indication of when that might be.

Mr. Evans: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we intend to answer that question. In fact, half of the answer is now in our hands and we are attempting to get the other half. At the present moment the half that is in our hands measures almost one half inch thick. It is going to have to be made an Order for Return, Mr. Speaker; it simply cannot be read in this Chamber as a starred question is supposed to be, because it would take literally hours to read. The Hon. Member has obviously misused the starred question provision.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, the misinterpretation placed upon this by the Parliamentary Secretary is somewhat regrettable. The question could have been answered in two different ways, one verbal. The processes of the House are such that all he had to do was to rise in his place and indicate that an Order for Return should be granted. He had three months to do that. The information is in the computer so all he had to do was pull it out. It should not take ten minutes to get the answer.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the point. The only purpose of a starred question is to have an oral answer given in the House. If the Hon. Member knew it was going to take computer output to answer a question, then why was it put on as a starred question in the first place?

Mr. Blenkarn: Mr. Speaker, this is the third time in six or eight weeks that I have risen to inquire about question No. 1,641 which I asked on November 20, 1981, over three years ago. In each case the Parliamentary Secretary has said that the answer is coming, it will be available forthwith, or that he will attempt to do what he can, but obviously nothing has been done. The question is very simple: it asks whether the directors of the CNR get free passes on Air Canada. A yes or no answer would have been satisfactory. The answer really is that they probably do but they do not want to disclose it. They cannot tell why and they refuse to admit that this is an abuse—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member has the answer to his question. The Chair wonders why he had it on the Order Paper. Would the Parliamentary Secretary care to comment?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, again I will indicate that I will try to get an answer for the Hon. Member. If we look at the Standing Orders and at Beauchesne's with regard to Questions on the Order Paper it will be seen that question should not be put on the Order Paper where the answer is available in a public form elsewhere. I suggest that the answers to the questions that Hon. Members are putting on the Order Paper are available elsewhere. Members should not be taking up space on the Order Paper or the time of Parliament to ask questions when they can obtain the answers elsewhere.

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the last statement of the Parliamentary Secretary should go unchallenged. The Parliamentary Secretary is only a lackey whose job it is to get the answers to questions that Members of Parliament are entitled to ask. He has no right to make the decision on whether or not the answer is available from another source. If he would do his job rather than passing judgment on whether Members of Parliament are properly

fulfilling their function, he would be a lot better off and would do a much better job for his Party.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

● (1550)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

ATLANTIC FISHERIES RESTRUCTURING ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. De Bané that Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring fishery enterprises, be read the third time and do pass.

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this Bill for second reading, I ventured the opinion that it was one of the most important in the history of the Canadian fisheries. Since then, I believe it has acquired another distinction. I know of no other Bill affecting the fisheries which has moved through the House so rapidly and with such thorough scrutiny by all interested parties.

A great deal has happened in a very short time. As Hon. Members know, this Bill received second reading on November 18. Since then it has been the subject of intensive hearings before the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. The Committee, in a truly marathon effort, Mr. Speaker, held meetings which went far into the night, right through the week. In the case of the sessions, last Thursday we did not finish our work until 4.30 in the morning. Even yesterday at 11 p.m., I was appearing before the Senate Committee which was studying the same Bill. They were very well attended hearings. A cross-section of the industry was present. Inshore and offshore fishermen were both represented. So were the representatives of the similar independent processing companies of the region.

If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, I wished at times that the parliamentary television audience across Canada could have seen these hearings. It would have been a powerful advertisement for the benefits of an open parliamentary system. I can think of no interest which was not represented, no important concern or apprehension which was not expressed, no potential pitfall which was not explored. And all this was done in one week.

The industry, for its part, needs to look Government in the eye and make up its mind about its commitment and its intentions. You cannot legislate this kind of confidence, nor can you build it from a distance. You can, however, develop it through direct dialogue. I will not pretend that we have dispelled every single doubt in committee. However, we have made an impressive start toward improved confidence. One unfounded concern, which had become visible both in this House and outside it, was that the Government was coming into the Atlantic fishery industry to stay on a permanent basis. That concern emerged even after specific formal commitments were made, for instance, in the Newfoundland agreement and in public statements. I believe we have successfully dealt with these concerns. The Bill now contains a clause by which the federal Government commits itself to divestiture if the circumstances are right and as soon as the industry is profitable. On the other hand, and I think rightly so, I could not give an ironclad guarantee because it would be most imprudent to give such a commitment without being able to assess the particular circumstances of the moment. The intention is there, however. It is clear. It is included in the agreement we have reached, both with the Government of Newfoundland and the agreement in principle with the Government of Nova Scotia.

We have also added a clause to the Bill which sets up a systematic process of keeping Canadian taxpayers, who are now temporary shareholders of the industry, informed about the state of their investment. The Bill now calls for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to report to this House on an annual basis. Those reports, incidentally, will cover progress toward divestiture, if the Minister has some relevant information to give in that regard. However, again, while the intention is clear, I believe it would have been most imprudent to have accepted amendments which would have committed the Government, without regard to the circumstances, to follow only one course of action. On the other hand, if circumstances are right, the companies are profitable and suitable buyers are interested to invest, then, of course, the Government would be anxious to get out.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, we have been careful in these measures to avoid what one might call "institutional role conflict". We did not feel that the Department of Government which is responsible for managing the fisheries and for setting the ground rules, should even be a temporary shareholder in the industry. We were able to clarify this in committee by stipulating that the Government's share will not be held in the name of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. The moment he buys shares he will have to transfer them to another Minister, for instance, the Minister responsible for the Canada Development Investment Corporation.

More generally, Mr. Speaker, these hearings have helped to clarify the broad purpose of these measures. I believe it is now more generally understood, for instance, that this Bill is not simply a mechanism to ratify agreements between the federal Government and the Governments of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. I believe that the committee and the fishing industry also understand that it is not an appropriation Bill, that it does not deal in programs. If specific programs need to be set up in the future, that will be done subject to the normal budgetary and other procedures of Parliament.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my thanks to all Committee Members from all Parties in this House who, in addition to their co-operation, were also generous with their knowledge of the fishing industry and suggested various amendments that were accepted by the Government. The Committee's sittings were most instructive, but I hasten to add that the Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau), in addition to taking part in the sittings of the Parliamentary Committee, also sent, early this week, a long brief detailing various items of major importance to the Atlantic fisheries, and more particularly to New Brunswick. I want to take this opportunity to inform my hon. colleague that I read his brief with great interest, and that I intend to meet him as soon as possible to have a thorough discussion of the various points he raised, and I hope that at that time we shall be able to find positive solutions for the very basic concerns he raised and which arise from the need to provide stability for the fisheries and a fair apportioning of the jobs and profits to be generated by this industry in the various Atlantic regions, and especially in New Brunswick. I therefore wish to thank the Hon. Member for his brief.

[*English*]

I would also like to express our appreciation to the many witnesses who came at short notice, and in some cases, at no small inconvenience, to Ottawa for these hearings, and for giving their time and energy so freely when they were here. I am also, of course, very happy that the Ministers of Fisheries of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Labrador, or their representatives, came before our committee.

[*Translation*]

If I have one regret, it is that among all the Ministers of Fisheries, the only one who did not come personally or send a representative was the Quebec Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food. Fortunately, the board of directors of Pêcheurs-Unis and representatives of employees and unions appeared before the Committee to express their support for this legislation. I think this goes to show that the Canadian Government, not the Government of Quebec, has understood the aspirations of the parties concerned in Quebec's fishing industry. The Quebec Government acknowledged publicly that the ideological issues were more important than the welfare of the fishermen.

● (1600)

[*English*]

The time has now come to act on this Bill. The industry has been through traumatic times. Fishermen, processors, suppliers, everyone connected with this strategically important Atlantic industry has been in a state of uncertainty and confusion about the future. That in itself is an unhealthy state of affairs. It is important to replace uncertainty with a clear sense of purpose and direction. We must do so quickly. Time is precious and delay is costly. For instance, interest charges of about $1 million a week are accumulating on existing loans which will be rolled into equity once these measures are in place. In some regions, the next fishing season is barely a month away. I urge the House to carry through on the momentum we have achieved and to approve this Bill unanimously.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on Bill C-170 at third reading. The theme of my speech is "onward through the fog", because Bill C-170 has blanketed Atlantic Canada in a thick fog of confusion, fear and contradictory Liberal promises.

This Government claims to have finally realized that the fishery must be economically viable and privately owned. Yet it intends to achieve these ends by literally nationalizing some 65 per cent of the productive capacity of the industry. Through negotiations with only two Atlantic provincial Governments, this Government intends to force through a program that will have serious impact on the five Provinces around the Gulf of St. Lawrence. This Government has literally guaranteed the jobs of some plant workers and left others to compete against them without any protection whatsoever. While promising that the industry will be denationalized as soon as possible and that the competitive balance of the marketplace will not be upset, this Government is incapable of providing any detail as to how these specific aims are to be achieved. No wonder many independent operators are taking the attitude that the federal Government should buy their businesses now while they are viable, before they are driven into ruin by trying to compete against nationalized, subsidized enterprises.

Of all the foggy Liberal notions, Mr. Speaker, one of the foggiest was that somehow the people of Atlantic Canada would not notice what was being done to them if this Bill was rushed through Parliament. Last week, as we crammed some 33 hours of committee meetings into four days, it was quite apparent to practically everyone that Atlantic Canadians knew only too well what was being planned, and for the most part they wanted no part of it. Among 17 witnesses who appeared before the committee, 12 were solidly opposed to the Liberal assault on the fishing industry. Today in the House we still feel, at least on the Opposition side, that a gun is being held to our heads to pass this Bill and allow the federal Government to get these restructured companies established before 1984.

The Opposition has been criticized for delaying this Bill six days at second reading. Quite frankly, Sir, we strongly resent such criticism. It is none other than the Liberals who delayed this Bill 14 days at first reading and delayed its introduction for a full month after signing a restructuring agreement with Newfoundland and Labrador. Look at the delays this Government took in the restructuring as a whole and you will find that the Government took six months to negotiate the Newfoundland agreement alone. The Nova Scotia agreement, if there ever is to be one, will take even longer because this Liberal Government has unfortunately backed down from verbal assurances it made in September. Meanwhile the proposed restructring in Quebec is being fought at every turn of

the wheel by that Province's Government. In short, it is the Liberal Government's own abysmal record in negotiation and consultation that is to blame for the restructuring delays and for much of the crisis in the Atlantic fishery.

During the committee hearings last week one of the most oft repeated criticisms for fishermen, processors and provincial Governments was that they had not been consulted about restructuring althouth they will be profoundly affected by its outcome. This is the real tragedy of the restructuring this Bill will authorize. The Liberal Government has failed to demonstrate respect for the different needs of the fishing industry in different parts of Atlantic Canada. There is no reason to think, no reason whatsoever, that Bill C-170 will in any way change this position. Indeed, this federal Government seems to think that what is good for Newfoundland is good for Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec. This of course reminds me of that old cliché about the lady with ten kids who, when one of them got sick, gave cod liver oil to the whole lot. That is in effect what is happening here. One of our Provinces is economically ill and, instead of recognizing the need of that particular Province, this Bill encompasses the whole of Atlantic Canada as well as Quebec. This Government seems determined to prop up one sector of the industry and kick out the blocks from under the others.

No one could blame the people of Newfoundland and Labrador for seizing the opportunity provided by this restructuring agreement with the federal Government. That Province has been shamefully ignored by federal programs ever since Confederation. DREE expenditures, for example in Newfoundland, have been cut in half in the past three years when, by rights, they should have been increased. Despite its strategic location in the North Atlantic, which I might add was well recognized during World War II, Newfoundland is the only Canadian Province without a permanent Canadian Forces base, and it has the lowest per capita national defence expenditure. For years the Province has been trying to negotiate an agreement on its petroleum resources. Of course, Newfoundland would jump at the chance of seeing increased federal spending on its fishery and an opportunity for a little more control over the management of the industry. Whether these opportunities will be realized remains to be seen, Mr. Speaker, as the detailed negotiations have not yet begun.

The way restructuring has been presented so far makes it acceptable only to Newfoundland. In the maritime Provinces the consensus appears to be that this federal Government should not have controlling interest of any fishery enterprise and that the large Nickerson-National sea corporation should be split up into five corporations rather than being further consolidated.

Tomorrow this Bill will be passed and the ball will once again be in the Liberal court to pursue the course of restructuring. I wonder how this Government will placate the many fishermen and processors it has already antagonized. How will it improve the fishery and create a spirit of co-operation when four out of five Provinces in the region are opposed to the federal manoeuvres? This Government is led by a man who declares that co-operative federalism is dead. In the months ahead, we in the Official Opposition will be watching the implementation of restructuring with great concern. We will not hesitate to criticize the federal Government for unnecessary delays in the process.

● (1610)

While this Bill was in committee our Party was successful in bringing in two major additions to the Bill. One will ensure that Parliament gets an annual report on the administration of this Act. The other provides at least a whisper of acknowledgement that federal equity in fisheries enterprises will be returned to the private sector when the enterprises become economically viable.

Our Party actually introduced 11 amendments to this bill in committee. Six were accepted. At the report stage I again moved two of those, which were voted down by the government side. The fact that these two amendments were defeated as of today clearly establishes the tone in which restructuring will be carried out. It confirms the fears that have already been expressed throughout the Atlantic region that accountability and consultation will be minimized while federal control of the fishery will be maximized for an undetermined period.

Beyond these amendments there is another important change that should be made to the way in which this Bill is enacted. Representatives from the processing industry have given this issue the highest priority for changes to Bill C-170. It requires no amendment, merely the proper exercise of powers under Clause 7 of the Bill. This will allow the Governor in Council to appoint another Minister, other than the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, to administer this Act. It sounds like a small change but it would go a long way to allay the fears of the fishing industry. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané), controlling a majority of shares of some 60 or 70 per cent of Atlantic processing capacity, could be in a conflict of interest position with regard to his duties for resource management and licensing. Imagine the CBC, for example, being responsible for all broadcasting licences, or Petro-Canada for all drilling permits, and you have comparable situations. I therefore call upon the present Government to confer the administration of this Act upon some other Minister. After all, the powers of the Bill are purely economic in nature and they should be exercised according to economic and social criteria established by a Department such as the Department of Economic Development or the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion.

The Minister, in his comments today, alluded to this particular section in a way. He said it was the intention of the Government that the shares would not be held by him but would be held by the Minister responsible for the Canada Development Investment Corporation. I question whether this will satisfy the fears of the independents who appeared before our committee because of the track record of the Minister to whom he indicates this authority will be transferred.

At this point I would like to read into the record the reasons why the Minister mentioned in Bill C-170 should be some

Minister other than the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and other than the Minister responsible for the Canada Development Investment Corporation, as they have been outlined to me by Mr. Ron Bulmer, the spokesman for the Fisheries Council of Canada, which represents not only the processors but also some inshore and offshore fishermen as well. Mr. Bulmer makes the following point:

1. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans now regulates allocations, plant licences, in-plant inspection, and is planning to police grading. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans should not have the pressure toward or the appearance of bias by being responsible for restructuring, and ongoing funding of restructured companies.

2. Key elements of Bill C-170 are financial in nature and are needed for the development of Atlantic Canada. Therefore, the Bill should reside in an economic department where financial analytical and business skills reside.

3. The U.S.A. market would perceive such a management function and stated reprivatization as positive signs, thus minimizing the risk of countervail.

I would interject here and say that the risk of countervail, in light of the programs in motion in the United States, is a very real concern at this time among the 700 independents still surviving in the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada and Quebec. He continues:

4. Processors will continue to feel that only those who toe the party line and perhaps accept other government initiatives such as in the marketing area will ever qualify for any of the funds outlined in Bill C-170 while this Bill resides under the powers of the Ministry of Fisheries and Oceans.

Mr. Speaker, our amendments and our speeches have indicated that we share these concerns. We believe that two elements in this Bill that need to be further pursued are moving the powers of the Bill to an economic Ministry and gaining some form of mechanism for establishing the review process. We need a guarantee that the taxpayers' dollars are being well managed and that Parliament and the industry can determine exactly how many of these dollars are involved. Further, there is an obvious need for a direct balance of power between ongoing practices in the fishery and the restructuring process.

Since the conclusion of the committee meetings to which I referred last week, my office as well as the offices of other Members of the Official Opposition have been contacted repeatedly by witnesses who appeared in Ottawa. After thanking us for the efforts we made on their behalf, these witnesses have again expressed their concern that a mechanism for improved consultation with the fishing industry and with provincial Government must be established. Our Party moved an amendment to this effect in committee, but unfortunately it was voted down by the Liberal majority.

Mr. Tobin: And the NDP.

Mr. Crouse: The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister says, "And the NDP". He is quite correct and I thank him for that addition. The point at issue here is that while we were trying to amend and improve the Bill, some of the Liberal Members, who indicated in one way or another that they do not like this Bill either, did not take the opportunity to stand up and be counted. They voted with the Government and killed this very worth-while amendment. I regret that action. We moved this amendment and it was voted down.

I am now going to urge the Government to establish a restructuring review council.

Mr. Breau: Which one did I vote down?

Mr. Crouse: The Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) asks which one he voted down. I will remind him that he voted this down in committee. I am going to urge that the Government establish a restructuring review council that will consist of representatives from all relevant sectors of the industry as well as provincial Governments. The work of this review council would be to focus its attention on the extent to which restructuring is achieving its stated purpose. That is our major concern at this stage. They should present an annual report to Parliament containing their recommendations. That is what we would like to see. It may well be, after consideration, that the stone which the builders rejected in committee could well become the cornerstone of the restructuring process for the information of Parliament.

These views have been echoed and re-echoed through the brief as presented in committee. They are in the brief that was presented to the committee by the Department of Fisheries of the Province of New Brunswick. I am just going to place this on the record. It reads:

Generally, the New Brunswick fishing industry has weathered the economic recession of the past few years in relatively good shape. Our independent processors, both large and small, and our fishermen, independent owner-operators of their own vessels, have been able to survive economic hardship through their own good efforts, and the support offered to them by the New Brunswick Department of Fisheries and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. A loans program for vessel acquisition and improvement, training programs, technical advice, innovative fisheries and the exploitation of new species—all have assisted the New Brunswick fishery to adapt and survive.

● (1620)

The reports that came from the New Brunswick representatives indicated at least a healthy fishery if not an extremely profitable one. It was gratifying for me to listen to their presentation because it indicated that private enterprise and the force it engenders is still in a healthy state in your own native Province, Mr. Speaker.

The Eastern Fisheries Federation made a number of outstanding points in the presentation that it made before the committee. I wish time permitted me to earmark all of them, but I will refer briefly to one or two. They stated that there was a lack of consultation. They went on to say:

Independent fishermen land well over 50 per cent of the fish in the Maritimes but were never included in the discussions on industry restructuring. Similarly, we were not consulted when this Bill was proposed. How can we rest assured that the federal Government will ever consult with us on the operation of the fishing industry, or the massive companies now to be controlled by the Government.

They went on to say:

Not only was there no consultation with us, but there was none with the smaller companies on whom we depend. They now are seeing the banks reduce their lines of credit by 33 per cent to the small buyers. What will the Government do to restore banking confidence in the 700 independents which are vital to us?

The Minister of Fisheries for Prince Edward Island expressed equal concerns. In his brief to the committee he said:

This brings us to the point of how we should approach the resolution of this difficult situation. We do not adhere to the view that, because some of the private sector is currently experiencing financial difficulty, state ownership is required to bring about resolution to this event. Indeed we may be jumping from the frying pan to the fire. It would be equally wrong to conclude that the small scale private sector companies alone could deliver our future prosperity. Rather we would have been more anxious about determining what are the manageable units within the large concerns and insure that by providing support and loan security, private investment would have been found to acquire those manageable units and run them as viable concerns. Yes, there would have been a period of disruption while the reordering took place but had we undertook this activity when the problem was recognized at least two years ago, I submit the industry would be stabilized at this time and markets supported.

To date, my own Province of Nova Scotia has refused to sign an agreement with the federal Government. There were proposals made at Port Hawkesbury in September but we were informed in committee that they are now in limbo as a result of backtracking by the federal Minister.

Some of the points still to be resolved were laid before the committee in an excellent presentation by the new provincial Minister of Fisheries, Mr. John Leefe. I will not read all of them but simply four to which he referred. He stated that no agreement was yet signed and listed some of the points that are in disagreement between the federal and provincial Governments, for example, a commitment to transfer equity back to private enterprise within five years. Another point is maintenance of existing northern cod quotas together with incremental increases every year. No one level of government will have a majority of control of the new company, and finally, the Nova Scotia-Canada multi-million dollar fisheries development plan is to be renegotiated. These and other problems still remain to be resolved.

A spokesman for the Independent Sea Producers also raised in the committee some very important points. In the interest of time I will only mention one or two. The independents contend that restructuring represents an effective but somewhat subtle nationalization of the Atlantic fishery. The independents have no confidence that the new super companies will be run on a commercial basis and expect that they will need continuous subsidies. Consequently, the independents will have to deal with very unfair competition. For the independents, restructuring will have particularly negative implications in the following areas: fish prices, wages, marketing, resource allocation, policy development and implementation and financing. The underlying concern here is that the new super company will not be permitted to function in a commercially responsible fashion. I could go on, but this shows the fear of the people who are still trying to operate in the industry.

There is even some concern that this Bill is entirely unnecessary since its requirements are, in my view, covered by an Act called the Fisheries Development Act. Two clauses of this Act in particular appear to give the Minister all the power that he needs to help the industry through this period of depression within the industry. I would like to present two of the clauses of that particular Bill to show what I mean. According to the Fisheries Development Act, Section 3(1), the Minister:

—may undertake projects (*a*) for the more efficient exploitation of fishery resources and for the exploration for and development of new fishery resources and new fisheries;

(*b*) for the introduction and demonstration to fishermen of new types of fishing vessels and fishing equipment and of new fishing techniques; and

(*c*) for the development of new fishery products and for the improvement of the handling, processing and distribution of fishery products.

Section 3(3) states:

The Minister may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, enter into an agreement with any province providing for the payment to the province of contributions in respect of the cost of any project that is undertaken by the government of the province or any agency thereof and that the Minister is authorized to undertake under subsection (1).

Section 5 states:

The Minister may make payments to such persons or classes of persons, in such amount and on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council,

(*a*) for the construction and equipment of

(i) commercial cold storages, or

(ii) commercial bait freezing facilities equipped with mechanical refrigeration, that will be suitable for the preservation of fishery products.

I could go on but it seems to me that the officials of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans should have taken time, upon examination of this over-all problem, to see what vehicle could have been used in order to assist the people in Newfoundland and some in my Province of Nova Scotia who are in dire straits as a result of the cyclical downturn. I say "cyclical" as one who spent some time in the industry. I know that the biblical quotation of "seven fat years and seven lean years" seemingly applies to the fishing industry. We do have our ups and downs, as I am sure you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, coming from New Brunswick. Instead of using this vehicle to which I just referred as a modus operandi in order to resolve these difficulties, these officials have jumped in with a whole new piece of legislation which is, in effect, balkanizing and dividing all the Provinces of Atlantic Canada as well as Quebec.

In conclusion, I simply wish to say that if this is the best that the federal Government can come up with after two years of procrastination and exhaustive study by the Kirby task force, we on this side have decided to let it get on with it because time is running out for the people in Atlantic Canada whose financial resources in some areas are completely depleted. That is the sad side of this entire mess which we face today. This is why we agree to third reading today.

I believe it is significant that with the exception of the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) whose amendment dealt with the Saltfish Marketing Corporation and therefore ruled out of order by you, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party and its Members are the only ones who moved amendments in the House in the hope of strengthening this Bill and in the hope of making it more acceptable to the independents still functioning in the industry. Unfortunately, when these amendments were moved some Liberal Members who obviously do not like the Bill negated these very amendments which would have strengthened it. This is called window dressing in the trade. They are called paper tigers because without that type of support we are stymied and handtied. As I said earlier, we are here with a gun

held to our heads by the majority which runs the country in the name of the Liberal Government.

I hope that no one on the Government side would construe our statements on this Bill as an over-all agreement to this socialistic legislation. As I said a moment ago, our position is taken as a result of the dire straits faced by some Atlantic Province Canadians due to the over-all mismanagement of our economy and specifically the over-all mismanagement of our fishing industry by the Government. There appears to be no other alternative for them at the present time. This is really a Bill which provides short-term gain for long-term pain. But hopefully it will get our fishermen in some areas through this winter of discontent and hardship. That is basically what they are facing at the present time. As the fishermen say—and Lord knows I have heard them say it many times, when faced with a broker—let's pray we have better luck next time. In my opinion it would be very unfair to rob them of that hope which in many areas is all they have left.

• (1630)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Questions, comments? Debate.

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak on third reading of Bill C-170. I want to reiterate the importance which the New Democratic Party has felt for Bill C-170 and why we have co-operated in seeing that this Bill went to committee and that it receives third reading in the House of Commons. There is no doubt in the minds of anybody in Atlantic Canada, and hopefully nobody in the House of Commons, about the urgency this Bill requires. Basically it is because we have an industry in Atlantic Canada which employs an important component of the work force there. It is an industry that meets the employment requirements for thousands and thousands of people and hundreds of communities.

When we decided we would support this Bill going through the House reasonably rapidly we did so with some reservations, because we did not have all the facts that we would liked to have had in dealing with a major expenditure of money and a restructuring of the entire Atlantic fishery we were cautious. The urgency with which the Bill must be dealt, and the late date on which it has been introduced in the House has still not convinced us that we have had an ample opportunity to look at all the implications of the Bill. We do realize that fishermen, particularly in Newfoundland, and in those major companies in Nova Scotia, are dependent upon settling some collective bargaining negotiations. The new companies will have to settle some marketing strategies to sell the product which the fishermen will be catching in a few months' time. Under those terms we agreed to look at the Bill.

In the meantime quite a bit of information came to light. In the committee we looked at the Newfoundland agreement. We have heard something about the Nova Scotia agreement and some of the reservations which the Nova Scotia Government has had. We have looked at the bail out of a major bank, the Bank of Nova Scotia. We have seen some amendments to the Bill that we in the New Democratic Party do not like.

It has been interesting to see the Progressive Conservative Party attempt to wrap itself around the Bill and divorce itself from the Bill. Not only did the Hon. Member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) do this but his colleagues in provincial Government of Nova Scotia who on the one hand do not want this Bill because they claim it is a nationalization of the industry, a socialist plot to take over the industry, and who on the other hand, are hoping the federal Government will use its majority to see this Bill goes through. If the Bill is not passed, then a major part of the Nova Scotia fishing industry will not be functioning and there will be major unemployment in that already high unemployment area. It is interesting to see how the Progressive Conservatives on the one hand can support the Bill and on the other hand give us all kinds of reasons why they should not, and why they are so anxious to get this Bill through. It is interesting to note that these two new companies are going to put some stability in the East Coast fishing industry.

There is one amendment which the Conservatives and the Liberals support. Once we have injected all this money, the $138 million initially, the $100 million in guarantees and the major bail-out of the Bank of Nova Scotia, it is interesting to note that the amendment moved by the Government would find that when those companies become profitable—not only the companies that become profitable but any portion of a company that becomes profitable—they shall be disposed of by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) and returned to the private sector. In other words, once the Government and the public of Canada pumps money into these corporations, once they provide a stable funding mechanism to put some equity into these companies and once they become profitable, we will turn them back to private industry. I do not think the fishermen and the shore workers in the communities in Newfoundland in particular really want that to happen. Privatization of the industry should not be in the Bill that it shall happen. Communities such as Grand Bank, Burin, St. Anthony, St. Lawrence, Ramea and a number of others in Newfoundland, over the last year have seen their community completely without adequate work in terms of the fishing industry. People will question the rationale of supporting a community through public expenditure to salvage jobs, to give some security to those communities, only to turn around when the community and the fishing enterprise becomes profitable, starts to contribute and starts to bring up the wages and incomes of fishermen and shore workers and return it to the private sector. I do not think, nor does the New Democratic Party think, that those communities will want to go back to private sector hands with the uncertainty that generates.

What the Bill will do if the Government follows the letter of the law—and let us not forget there is a possibility sometime in the far future when we might get a Progressive Conservative Government—is that I am sure the Government would not hesitate at any stage to turn those money-earning enterprises back to the private sector. What they would do is to maintain

those enterprises which the corporate sector would not want to purchase. The taxpayer would end up supporting those enterprises that are not profitable. Nevertheless they would probably serve a very important social function in communities in Atlantic Canada. That is one of the reasons this Party has serious reservations about the Bill. We had an amendment that was unnecessary. It was an amendment to satisfy the free enterprise spirit of the Liberal Government and the Progressive Conservative Opposition in spite of the failure of free enterprise in those major corporations which has led to this mammoth bail-out of the banks and the fishing industry.

We cannot see the rationale of putting an amendment in a Bill which gives the opportunity in the future if it were feasible, to see some privatization. To put in a Bill the words that the Minister shall dispose of such assets of fishery enterprises or portions of that enterprise really begs the whole concept of public ownership and the support of the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada.

The Bill itself is not all that long. Our Party in committee attempted to remove from Clause 3 in the Bill the aspect of private ownership. That was simply in order to give some confidence that the fishing industry could continue to be supported if necessary. We in this Party are hopeful that the economy of the fishing industry will turn around as those markets improve and that as our fishery techniques and marketing skills improve, we will find a viable and profitable fishing industry for the communities of fishermen and the owners of these enterprises.

The other information we received in committee, which again puts a different light on this whole Bill, is the aspect of the refinancing itself. We have all suspected that the fishing industry was in serious financial straits, but this was confirmed when the task force was given a letter of agreement between the Bank of Nova Scotia and the Kirby Task Force on Atlantic Fisheries. We found that the total debt in the industry owing to the Bank of Nova Scotia as of December 31, 1982 was $276.9 million. Of course there were many reasons for the size of the debt owing to that bank, however it pointed out the inability of major fishing enterprises and the banks to manage the fishery adequately. Also it pointed out their inability to predict adequately the ability of the processors or the amount of available stock for the processing plants. As well, it indicated the inability of provincial Governments to control the number of processors and the inability of the Bank of Nova Scotia to conduct an adequate assessment of loans to the corporate sector. However, once again the bank is the one enterprise which will be immune from major losses.

● (1640)

In order to recoup some of that $276.9 million, the Government will have the bank convert $143.8 million of debt into equity. Also, to reduce the debt owing to the bank, the Government will give the company $25 million. Also the bank will receive in holding company X, which is the Nova Scotia company, $70 million in preferred shares. It will also receive class A and B preferred shares in both the Newfoundland and the Nova Scotia companies.

What will occur over the next five years is that the Bank of Nova Scotia will be able to claim those shares. The Government of Canada will pay a 5 per cent dividend on the shares regardless of the viability of the fishing industry. Also it will be paid $14 million per year for five years to reclaim the preferred shares. In other words, it will receive its $70 million back and a 5 per cent dividend in the first five years and will be able to sell off the class A shares. It will receive a great deal of the money owing in that way. Also, $107 million will be left in the industry as loans outstanding. Now that the companies will be supported by federal and provincial funds, as well as provincial agreements, it is almost like guaranteeing a $107 million loan to the companies.

Perhaps this was necessary. We are not denying that. We knew there was a crisis in the industry and that it would take strong medicine to resolve it. However, it would appear that those who get into the most economic difficulty, those with the highest debt, always have Governments to come along and bail them out.

We have some severe reservations about the mechanism by which Parliament and the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry have been used in dealing with this Bill. For many months in committee we asked for some information on the restructuring. We asked what was happening in the negotiations among the federal Government, provincial Governments, banks and major companies. We were always told that it was confidential. We appreciate that some of these negotiations are very sensitive. Certainly in committee we saw how the Province of Nova Scotia did not agree with the federal Government. I am sure it does not agree with the sharing of stock between Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. Why that should be part of the discussion of this Bill rather than part of the normal negotiations between federal and provincial fisheries officials in terms of establishing quotas, I fail to understand. However, it was a major concern of the Province of Nova Scotia. It is not a red herring; it is the redfish stock in the gulf. In the ongoing negotiations between the federal and provincial Governments, particularly the Government of Nova Scotia, that Province does not want to look as though it wants to enter into this agreement. It wants to scream and kick so that it indicates to the public that it is the free enterpriser in Atlantic Canada and that it wants the federal Government to stay out of it. The federal Government cannot stay out of it and still have a viable industry in Nova Scotia.

There is no private capital available, and again Canadian taxpayers come to the aid of major companies which have gone bankrupt, partly through their own fault and partly through the economic conditions of a world recession. Nevertheless, we do not see the kind of co-operation required to maintain a viable fishery in Atlantic Canada. It is ironic that the super companies, because of greater marketing skills and better management skills, along with the co-operation of the community, fishermen and plant workers who now have a real stake in the companies that have been formed in Nova Scotia, New-

foundland and Quebec, now have the ability to market products not only in the United States but to expand those markets. They now have the benefit of a provision being incorporated in a Bill of which, if public ownership or a public enterprise becomes successful, we will have to dispose.

This could mean that in super company A or "No FishCan", which is the Nova Scotia aspect, or in "New Fish Can", which is the Newfoundland aspect of this restructuring—

Miss Campbell: That is very good.

Mr. Miller: I have been holding those names for some time. I have heard "FishCan", but that does not sound as good as "New FishCan" and "No FishCan"; I think they are rather catchy.

Mr. Breau: They are better than X, Y and Z.

Mr. Miller: They are better than the terminology in the Kirby task force memorandum. However, public ownership has a role to play in the fishing industry as well as in Canada as a whole. We cannot accept that once the operations of the super companies become profitable, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) can dispose of it to private ownership. That amendment moved by the Government and supported by the Conservatives could mean that if an individual trawler shows a profit over a year or two, the trawler could be sold. I do not think that was the intention of the Government; at least I hope it was not. We have the possibility now of a company which could really meet the needs of communities in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia.

The possibilities of the super companies in terms of involving more people in the management structure are very important. The possibilities of the super companies, in co-operation with the federal and provincial Governments in establishing marketing courses through marine colleges or marine colleges and developing new technologies or new techniques in processing and establishing new product lines, will be beneficial. We in the NDP share the concerns expressed by independent fishermen and processors before the committee in terms of their profitability and ability to survive in an industry which may be dominated by one, two or three major companies. We do not see the necessity of super companies eroding the viability of independent processors and fishermen. The co-operation between the new companies and the independents in terms of supporting new market research and trade missions through Europe and some of the developing countries in which there may be a possibility of selling fish products is very important.

● (1650)

We are somewhat amused that this debate seems to have evolved only around the ownership and the privatization some time in the future of a publicly owned corporation. Projections from Price Waterhouse for the corporation indicate that over the next five years it will make something like a $50 million profit. I think that is very optimistic. For an industry that is currently losing millions of dollars a year, it is optimistic to think that we will see profits of $50 million over the next five years simply through restructuring. We would certainly like to see that come to pass, but we have a long struggle ahead of us to bring the Atlantic fishery industry back to profitability, to see that fishermen can enjoy collective bargaining and have increased prices for the product delivered to the dock and to the plant and to see that the shore workers have some involvement in the management and production of that fishery.

In this instance, Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to support a Bill which is radically different from the Bill for which we indicated support in the past. We think that it is a necessary Bill, but we are not prepared to support a Bill that sees the privatization of a company which has not been able to prove itself to Atlantic Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in the House on second reading of Bill C-170, I said there was a problem with the Government's general orientation with respect to fisheries. Although the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry held a number of sittings to examine the Bill, there was nothing in the proceedings of this Committee that could convince me the approach taken by the Government at the beginning of the so-called Atlantic fisheries crisis, that is, when the Kirby Commission was set up in January 1982 or perhaps December 1981 . . . Up to now, the result has been, in terms of restructuring, an agreement on restructuring with the Province of Newfoundland, an agreement in principle with the Province of Nova Scotia and finally, Bill C-170 which is not restructuring anything.

Bill C-170, and this is very important, does not restructure anything as such. What it does is allow the Government to acquire in Section 4 of the Bill, on page 3, and I quote:

—the Minister may, on behalf of Her Majesty,

(*a*) acquire, hold or dispose of or otherwise deal with shares, debentures or other securities of, or any security interest in, any fishery enterprise;

Although the Government is given other powers, in the main Bill C-170 authorizes the Government to purchase equity in companies but does not provide the basis for concluding a restructuring agreement.

I must say that while we were examining the Bill, I at least managed to get one positive item in this legislation, in Section 6, where it says, and I quote:

6. (1) To carry out the purpose of this Act, the Minister—

—the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané)—

—may, with the approval of the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister of Finance, on such terms and conditions as the Minister specifies, guarantee the repayment of any portion of the principal and interest owing on any loan made to a fishery enterprise.

The second paragraph of this section provides, and I quote:

(2) The aggregate amount of guarantees given under this section that are outstanding at any one time shall not exceed one hundred million dollars.

Mr. Speaker, this means that aside from the restructuring agreement with Newfoundland, and with Nova Scotia, if it materializes, aside from the $138 million appropriated under Section 8 for acquiring shares in restructuring projects, the federal Government may set up a program to guarantee loans of $100 million for fishery enterprises. I think that is a positive point and, in fact, the only truly positive aspect, as far as I can see, of Bill C-170.

One of the things that examining the Bill in Committee has done is to provide a forum for various fisheries interests to express their views, not only on this legislation and the restructuring plan, but also on the fisheries policy in general, especially in terms of fish stocks management as it is pursued at the present time, and this was brought up in connection with a paragraph of the agreement in principle concluded with the Province of Nova Scotia which referred to quotas for ocean perch in the Gulf. When people realized that the Government of Nova Scotia, in a bilateral agreement with the federal Government, insisted on privileged access or preferential treatment with respect to fish stock management and ocean perch quotas, they immediately saw two potential problems. There were two concerns.

First of all, there was a link between the government or governments that were owners of large companies, and fish stock management. In other words, the federal Government's role as objective arbitrator in awarding quotas was compromised. That was one concern. The second concern was that a dangerous precedent had been set, in that for the first time, without going through the usual consultation body, which in the case of groundfish happens to be the Atlantic Groundfish Advisory Committee (AGAC), a decision had been made on awarding quotas to a province or a party with interests in the fishing industry. I know that there was considerable unfavourable reaction to this, especially in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, and I have the impression that was the case in the other Atlantic provinces as well.

In any event, examining this Bill in committee gave people an opportunity to express their views on various items. For instance, a number of intervenors from New Brunswick appeared before the Committee to submit briefs, and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate them and thank them for having done so. I am referring to the Government of New Brunswick, a coalition of various fisheries interests in New Brunswick, the New Brunswick Fish Packers' Association and the Prince Edward Island Association, the Association professionnelle des pêcheurs du nord-est du Nouveau-Brunswick, the Maritime Provinces Fishermen's Union. I don't think I left anyone out. These people expressed a number of concerns relating to federal policy as well as to the legislation itself. In fact, I also want to congratulate them because they were positive. They did not come here to fight against something, they did not come to speak out against restructuring and against the legislation. They came to tell the Government: These are our concerns and we would like some reasurrance.

In his speech earlier today the Minister referred to a brief I sent him. Since at four o'clock in the morning I did not think a long speech would be welcome, I told the Minister I would be sending him a brief that would summarize the concerns of the people from New Brunswick who came to testify before the Committee. It was a matter of summarizing and interpreting in my own way what their concerns were and what the Government could do to deal with those concerns, to give them the assurance that what is good for Newfoundland and may be good for Nova Scotia is perhaps not so bad for the rest of the Maritime Provinces or for the fisheries industry in New Brunswick, for that matter.

• (1700)

I will sum up as briefly as possible the five points I raised in the memo I sent to the Minister. The first has to do with groundfish quotas in zone 4 RST or both zones, those which most closely follow the outline of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. In my opinion, the Federal Government and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) ought to make a statement very soon to tell the people that groundfish stocks in the Gulf will be reserved for the fleet of boats measuring 100 feet or less based in the Gulf. Besides boats from New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec, that fleet includes as well boats from Newfoundland, the western coast of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and especially the Cape Breton area, because they too fish in the Gulf.

Because I come from New Brunswick and others are from Quebec or Prince Edward Island, some people tell us that we do not want any Nova Scotia and Newfoundland boats in the Gulf. That is not true, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to boats from other provinces plying the Gulf, because the Gulf of St. Lawrence belongs to all Canadians. There has been talk about a dispute among fishing fleets. When talking about a fishing fleet, two things come to mind: the length and power of the boats. What people are saying is that, if boats belonging to fleets are powerful or long enough to go fishing offshore—meaning those boats which are big enough to store the fish caught over a period of one or sometimes two weeks—those boats can go offshore, but that most of the groundfish stocks in the Gulf, the 4 RST zone, should be reserved for boats measuring 100 feet or less based in the Gulf. There are 100-footers or smaller boats operating in the Gulf, and they come from the five eastern provinces, not only from New Brunswick, not only from Prince Edward Island, and not only from Quebec.

The philosophy expressed at the 1980 Memramcook symposium on Gulf groundfish must be maintained. I think that, in the distribution and management of quotas, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans must ensure that the policy of the Federal Government will continue to reflect that philosophy.

My second concern has to do with the agreement with Newfoundland, where reference is made to what is called secondary processing at the Burin plant and perhaps elsewhere. We want the assurance that Federal Government assistance—technical, monetary or whatever—efforts and resources will not be directed exclusively towards the new Newfoundland company when time comes to consider means

of going in for secondary processing. Indeed, we have the means to do that in New Brunswick as well, and like the others we should be entitled to the same assistance for private sector plants and businesses in New Brunswick and elsewhere, for people who are not restructured into super-companies. We should be given the same opportunity to go in for secondary processing.

The third point is that groundfish fishing permits were lost in New Brunswick during the 70s when groundfish stocks were radicaly depleted. At that time, 19 groundfish fishing permits were lost in New Brunswick. In addition, four large trawlers financed by the Province of New Brunswick used to fish in the Gulf northeast of New Brunswick, but they have now been leased to Nova Scotia companies. Two are financed by a company called Pearce Fisheries and the other one by National Sea Products. Now that groundfish stocks are plentiful in the Gulf, I think that those four boats should be sent back in the Gulf because they are financed by the New Brunswick taxpayers. The Minister has the authority to do that. There was a moral agreement under which those boats would continue to supply northeastern New Brunswick plants, but they discontinued that practice after a few months. And now we have to share quotas, for cod for instance, offshore within the 200-mile limit. Two New Brunswick boats are now operating there, so they will have to go along with the proposed offshore groundfish quotas. The Department says that it is going to return to past practice and keep fishing records in mind. I think it has been its intention for the past five or six years. What happens is that the record will show the catches of these four New Brunswick boats that fish off Nova Scotia as Nova Scotia landings. I believe that the landings of these four boats should be recorded as New Brunswick landings and that, based on these figures, New Brunswick should be allocated larger quotas for off-shore groundfish landings. I would like to talk about two boats, namely the *Caraquet* belonging to a Caraquet company, and the *Pandalus* belonging to the Lanièque Island Fishermen's Cooperative.

Now, for my fourth point. The federal Government should quickly develop a marketing financing and assistance program for New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island plants, because there are no restructuring agreements with these two provinces. We cannot expect the Government of New Brunswick, not to mention that of Prince Edward Island since it has not signed a restructuring agreement either, we cannot expect the governments of these provinces, which did not receive any injection of funds as opposed to Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, for example towards a reduction of the debts on fishing vessels, to be able on their own to finance independent processors, for instance. The federal Government must therefore implement a program for these two provinces.

Fourth point! One irritant in New Brunswick is that the current policy for herring and mackerel fishing leaves a lot to be desired, for both the inshore and the offshore fisheries. In the case of the inshore fishery, there are no markets or guarantees for the fisherman when he brings in his catch. The result is that he does not get the price he deserves for his fish. Inshore fishermen therefore cannot be expected to cooperate in terms of a balanced policy for herring and mackerel fishing.

As for the offshore fishery, the policy announced by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans last August to reduce the seiner fleet is very ineffective and unfair because the fishermen are told to reduce their fleet, and to do so, they have to buy a lottery ticket. This means that the owner of a fishing vessel who has had good years in the herring fishery and who is now financially sound can purchase the quotas of a younger fisherman or someone who has just gotten into the industry and who is in a more precarious financial situation saddled with a heavy debt on his boat. He can purchase the quota of this fisherman, who will then be left with his boat, but without quota or a licence.

Mr. Speaker, it is very unfair to have a policy that simply says that the big guy will be able to buy out the smaller one. The Government should review its policy without delay because it is another irritant for New Brunswick fishermen, and they cannot be blamed for having lost confidence in the current policy of the Government.

Last point! We must make sure that the restructuring in Quebec will not result in an expansion of the Quebec plants. I do not object to the Government helping the Quebec plants, or to Quebec companies modernizing their plants, but if this restructuring program or another assistance program for Quebec were to increase the capacity of Quebec plants, it would create a very unfair competition for the fishing industry of Northeastern New Brunswick. Historically, some of the companies now having problems in Quebec paid more for fish than New Brunswick companies. As a result, these Quebec companies had financial problems, and now, the Government is bailing them out. This must not happen again, Mr. Speaker. We have to ensure against any unfair competition based on prices and also avoid any unfair competition as a result of Government development assistance to Quebec processing plants.

[*English*]

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the total approach to the problem of restructuring the industry taken by the Government is highly unusual, in my view. I just do not understand how anyone in Government could even think of this kind of agreement with the Bank of Nova Scotia. I am surprised to see that the Opposition is supporting this kind of approach. The hypocrisy of the Official Opposition on this Bill is very obvious. They should not think that people are not seeing through their position. If Hon. Members opposite want to support this Bill, that is fine. That is their right. But they should not keep saying this is nationalization of the industry, or socialization of the industry and, on the other hand, cooperate with the Government to get the Bill through the House in one day. I want the record to show, Mr. Speaker, that the Official Opposition supports this Bill, because its position is very visible. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) said, a few days after this Bill was tabled, that he was going to support this Bill. The Minister of Fisheries from Newfound-

land came up here and said privately to anyone who wanted to hear it that he had received the assurance of the Official Opposition that it would not oppose this Bill.

• (1710)

That Party cannot have it both ways, Mr. Speaker. If it supports this Bill, fine. If it does not support this Bill, then it knows what it should have done. They cannot keep saying that the Bill is bad and that it is nationalization of the industry, because they did support it. If they had not supported it, we would have had a better examination of this Bill.

Mr. Baker: Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Hon. Member for Gloucester in committee. I listened to his speech here today on this Bill. I would like to ask him one question. How does the Hon. Member rationalize saying, on the one hand, that it is all right for New Brunswick boats to fish off the Newfoundland coast, but, on the other hand, saying, oh, no, there cannot be Nova Scotia boats and there cannot be Newfoundland boats going down into the Gulf? The Hon. Member has said many times he does not put provincial flags on ships. However, would he not agree that actually what he is doing with the Gulf question is putting provincial flags on fish? Is it not true that the list he just read out, which was given to the Minister, is really a form of blackmail on the part of the Hon. Member?

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member calls the list blackmail. It is no such thing. I put to the Minister in committee, and also in a memo, the list of concerns, as I interpreted them, of the New Brunswick fishing industry. If it has to be called "blackmail", which I say it is not, then so be it. My job here is to represent my constituency, to put forward the views of my constituents, and to defend New Brunswick's fishing interests as they were expressed before the committee.

With regard to the question of putting provincial flags on ships, the Hon. Member presumably did not hear my speech. If he did, he did not understand it. What I said is that we are talking here about conflict between fleets of fishing vessels. When one talks about a fleet, one is really talking about two things, the length of the boat and, therefore, its capacity to hold fish and, second, the horsepower of the boat. That is what we are talking about. I never took the position that Nova Scotia or Newfoundland boats cannot fish in the Gulf. In fact, they do. What we are talking about is to reserve in the Gulf the majority of the groundfish for vessels of 100 feet or less, with less power, who are based in the Gulf—vessels from Newfoundland, from Nova Scotia, from Prince Edward Island, from New Brunswick and from Quebec. There is that kind of vessel, Mr. Speaker, which can only fish in the Gulf. It does not have the power to go outside the Gulf. And these vessels are based in the five Provinces.

There are boats based in New Brunswick of 100 feet or more, with more power, which can go offshore, and we are taking the same position, that those vessels should not be entitled to fish in the Gulf. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about putting provincial flags on fish or on ships. What we are saying is that in the Gulf we should reserve the groundfish stocks for those boats which cannot go outside the Gulf to fish. I think that is fair and reasonable.

Mr. Nickerson: Mr. Speaker, I hate to break into this altercation between the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate and the Hon. Member for Gloucester. I perceive that there are very deep divisions among Members of the Liberal Party on this issue, as indeed there are on many other issues. My question to the Hon. Member for Gloucester is this: he has spoken at some length of the concerns of his constituents on this issue—I applaud him for doing so, that is his job—why does he think he has been completely disregarded on this issue by the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and the Government, which, presumably, he supports?

Mr. Breau: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question. I do not believe that my concerns have been totally disregarded by the Government. The Hon. Member, if he is aware of this issue, will know that on the question of restructuring, the agreement in principle with Nova Scotia seemed to link the question of management of Gulf stocks with the restructuring of a super company in Nova Scotia. I would not say that the concerns of the New Brunswick industry and the concerns which I expressed on its behalf, have been disregarded by the Government, because the fact is that that particular paragraph of the agreement with Nova Scotia has not been accepted by the Government as yet. The Minister said in his speech on third reading earlier today that he would organize a meeting with his departmental officials very early next week to discuss all the points which were brought forward by the New Brunswick fishing industry which I summarized in my memo to him. I do not believe that the Minister will disregard that.

The reason we are in this position is that there has been pressure in Newfoundland, expressed by the Government of Newfoundland, and the federal Government to try to solve the problems of the industry in Newfoundland. The same thing has happened in Nova Scotia. There have been discussions by both Governments. My position, and the position of the people from New Brunswick who came here, was not to oppose that. What is good for Newfoundland and Nova Scotia is fine. However, we want to make sure we are going to be protected, without having a restructuring agreement, because our fishing industry does not happen to be bankrupt. Because we are not bankrupt, we do not want to lose what we have.

Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, there are those who suggest that some Hon. Members of this House are unclear in their position. May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are those of us who tried to improve this Bill but we could get no support from those who have now claimed they have taken a position against the Bill, and who now challenge us, in turn, to take a position against the Bill. I submit to you, Sir, that they have personal constituency issues which are putting them in a position which is important. It is an Atlantic issue. For the first time, it has been indicated that some Hon. Members to your right, Mr. Speaker, are in fact aware that at last there are Atantic issues which supercede their loyalties to

the Liberal Party. I think that is very significant. I say to the Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) that I wish we had had your votes in favour of some of those amendments. No matter how this Act might be administered, we would at least have had access to information which might have contributed to an opportunity for this House and the fishing industry—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Hon. Member for South West Nova invokes a question of privilege.

Miss Campbell: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who was speaking is referring to the Chairman of the Committee. The Chairman of the Comittee said here in the House that it would be unbiased. At no time was the Chair asked to break any votes in that Committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): That is perhaps a point of explanation, but it is hardly a question of privilege in the true sense of the word.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, may I draw to the attention of the House that in the spirit in which the Fisheries Committee has functioned, the Chairman has pretty much reserved the right to participate in that Committee as if she were not chairman but, rather, as a normal member, and she has had—

Mr. Evans: There are clear rules on how chairmen vote.

Mr. McCain: Just a minute. You were not there. Let us get Ottawa Centre out of the fishing business where it does not belong.

● (1720)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, the Hon. Member should address his remarks to the motion as well as to the Chair, please.

Mr. McCain: My regrets, Mr. Speaker. My respect for the Chair is inalienable, Sir.

We have a question raised through the interjection by the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker) as he referred to the Hon. Member for Gloucester. We have sought the answer repeatedly. What becomes of the surplus redfish in the Gulf? Nova Scotia says it has it, that is part of the deal. Newfoundland has implied it has part of that surplus as part of the deal.

An Hon. Member: There is no surplus.

Mr. McCain: Well, the biologist says there are another 50,000 tons we ought to be catching. I do not know whether you call that surplus. The TAC is not utilized, put it that way.

New Brunswick has had no assurance because there has been no negotiation. We do not know what is going on between Quebec and the Minister. We know there is some reorganization, apparently scheduled to be in place in Quebec, but we do not know how many redfish they have. Prince Edward Island has no conception of whether or not it will in turn have any redfish. No one will answer because everything is so secret in these negotiations. Here we are with the full knowledge of the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate, the Hon. Member for South West Nova and the Hon. Member for Gloucester, voting for a pig in a poke because we feel there is a social responsibility which has motivated us to give this Bill quick consideration. This goes against our principles, because we are conscious of the consequences.

This is the only proposition the Government placed before the industry in spite of advice which I would like to read into the record. I am quoting from the Kirby report as follows:

> Improving the climate of co-operation and confidence in the industry will require strong leadership from processors' and fishermen's organizations, as well as changes in attitude among all participants in the fishery, including government. This recommendation will probably be the one that is most difficult to implement.

That is the one on which Mr. Kirby has capitulated under pressure, I suppose, from Government. The primary mandate of the Kirby task force was to recommend:

> How to achieve and maintain a viable Atlantic fishing industry with due consideration for the overall economic and social development of the Atlantic Provinces.

Again I wish to quote from the presentation to the Committee by the New Brunswick Department of Commerce and Development. It said:

> Recommendation number 45 of the Task Force, "do not establish a new general program of financial assistance for either fishermen or processors", appears to conflict with the preamble to this Bill.
>
> The potential damage to the Atlantic fishery, the profitable and independent part of the industry, is incalcuable unless the Bill in its present form is amended.

The presentation continues:

> Certain trends are readily discernible. Comparing the years 1976 (the year before the 200 mile limit was proclaimed) and 1980 (the latest year for which data is available), the number of staff-hours worked in New Brunswick increased by 35 per cent over the period, compared to 41 per cent for Canada. The total wage bill in the same period grew by 107 per cent in New Brunswick and 102 per cent for the Canadian fish processing industry.

In other words, New Brunswick was outpacing the rest of Canada. It continues:

> This growth in employment in New Brunswick is impressive when one considers that New Brunswick has not benefited from the declaration of the 200 mile limit as have other Atlantic Provinces.

On page 4 of this report it says:

> Plants that are owned by larger integrated firms cannot respond as quickly and must often cope with corporate bureaucracies which inhibit such agility. Statistics Canada reports that New Brunswick has more owners working in production than any other province in Canada.

If we look at the value added in New Brunswick versus the rest of Canada it shows that the value added as a ratio of market landed is 4.5 for New Brunswick, 1.9 for Nova Scotia, 2.0 for Prince Edward Island, 1.9 for Quebec and 2.5 for Newfoundland. In other words, the little independent is accomplishing a 4.5 increment in value. That is separate and apart from what is to become the nationalized structure. They have functioned very well. I quote again:

> The New Brunswick industry has been successful because a diverse product mix and more finished production by independent "hands on" management and ownership.

. . .

It is highly diversified and has grown rapidly in recent years.
It employs 12,000 persons at peak periods of the year.
It is made up of numerous small processors employing few people and several large plants employing a large number of people.
Despite being limited to Gulf and Bay fishing grounds, the value of production and value added has matched or outstripped the Canadian average since 1976 despite being limited in Bay Fundy and inshore.

These are limitations imposed in a rather harsh fashion by the regulation of the Department of Fisheries which has depleted the fishery in the Bay in the Province of New Brunswick to a very measurable degree. I know because I represent those people. They fear what may happen.

Vertical integration and borrowing, accompanied by distant management of the integrated companies, has contributed to the lack of productivity of the companies we are about to save. Whether you be on Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick or in other parts of other Provinces where independent people are doing the work, they are viable, they have been profitable and they are not begging. The report continues:

The independent fish processing companies were faced with the same problems of interest rates, seasonal production, weak markets, and for the exception of being supplied by independent fishermen who own their vessels, were able to not only survive but improve their profitability.

We are bailing out the incompetent and threatening the survival of the competent individual entrepreneur. I quote again:

What is exasperating is that the restructured companies represent an even further vertical integration under government ownership. Under Bill C-170 the Government which controls fish allocations, inspects all processing plants and subsequently is the federal Department charged with fisheries development now expands its mandate into fishing and processing. Verbal pledges to the contrary are not adequate assurances. The industry requires ironclad guarantees.

We are not against restructuring as a means of saving employment. Do not restructure in a manner which will affect the viability of independent industry. Our industry has always said that the Kirby Task Force represented a study of the cod fishery problem in Newfoundland.

● (1730)

I submit to you that that is an accurate assessment of the Kirby report. It did not address the whole industry. I say to you, and I do not think Mr. Kirby would object to my saying this, that he conceded that the terms of his reference at one point in time were not adequate. He did not have time enough to do the job. As he left one of our committees, I had a little discussion with him. The Minister does not shake his head on that subject matter.

I would like to quote once more from this submission by the Province of New Brunswick. I am going to quote from page 10:

Michael Kirby in an address to the Fisheries Council of Canada's Annual Meeting, St. John's, Newfoundland, May 2, 1983 stated:

"The disagreement over marketing organization boils down to whether or not there is a need to build in a 'pro active' buy-and-sell function for government. I have argued previously that the Fisheries Prices Support Board already has all the powers the federal government needs to buy and sell and engage in state-to-state deals. Hence, a new marketing role for the government is not needed."

Mr. Speaker, that is a quote from remarks of Dr. Kirby who is part of the team which represented the Government's case before the Committee. Here we have a contradiction of the report, and now a contradiction of his speech on May 2, 1983 in Newfoundland to the Fisheries Council.

There is so much more, Mr. Speaker, that could be said, but I do understand that, by agreement, this House has imposed certain time constraints upon this debate. I would like to close. If I am imposing upon those time constraints, I hope you will advise me. In closing I would like to say that the New Brunswick processing industry is highly competitive and relatively flexible to changing conditions. This industry has stayed in relatively good shape through innovation, not intervention. I share the concern of the Province of New Brunswick which has a mix which has strengthened its position, as compared with those in Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and the other integrated branches of those companies. How can the New Brunswick industry compete against the federal Government which will obviously have vested interests in Newfoundland and Nova Scotian companies? Is the federal Government able to guarantee that the New Brunswick fishing industry will receive a fair share of the resource allocation, and that restructuring will not interfere with their markets? Is the Government of Canada prepared to use the lending authority of this Act to guarantee the loans which may be required? The Bank of Nova Scotia and other banks have said, "You little guys are not going to be competitive with the Government monster. We, therefore, have cut your credit rating by one-third." What is the Minister going to do? We have addressed this subject many times. He has not committed himself to use the lending authority of this Bill. He has not committed himself to use the Small Business Development Bond, or a similar bond for fishing. These people are crying, and they need to be addressed now by commitment, not by evasion, not by saying the negotiations are secret, and not by ignoring them. The little fisherman and the little processor need succour from the Government at this moment in time to remove from them the fear that their life's accumulation of wealth will in fact have been lost as a result of a lack of credit and the conflict of interest which will exist within the Government itself.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are socially-minded. I guess we now have to depend upon the wisdom of Government which, in administration of its private business affairs, has certainly been more than wanting. It is with great regret that I say to this Government and to all those in the fishing industry that we have been absolutely unable to make an impression of any kind, in spite of the fact that of the 17 witnesses whom we heard, the Province of Newfoundland gave unequivalent support to the deal as it is. The Newfoundland labour union people, as they left the table, gave some indication that there was a bit of hesitation, but basically they unequivocally supported it. Of the other 15 who appeared, four or five gave rather strong support, but every one of those four or five demanded that in the best interests of the total fishing industry amendments were necessary. They were ignored. The balance of those representations did recognize the social qualifications of this Bill but said, "In the name of the best interests of the fishing industry, amend, modify, adjust." The Province of

Prince Edward Island opposed. The Province of New Brunswick opposed. The Province of Nova Scotia has not yet signed. The Province of Quebec is in limbo. We do not know where it is at.

That is where we leave the fishing industry with this Bill, as a social measure whose inestimable consequence may very well be negative rather than positive without judicious management and without consideration for both the private fishermen and the little processor.

Hon. W. Bennett Campbell (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I realize that time is quickly running out on the third reading stage of Bill C-170. I would be remiss if I did not take advantage of the opportunity to make a few very brief comments with respect to the Bill presently under consideration.

I will begin, Mr. Speaker, by asking Members of the House and myself why we are considering such a Bill today. I think the answer is very clear to all of us. The answer is that it became necessary because of the dire straits being faced by the fishing industry of Atlantic Canada that Governments, and I use that in the plural sense deliberately, become involved in providing some form of assistance to enable the survival of our fish processing and fishing industry in Atlantic Canada. I am sure all Members are aware of the significant impact which the fishing industry has in Atlantic Canada. It provides some 90,000 jobs for Canadians living in Atlantic Canada. It is with reluctance that Governments are involved in private sector enterprises. I ask Members of the House what the alternatives are if our fishing industry is to prevail and to succeed.

My Province of Prince Edward Island and specifically my own riding, is made up of independent processors who have provided employment opportunities and a solid backbone to the economy of many of the communities around my riding and around our Province. They have expressed concern and anxiety as to the implications of Bill C-170. Obviously something has to be done. A response had to be made to the potential collapse of the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada. That response came in the form of arrangements and agreements between Provinces and the Government of Canada where in Provincial Governments and federal Governments, along with the private sector, would restructure companies to enable them to continue their operations and to bring their operations back on to a profit making basis.

I would like to add my words of accommodation to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. He has worked very diligently over long hours over many days to communicate, discuss and carry out consultations with various sectors of the industry, going all the way back to the Kirby task force and following through with direct interventions and direct meetings between the federal Minister and his provincial counterparts in Atlantic Canada. We also want to compliment him for his effort in addressing a number of issues which have surfaced since the beginning of the Kirby task force examination of the Atlantic fisheries.

From my own Province's point of view, we are talking about the second largest contributor to the economy of the Province of Prince Edward Island. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I followed the discussions, beginning with the work of the Kirby task force, having served as a member of the ministerial subcommittee on the Atlantic fisheries. I met with the independent processors in my own riding and in Prince Edward Island. I was successful in being able to secure an opportunity for them to make their presentation before the Fisheries Committee.

• (1740)

I can only express the wish and the desire, which I am sure is shared by all Members, that this restructuring will enable a return to health for the fish processing sector and for the private entrepreneur within Atlantic Canada.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, please. It being 5.40 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings, pursuant to the provisions of the order made earlier today, and to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the third reading stage of the Bill now before the House.

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

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

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

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY—S.O. 62—GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Huntington:

That this House agrees without reservation with the prediction of the Prime Minister made on August 13, 1969, in a nationally televised press conference when he said, "We'd soon be on the road to financial disaster if nothing were done to bring spending under control" and calls upon the government to initiate policies which would avoid the Prime Minister's prediction.

And the amendment of Mr. Blenkarn:

That the motion be amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and by adding the following words:

"including, but not limited to, the adoption forthwith of the Seventh Report of the Special Committee on Standing Orders and Procedure".

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): It being 5.45 p.m., pursuant to order made Thursday, November 24, 1983, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred division on the amendment of Mr. Blenkarn to the motion of Mr. Huntington under our supply proceedings.

Call in the Members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Blenkarn) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 469*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—140.

● (1815)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

The next question is on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the Members. Shall we dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Huntington) which was negatived on the following division:

(*Division No. 470*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)

Messrs.

Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—117.

NAYS

Messrs.

Allmand
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourd (Argenteuil-Papineau)
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rooney
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—140.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

* * *

● (1825)

SUPPLY

CONCURRENCE IN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there are some 15 opposed items to the Supplementary Estimates (B). We have had consultations and agreed amongst ourselves to dispose of those 15 opposed items by having three recorded divisions as follows: The vote on item 1 will dispose of Item No. 12. The second recorded division, a vote on item No. 2 will dispose of items Nos. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 15. The third recorded division, a vote on item No. 5, will dispose of items Nos. 6 and 14. In so far as the unopposed items are concerned, you will realize later that they will go through on division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Mr. Nielsen: That is substantially correct, Mr. Speaker. The votes on all motions will be recorded as though a recorded division had taken place. Earlier this afternoon the Member for Hamilton Mountain asked for consent to delete Motion No. 4. We provide that consent now.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate receiving the consent. It is not necessary. We are prepared to take the votes as they were indicated by the President of the Privy Council. I agree with the comments of the House Leader for the Conservative Party.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed and so ordered. The next question is on Motion No. 1. This vote will also apply to Motion No. 12.

[*Translation*]

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 6B, DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 6b, in the amount of $8,109,406 under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs—Payment to Canada Post Corporation, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Gray) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 471)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Fulton
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Heap
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Knowles
Kristiansen
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murphy
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Parent
Parker
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson (Burnaby)
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Sargeant
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Skelly
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—165.

NAYS

Messrs.

Andre
Beatty
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Hnatyshyn
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kempling
Kilgour
Korchinski
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
MacDougall
Malone
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Mitges
Mulroney
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Paproski
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright—89.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 70B, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 70b, in the amount of $344,350,000 under the Department of Public Works—Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Gray) which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 482)

YEAS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Benjamin
Berger
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blais
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Chrétien
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
Deans
De Bané
de Corneille
de Jong
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Fulton
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Heap
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hovdebo
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Keeper
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Knowles
Kristiansen
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewycky
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Manly
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McRae
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murphy
Nicholson (Miss)
Nystrom
Ogle
Olivier
Orlikow
Ostiguy
Parent
Parker
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Riis
Roberts
Robinson (Burnaby)
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Sargeant
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Skelly
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Waddell
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis
Young—165.

NAYS

Messrs.

Andre
Beatty
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Hnatyshyn
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Kempling
Kilgour
Korchinski
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
MacDougall
Malone
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Mitges
Mulroney
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Paproski
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright—89.

● (1835)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion agreed to.

The next question is on Motion No. 2. This vote also applies to Motions Nos. 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 15.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B, MINISTRY OF STATE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $3,486,000 under the Ministry of State for Economic Development—Program expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall we dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Mr. Nielsen: As soon as the deputy Opposition Whip returns from the lobby we can dispense with the ringing of the bells, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We shall dispense with the ringing of the bells.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 472)

YEAS

Messrs.

Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 25B, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 25b, in the amount of $484,000,000 under the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources—Energy Program—Petroleum Incentives Program, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 473)

YEAS

Messrs.

Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly

Messrs.

Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 26B, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 26b, in the amount of $1 under the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources—Energy Program—Payment to Canertech Inc., in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 474*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid

Messrs.

McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 76B, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 76b, in the amount of $16,000,000 under the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources—Petro-Canada, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 477*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE L41B, DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote L41b, in the amount of $5,000,000 under the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce—Loans pursuant to the Industrial and Regional Development Act, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 478*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)

Messrs.

Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 65B, DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 65b, in the amount of $3,087,000 under the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce—Federal Business Development Bank, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 479)

YEAS

Messrs.

Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong

Messrs.

Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B, DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—CUSTOMS AND EXCISE

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $1,679,000 under the Department of National Revenue—Customs and Excise, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 480)

YEAS

Messrs.

Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dionne
(Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B, DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $9,700,000 under the Department of the Privy Council—Program expenditures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

Supply

(Division No. 481)

YEAS

Messrs.

Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 20B, DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 20b, in the amount of $61,000,516 under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion—Cape Breton Development Corporation, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 483)

YEAS

Messrs.

Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Chénier
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro (Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $1 under the Department of Transport—Departmental Administration Program, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following motion:

(*Division No. 485*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beauchamp-Niquet
(Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bossy
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss)
(South West Nova)
Campbell
(LaSalle)
Campbell
(Cardigan)
Chénier
Collenette
Comtois
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Cullen
Cyr
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne
(Chicoutimi)
Dionne
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Foster
Fox
Frith
Garant
Gauthier
Gendron
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde
(Lévis)
Gray
Guilbault
Harquail
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette
(Mrs.)
Hopkins
Hudecki
Irwin
Isabelle
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Killens (Mrs.)
Lachance
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapierre
Lapointe
(Charlevoix)
Lapointe
(Beauce)
LeBlanc
Leduc
Lefebvre
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
McCauley
McRae
Munro
(Hamilton East)
Nicholson (Miss)
Olivier
Ostiguy
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid
(Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schroder
Simmons
Smith
Tardif
Tessier
Tobin
Tousignant
Turner
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Yanakis—136.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Andre
Anguish
Beatty
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
Blenkarn
Bosley
Bradley
Cardiff
Clark
(Brandon-Souris)
Clarke
(Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Crombie
Crosbie
(St. John's West)
Crosby
(Halifax West)
Crouse
Dantzer
Darling
Deans
de Jong
Dick
Domm
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Fennell
Forrestall
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Fulton
Gamble
Gass
Gilchrist
Greenaway
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton
(Qu'Appelle-Moose
Mountain)
Hawkes
Heap
Hnatyshyn
Hovdebo
Howie
Huntington
Jarvis
Jelinek
Keeper
Kempling
Kilgour
Knowles
Korchinski
Kristiansen
Kushner
Lambert
La Salle
Lawrence
Lewis
Lewycky
MacDougall
Malone
Manly
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McDermid
McDonald (Ms.)
(Broadview-Greenwood)
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
Miller
Mitchell (Mrs.)
Mitges
Mulroney
Murphy
Murta
Neil
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Nystrom
Oberle
Ogle
Orlikow
Paproski
Parker
Riis
Robinson
(Burnaby)
Sargeant
Schellenberger
Scott
(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott
(Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Skelly
Speyer
Stevens
Stewart
Taylor
Thacker
Thomson
Towers
Vankoughnet
Waddell
Wenman
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Young—118.

● (1845)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 5. This vote also applies to Motions Nos. 6 and 14.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE L31B, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote L31b, in the amount of $6,000,000 under the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources—Energy Program—Loans to New Brunswick Electric Power Commission, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some Hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some Hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the yeas have it.

And more than five Members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Shall we dispense with the ringing of the bells?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(*Division No. 475*)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre
Appolloni (Mrs.)
Axworthy
Bachand
Baker
Beatty
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)
Bégin (Miss)
Berger
Blais
Blaker
Blenkarn
Bloomfield
Bockstael
Bosley
Bossy
Bradley
Breau
Bujold
Burghardt
Bussières
Caccia
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)
Campbell (LaSalle)
Campbell (Cardigan)
Cardiff
Chénier
Chrétien
Clark (Brandon-Souris)
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)
Coates
Collenette
Comtois
Cook
Cooper
Corbett
Corbin
Corriveau
Cosgrove
Cossitt (Mrs.)
Côté (Mrs.)
Cousineau
Crombie
Crosbie (St. John's West)
Crosby (Halifax West)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Dantzer
Darling
Daudlin
Dawson
De Bané
de Corneille
Demers
Deniger
Desmarais
Dick
Dingwall
Dion
Dionne (Chicoutimi)
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Domm
Dubois
Duclos
Dupont
Dupras
Ellis
Elzinga
Epp
Erola (Mrs.)
Ethier
Evans
Fennell
Ferguson
Fisher
Fleming
Flis
Forrestall
Foster
Fox
Fraser
Fretz
Friesen
Frith
Gamble
Garant
Gass
Gauthier
Gendron
Gilchrist
Gimaïel
Gingras
Gourde (Lévis)
Gray
Greenaway
Guilbault
Gurbin
Gustafson
Halliday
Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
Harquail
Hawkes
Henderson
Herbert
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)
Hnatyshyn
Hopkins
Howie
Hudecki
Huntington
Irwin
Isabelle
Jarvis
Jelinek
Johnston
Joyal
Kaplan
Kelly
Kempling
Kilgour
Killens (Mrs.)
Korchinski
Kushner
Lajoie
Lalonde
Lambert
Lamontagne
Landers
Lang
Laniel
Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Lapointe (Beauce)
La Salle
Lawrence
Leduc
Lefebvre
Lewis
Loiselle
Lumley
MacBain
MacDougall
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLaren
MacLellan
Malépart
Malone
Maltais
Marceau
Massé
Masters
Mayer
Mazankowski
McCain
McCauley
McDermid
McGrath
McKenzie
McKinnon
McKnight
McLean
McMillan
McRae
Mitges
Mulroney
Munro (Hamilton East)
Murta
Neil
Nicholson (Miss)
Nickerson
Nielsen
Nowlan
Oberle
Olivier
Ostiguy
Paproski
Parent
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Peterson
Pinard
Portelance
Prud'homme
Regan
Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Roberts
Rompkey
Rossi
Roy
Savard
Schellenberger
Schroder
Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
Shields
Siddon
Simmons
Smith
Stevens
Stewart
Tardif
Taylor
Tessier
Thacker
Thomson
Tobin
Tousignant
Towers
Turner
Vankoughnet
Veillette
Watson
Weatherhead
Wenman
Whelan
Wilson
Wise
Wright
Yanakis—222.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse
Anguish
Benjamin
Blackburn
Blaikie
de Jong
Fulton
Heap
Hovdebo
Keeper
Knowles
Lewycky
Manly
McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)
Miller
Murphy
Nystrom
Ogle
Orlikow
Robinson (Burnaby)
Sargeant
Skelly
Waddell
Young—24.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 55B, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, MINES AND RESOURCES

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 55b, in the amount of $700,000 under the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources—Atomic Energy of Canada Limited—Capital expendi-

tures, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 476)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre	Domm	Lapointe (Charlevoix)
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Dubois	Lapointe (Beauce)
Axworthy	Duclos	La Salle
Bachand	Dupont	Lawrence
Baker	Dupras	Leduc
Beatty	Ellis	Lefebvre
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)	Elzinga	Lewis
Bégin (Miss)	Epp	Loiselle
Berger	Erola (Mrs.)	Lumley
Blais	Ethier	MacBain
Blaker	Evans	MacDougall
Blenkarn	Fennell	MacEachen
Bloomfield	Ferguson	MacGuigan
Bockstael	Fisher	Mackasey
Bosley	Fleming	MacLaren
Bossy	Flis	MacLellan
Bradley	Forrestall	Malépart
Breau	Foster	Malone
Bujold	Fox	Maltais
Burghardt	Fraser	Marceau
Bussières	Fretz	Massé
Caccia	Friesen	Masters
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)	Frith	Mayer
Campbell (LaSalle)	Gamble	Mazankowski
Campbell (Cardigan)	Garant	McCain
Cardiff	Gass	McCauley
Chénier	Gauthier	McDermid
Chrétien	Gendron	McGrath
Clark (Brandon-Souris)	Gilchrist	McKenzie
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)	Gimaïel	McKinnon
Coates	Gingras	McKnight
Collenette	Gourde (Lévis)	McLean
Comtois	Gray	McMillan
Cook	Greenaway	McRae
Cooper	Guilbault	Mitges
Corbett	Gurbin	Mulroney
Corbin	Gustafson	Munro (Hamilton East)
Corriveau	Halliday	Murta
Cosgrove	Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)	Neil
Cossitt (Mrs.)	Harquail	Nicholson (Miss)
Côté (Mrs.)	Hawkes	Nickerson
Cousineau	Henderson	Nielsen
Crombie	Herbert	Nowlan
Crosbie (St. John's West)	Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)	Oberle
Crosby (Halifax West)	Hnatyshyn	Olivier
Crouse	Hopkins	Ostiguy
Cullen	Howie	Paproski
Cyr	Hudecki	Parent
Dantzer	Huntington	Pelletier
Darling	Irwin	Penner
Daudlin	Isabelle	Pepin
Dawson	Jarvis	Peterson
De Bané	Jelinek	Pinard
de Corneille	Johnston	Portelance
Demers	Joyal	Prud'homme
Deniger	Kaplan	Regan
Desmarais	Kelly	Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Dick	Kempling	Roberts
Dingwall	Kilgour	Rompkey
Dion	Killens (Mrs.)	Rossi
Dionne (Chicoutimi)	Korchinski	Roy
Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)	Kushner	Savard
	Lajoie	Schellenberger
	Lalonde	Schroder
	Lambert	Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth)
	Lamontagne	Scott (Victoria-Haliburton)
	Landers	Shields
	Lang	Siddon
	Laniel	Simmons
		Smith
		Stevens
		Stewart
		Tardif
		Taylor
		Tessier
		Thacker
		Thomson
		Tobin
		Tousignant
		Towers
		Turner
		Vankoughnet
		Veillette
		Watson
		Weatherhead
		Wenman
		Whelan
		Wilson
		Wise
		Wright
		Yanakis—222.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse	Keeper	Ogle
Anguish	Knowles	Orlikow
Benjamin	Lewycky	Robinson (Burnaby)
Blackburn	Manly	Sargeant
Blaikie	McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)	Skelly
de Jong	Miller	Waddell
Fulton	Murphy	Young—24.
Heap	Nystrom	
Hovdebo		

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1B, DEPARTMENT OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1b, in the amount of $4,073,864 under the Department of the Solicitor General—Administration Program, in the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, be concurred in.

The House divided on the motion, which was agreed to on the following division:

(Division No. 484)

YEAS

Messrs.

Andre	Cook	Ellis
Appolloni (Mrs.)	Cooper	Elzinga
Axworthy	Corbett	Epp
Bachand	Corbin	Erola (Mrs.)
Baker	Corriveau	Ethier
Beatty	Cosgrove	Evans
Beauchamp-Niquet (Mrs.)	Cossitt (Mrs.)	Fennell
Bégin (Miss)	Côté (Mrs.)	Ferguson
Berger	Cousineau	Fisher
Blais	Crombie	Fleming
Blaker	Crosbie (St. John's West)	Flis
Blenkarn	Crosby (Halifax West)	Forrestall
Bloomfield	Crouse	Foster
Bockstael	Cullen	Fox
Bosley	Cyr	Fraser
Bossy	Dantzer	Fretz
Bradley	Darling	Friesen
Breau	Daudlin	Frith
Bujold	Dawson	Gamble
Burghardt	De Bané	Garant
Bussières	de Corneille	Gass
Caccia	Demers	Gauthier
Campbell (Miss) (South West Nova)	Deniger	Gendron
Campbell (LaSalle)	Desmarais	Gilchrist
Campbell (Cardigan)	Dick	Gimaïel
Cardiff	Dingwall	Gingras
Chénier	Dion	Gourde (Lévis)
Chrétien	Dionne (Chicoutimi)	Gray
Clark (Brandon-Souris)	Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi)	Greenaway
Clarke (Vancouver Quadra)	Domm	Guilbault
Coates	Dubois	Gurbin
Collenette	Duclos	Gustafson
Comtois	Dupont	Halliday
	Dupras	Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain)
		Harquail
		Hawkes

Messrs.

Henderson	MacEachen	Pinard
Herbert	MacGuigan	Portelance
Hervieux-Payette (Mrs.)	Mackasey	Prud'homme
Hnatyshyn	MacLaren	Regan
Hopkins	MacLellan	Reid (Kenora-Rainy River)
Howie	Malépart	Roberts
Hudecki	Malone	Rompkey
Huntington	Maltais	Rossi
Irwin	Marceau	Roy
Isabelle	Massé	Savard
Jarvis	Masters	Schellenberger
Jelinek	Mayer	Schroder
Johnston	Mazankowski	Scott
Joyal	McCain	(Hamilton-Wentworth)
Kaplan	McCauley	Scott
Kelly	McDermid	(Victoria-Haliburton)
Kempling	McGrath	Shields
Kilgour	McKenzie	Siddon
Killens (Mrs.)	McKinnon	Simmons
Korchinski	McKnight	Smith
Kushner	McLean	Stevens
Lajoie	McMillan	Stewart
Lalonde	McRae	Tardif
Lambert	Mitges	Taylor
Lamontagne	Mulroney	Tessier
Landers	Munro (Hamilton East)	Thacker
Lang	Murta	Thomson
Laniel	Neil	Tobin
Lapointe (Charlevoix)	Nicholson (Miss)	Tousignant
Lapointe (Beauce)	Nickerson	Towers
La Salle	Nielsen	Turner
Lawrence	Nowlan	Vankoughnet
Leduc	Oberle	Veillette
Lefebvre	Olivier	Watson
Lewis	Ostiguy	Weatherhead
Loiselle	Paproski	Wenman
Lumley	Parent	Whelan
MacBain	Pelletier	Wilson
MacDougall	Penner	Wise
	Pepin	Wright
	Peterson	Yanakis—222.

NAYS

Messrs.

Althouse	Keeper	Ogle
Anguish	Knowles	Orlikow
Benjamin	Lewycky	Robinson (Burnaby)
Blackburn	Manly	Sargeant
Blaikie	McDonald (Ms.) (Broadview-Greenwood)	Skelly
de Jong	Miller	Waddell
Fulton	Murphy	Young—24.
Heap	Nystrom	
Hovdebo		

● (1850)

[*Translation*]

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (B)

Hon. Herb Gray (President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (B) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1984, laid upon the Table, Thursday, November 3, 1983, except those items disposed of earlier this day, be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to on division.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried on division.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Gray thereupon moved that Bill C-173, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Government of Canada for the financial year ending March 31, 1984, be read the first time and be printed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. Nielsen: On division.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

● (1855)

Mr. Gray thereupon moved that Bill C-173, an Act granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Government of Canada for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1984, be read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Corbin in the chair.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 2 carry?

Some Hon. Members: On dividion.

Clause 2 agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 3 carry?

Mr. Nielsen: On division.

Clause agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 4 carry?

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Clause agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 5 carry?

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Clause agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 6 carry?

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Clause agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall the Schedule carry?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that notwithstanding our support for Motion No. 5, there is a serious deficiency in that vote. The vote pertains to non-budgetary item L31b on page six of the Schedule under the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. It reads:

Loans to New Brunswick Electric Power Commission in connection with the operation of a nuclear generating station at Point Lepreau, New Brunswick.

An agreement reached between New Brunswick and the federal Government provides a series of standby loans to New Brunswick Power in the event that the Point Lepreau nuclear reactor fails to provide an adequate amount of electricity. The agreement provides that New Brunswick Power can receive up to $6 million per year maximum in the event that Point Lepreau's power production is less than 75 per cent of capacity.

When the Supplementary Estimate was drawn up, the Department assumed that the maximum amount for the year would be called upon. In fact, while the reactor missed its October start-up date, and only started producing at full power in March, the reactor has behaved very well since. Thus New Brunswick Power is only able to call upon a total of $3.8 million.

New Brunswick Power has indicated in writing to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources that it has no intention of seeking any funds for the current year. It is also worth noting that when called, New Brunswick Power knew nothing of this Supplementary Estimate.

● (1900)

Since the fund has been called upon to the extent I just indicated, we had no choice but to support concurrence in the estimate itself. But it is evidence of a sloppiness in the preparation of the estimate, particularly in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources where they would be calling for substantial moneys over and above those actually needed.

We are therefore supporting the Schedule, but now that these remarks are on the record the Department will likely take note and rectify things in the future.

[*Translation*]

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The President of the Privy Council, on the same point of order.

Mr. Pinard: There is absolutely no point of order. At this stage, the Chair is supposed to put all questions, without debate or amendment, and I think this is abusing the rules of the House. I hope the Member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) will refrain from doing so again.

[*English*]

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: The point raised by the President of the Privy Council is well taken. I refer Hon. Members to Standing Order 62(10) where the Chairman has no choice but to put all questions forthwith and successively without debate or amendment. I take it that the Hon. Member for Yukon was rising on a point of order. He has made his point and we will proceed.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Chairman, to accept the point of order raised by the Hon. Member for Yukon to place on the record justification for an absolute irrational act in supporting the nuclear program is unacceptable. The Member was not up on a point of order.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Order. We are now getting into debate.

Shall the Schedule carry?

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Schedule agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall Clause 1 carry?

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Clause agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall the preamble carry?

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Preamble agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall the title carry?

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Title agreed to.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: Shall I report the Bill?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Bill reported.

Mr. Gray moved that the Bill be concurred in.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Gray moved that the Bill be read the third time and do pass.

Some Hon. Members: On division.

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme), on a point of order.

Mr. Prud'homme: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

I seek unanimous consent. We have undertaken all consultations necessary and it should be possible to get consent for presenting to the House a motion to be accepted without debate by all Parties.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to reverting to motions?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

External Affairs and National Defence

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE CANADA'S PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): The motion reads:

That the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence be empowered to examine all aspects of Canada's participation in international peacekeeping, present and anticipated, and report to the House not later than May 15, 1984.

Mr. Nielsen: We have no problem with that motion, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the purpose for moving it now is so that the machinery can be put in place in anticipation of the work of the Standing Committee to carry out this reference. The Hon. Member for the Government will undoubtedly be putting a similar reference when we come back after prorogation, at which time we will have to consider its form and see how we deal with it at that time.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, that meets with our agreement also. It is in line with the discussion which I understand took place between the three House Leaders.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Agreed?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to.

It being 7.06 p.m. this House now stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock, pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 7.06 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 30, 1983

The House met at 2 p.m.

• (1405)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I hope that it will be possible for Hon. Members to join me in the chambers of Madam Speaker after the events of this afternoon for the usual reception.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate have passed the following Bills, without amendment:

Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Financial Administration Act;

Bill C-171, an Act to amend the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act;

Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring fishery enterprises; and also

Bill C-173, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Government of Canada for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1984.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received, which is as follows:

Madam,

I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 30th day of November, 1983, at 1400 hours, to give Royal Assent to certain Bills and for the purpose of proroguing the First Session of the Thirty-Second Parliament.

I have the honour to be
Madam,
Your obedient servant,
Edmond Joly de Lotbinière
Administrative Secretary to the Governor General

Mr. Domm: I rise on a brief point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder how you could have all of this information. I am sure I heard the bells ringing in the Senate when I came into this Chamber.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Statements pursuant to Standing Order 21. The Hon. Member for Winnipeg-Assiniboine.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[*English*]

PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

MANITOBA FUNDING OF HOSPITALS—CALL FOR INVESTIGATION

Mr. Dan McKenzie (Winnipeg-Assiniboine): Mr. Speaker, I wish to call on the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) to launch an immediate investigation into the manner in which the New Democratic Government of Manitoba is mismanaging its funding for health care. Three tragedies have occurred at the Manitoba Health Sciences Centre because of the NDP restraint policy of reducing staff at hospitals, which results in unacceptably low staffing and overcrowding. In one instance a nurse at the Health Sciences Centre had in her care 24 babies in the nursery. It was in this overcrowded nursery that two infants died.

The staff of the Health Sciences Centre are not able to perform their duties effectively under these conditions. In response to the obvious need for increased hospital funding the NDP Government announced a 3 per cent spending limit on hospitals and ordered the obstetrics unit at the Seven Oaks and Concordia hospitals to be shut down, adding an even greater burden to the Health Sciences Centre and a greater risk to the patients.

There is no public confidence in the administration of health services by the New Democratic Government. Clearly this is gross mismanagement on the part of the NDP, and an immediate investigation by the Minister of National Health and Welfare is necessary to make certain that funding for health care facilities in Manitoba is of an amount to ensure a standard level of safety, and that this funding is not misdirected.

* * *

THE ADMINISTRATION

NEWSPAPER REPORT OF STATEMENTS BY MEMBER FOR YORK WEST

Mr. John McDermid (Brampton-Georgetown): Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada had their suspicions. We in the Opposition have been saying it for years, and now the truth is out. The Liberal Government and Cabinet are controlled by the bureaucrats and do not listen to the people of Canada.

Let us review the facts presented by the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Fleming), and I quote from the Toronto *Star* of November 30:

S.O. 21

Cabinet Ministers are treated like children. They are afraid of officials in Trudeau's office. Too much power rests with non-elected officials and advisers in Trudeau's office. The Government operates on cynicism, ballyhoo and manipulation.

The six and five program is run by non-elected officials and not by Ministers.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I bring to the attention of the Hon. Member that reference to the Prime Minister should be by his title. That is the usual courtesy in this House.

Mr. McDermid: I was quoting from the Toronto *Star,* Mr. Speaker.

No wonder this Government is in trouble. Ministers get their marching orders from Jim Coutts, Keith Davey, and Tom Axworthy.

The Liberal defence to all these accusations is, "It's just sour grapes; the Hon. Member for York West is just mad because he was dropped from Cabinet". I like to think that it is a Liberal who finally decided to tell the truth. How refreshing, Mr. Speaker. It is fitting that these revelations be made available on the last day of the longest session in Canada's history. I call on the Government to let Canadians have a fresh start, forget the Throne Speech, and call an election. It would be the finest Christmas present—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired. The Hon. Member for Hamilton-Wentworth.

* * *

THE ADMINISTRATION

DESCRIPTION ATTRIBUTED TO MEMBER FOR YORK WEST

Mr. Geoff Scott (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are dead if they stay the way they are. People do not look at them as an honest, sincere bunch. Cabinet Ministers are fearful of the Prime Minister's Office. "Ministers are treated like children and are running off and watching their backs at all times." "Too much power rests with non-elected officials and advisers in the Prime Minister's Office". "The Government operates on cynicism and ballyhoo and manipulations." That, Mr. Speaker, was a Liberal Member of Parliament tearing great strips off his own hierarchy.

Today I get the chance, Mr. Speaker, to do something you do not often hear coming from this side. I want to congratulate the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Fleming) warmly for stating the obvious. Mind you, it has taken 15 years, including 591 sitting days in this current session of Parliament, for the message to sink in, but the Member for York West has publicly confirmed what we on this side have maintained for years; this Liberal Government is run from the Prime Minister's Office, not by its elected representatives. And it has taken a former Liberal Cabinet Minister to declare it. But running off and watching their backs at all times not only applies to his former colleagues in Cabinet. Most Liberals over there will be performing similar retreats at the polls next year. They should thank the Hon. Member for York West for reminding them that, after the next election, we Progressive Conservatives will be operating a true parliamentary democracy—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order.

• (1410)

THE ROYAL ASSENT

[*English*]

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

In the Senate chamber, the Governor General was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

Bill C-172, an Act to amend the Labour Adjustment Benefits Act and to authorize certain payments in relation thereto.—Chapter No. 169

Bill C-96, an Act to amend the Financial Administration Act—Chapter 170

Bill C-171, an Act to amend the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act.—Chapter No. 171

Bill C-170, an Act to authorize investment in and the provision of financial assistance to the Atlantic Fisheries for the purpose of restructuring fishery enterprises.—Chapter 172

Bill C-173, Appropriation Act No. 3, 1983-84.—Chapter 173

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

After which the Deputy Governor General was pleased to close the first session of the Thirty-Second Parliament of Canada with the following speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

I have the honour today of closing the longest and most productive session in the history of the Canadian Parliament. During the three and a half year period in which you have been sitting more than 200 pieces of legislation have been introduced and over 150 of these have been proclaimed into law.

This session has been remarkable not only for the number of bills passed, but for the magnitude of their impact. The Government recognized that those who wait for unanimity never act, and that those who do not act are engulfed by the wave of events of a rapidly changing world. Accordingly, the Government launched a series of bold initiatives, any one of which would have been sufficient to make this session of Parliament an exceptional one. Four in particular have transformed Canada.

Following the Quebec referendum, the Government initiated the process of federal renewal which it promised would ensue from a rejection of sovereignty association, patriating the Canadian Constitution with an amending formula and an entrenched Charter of Rights and Freedoms. A National Energy Program is in force providing a comprehensive set of measures designed to achieve security of supply, greater Canadian ownership and fairness to the consumer. The federal Government's 6&5 program established a framework for the cooperative national effort which has enabled Canada to realize a dramatic reduction in inflation. And the new Western Grain Transportation Act will replace the outdated Crow's Nest Pass freight rate with a more fair and equitable set of rates, thus completing the necessary groundwork for a major expansion of western rail capacity during the balance of the decade.

Meeting the Challenges of World Recession

These four achievements represent the highlights of the Parliamentary session which now is coming to an end; they have been attained in the midst of one of the most turbulent periods which Canada has experienced outside of wartime. The past three and a half years have been marked by global recession, by unstable international petroleum markets, by increased levels of East-West tension, and by the displacement of millions of people around the planet by war, hunger and economic deprivation.

The Canadian response to these troubled times has been, not to retrench, but to meet these greater challenges through a more effective mobilization of our

resources. The Government took steps to protect Canadians as much as possible from the ravages of international recession, and to battle domestic inflation. The stage thus was set for the renewed growth and job creation which we are now experiencing.

The centrepiece of the Government's battle against inflation was the 6&5 program, introduced last year to limit increases in incomes and prices regulated by the Federal Government to six percent and five percent respectively over two years. The compulsory restraint measures introduced in the federal public service were reinforced by widespread voluntary adoption of these guidelines by the private sector and the provinces.

The impact of the 6&5 program was enhanced by continuing Government restraint over the discretionary component of its expenditures, and by monetary policy conducted in a way which would not accommodate inflation. The "envelope" system placed pre-set limits on spending in each area of government responsibility, and ensured that policy and funding decisions were taken simultaneously. Improved management practices were implemented generating 122 million dollars in recurring annual savings; opportunities for realizing further annual savings of 139 million dollars have also been identified. Many of the recommendations of the Lambert Commission on Financial Management and Accountability were adopted. As a result of these efforts, the Government's "real", or inflation-adjusted, non-defence operating and capital expenditures are at the same level now that they were six years ago. Total federal government employment, measured in person-years controlled by the Treasury Board, is at the same level in 1983 as it was in 1979.

The inflation rate today is 4.9 percent, the lowest level in eleven years. Other dividends from the Government's anti-inflationary stance are reduced interest rates, a stable dollar and the record trade surplus which we are now experiencing.

Canada was struck as forcefully as its trading partners by the worldwide recession. The Government took concerted action to protect Canadians from its worst effects and to ensure the vigour of the domestic recovery. A work sharing program was introduced to prevent layoffs. New funds were channeled into direct job creation, tax incentives and other measures to stimulate activity in employment-intensive sectors, and new programs to promote economic development. A framework of investment incentives has been announced. Changes to the investment tax credit will make it more readily usable by firms investing in Canada, and will render a portion of the credit refundable. Purchasers of new shares issued by investing firms will also be eligible for the credit. A Special Recovery Investment fund is being created to speed and strengthen private investment during the early stages of the recovery. The maximum personal tax rate has been cut in order to encourage savings and investment. The Indexed Security Investment Plan will provide an additional incentive to invest in common shares of Canadian companies by eliminating taxation on the inflationary part of capital gains.

Particular consideration has been accorded to small business, the most dynamic force in our economy. The Small Business Development Bond increased the funds available to small business by providing a tax exemption on the interest earned by loans to small businesses. Tax measures were introduced to permit the deduction of spouses' salaries from income as a business expense, and review procedures for small business under the provisions of the Foreign Investment Review Act were streamlined.

In addition to initiatives aimed at stimulating private sector activity through direct incentives, the Government has undertaken a series of public sector and demand stimulus measures to generate rapid results. More than 2 billion dollars has been targeted to direct job creation alone during the past four fiscal years, providing work for over 700,000 people. A further 2 billion dollars in new funding has been directed to the stimulation of construction in the housing sector, while a major program has been launched, as part of the Crow Rate initiative, to speed the expansion and modernization of rail capacity in the West. The Special Recovery Program announced in the Spring Budget targeted a further 2.4 billion dollars over four years to public investment stimulus through accelerated capital and infrastructure projects.

These programs are now bearing fruit. During the first half of 1983 the Canadian economy grew at an annual rate of 7½ percent. Housing starts, industrial production and capacity utilization are all up significantly. Employment levels have rebounded, and the number of people employed has grown at an average rate of 31,000 per month since last November.

Many groups in our society were cruelly affected by high interest rates during the past three and a half years. The Government took extensive action to provide relief to those groups particularly hard hit.

It responded to the plight of homeowners facing high mortgage costs. Grants of up to $3,000 were made available to homeowners whose mortgage renewals brought their mortgage costs above 30 percent of their gross income. In addition, grants of $3,000 each were extended to first-time home buyers and to purchasers of new houses. The Canadian Home Renovation Plan provided assistance to homeowners undertaking home repairs.

Parallel measures were introduced to help renters. The Canada Rental Support Plan was put forward to ease tight rental housing markets by providing interest-free loans toward the construction of new rental units.

Special measures were enacted to ease the burden of farmers, fishermen and small businessmen. The ceilings for loans under the Small Business Loans Act and Farm Improvement Loans Act were raised to $100,000; for the Fisheries Improvements Loans Act to $150,000; and for the Farm Credit Corporation to $350,000. The total funding available under the Small Business Loans program was almost doubled, to 1.5 billion dollars, and a Small Business Investment Grant program was initiated to reduce costs on borrowing undertaken by small businessmen, farmers and fishermen. The Special Farm Financial Assistance Program provided an interest rebate of four percent on loans extended through the Farm Credit Corporation.

The Government's actions to deal with inflation, unemployment and high interest rates were accompanied by a program to respond to the challenges of the 1980s in a bold and creative manner. That program, outlined in the 1980 Speech from the Throne, had five principal goals:

—to respond to individual needs by promoting greater security for the elderly, expanded opportunities for the young, and equality for women;

—to achieve security of energy supply at a fair price for all Canadians;

—to promote national economic development in a way that would provide jobs, stimulate growth, build upon regional strengths, and increase Canadian ownership and control of our economy;

—to strengthen national institutions, while making them more responsive to provincial and regional goals;

—to ensure that Canada plays a vigorous part in the world beyond our borders.

Helping First Those Who Need Help Most

The first of the goals set out at the opening of the session, enhancing the security of the individual, was designed to help first those who need help most. The Government continues to believe that this must be its first guiding principle and it has given effect to this principle through a wide array of initiatives. In doing so, it has been one of the few western governments not to cut back spending on social services during the last three years.

The elderly came first, with the passage of legislation to raise the Guaranteed Income Supplement to the Old Age Security pension by $35 per month per household, thereby improving the standard of living of 1.3 million pensioners.

In addition, to initiate the complex process of pension reform, a National Pensions Conference was convened as part of the consultative phase of this process and a comprehensive study of the issue, published as a Green Paper, was undertaken.

The Government has addressed the needs and concerns of Canadian women, and taken steps to guarantee their right to full and equal participation in all aspects of our national life.

Within the federal public service, a pilot affirmative action program put in place in 1981 for women, natives and the handicapped is the model for a comprehensive affirmative action program now being implemented in all federal government departments. In addition, a Commission of Inquiry on Equality in Employment has been established to investigate employment practices affecting these groups in certain Crown corporations, and officials within the government have been working with private employers to help them develop their own affirmative action programs.

Female representation in the management and professional categories of the public service has expanded steadily. The principle of equal pay for work of equal value has been adopted within the public service as a guideline applicable to all collective agreements and salary settlements.

This session has been marked by the appointment of the first woman Speaker of the House of Commons and the first woman on the Supreme Court of Canada.

Women have been appointed to positions as Chief Justices in Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan, and a woman has been appointed Lieutenant Governor of Manitoba.

Outside the public sector, the Women's Employment and Women in Non-Traditional Occupations programs have helped break down barriers to entry in non-traditional job fields. The new National Training Act, which has directed resources towards improved job training, provides important support to women wishing to enhance or update their job skills.

The Government has moved to help many women who are working parents. It enriched the child tax credit to $343 per child and doubled the child care expense deduction to $2,000 per child. The Unemployment Insurance Act was amended to provide greater flexibility and equity in the determination of eligibility for maternity benefits, and to extend these benefits to adoptive parents.

For those staying at home to care for their children, pension coverage was improved with the introduction of a child rearing dropout provision to the Canada Pension Plan. It entitles mothers or fathers to remain outside the labour force while their children are under the age of seven without sacrificing future pension benefits.

The Government has addressed the problem of violence against women through major amendments to the parts of the Criminal Code dealing with sexual offences. These amendments replace the offence of rape with various offences of sexual assault, and provide additional protection to women through elimination of spousal immunity and elimination of the need for corroboration of a complainant's testimony.

Amendments to the Human Rights Act also afford increased protection to women, particularly against sexual harassment.

And the most fundamental step of all has been taken by enshrining the principle of equal rights for men and women in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Young people have also been a particular focus for Government action, which dealt with the primary concerns of youth employment and academic prospects.

The young, lacking employment experience, have been a particular casualty of the recession at the very point in their lives at which they should be acquiring job skills and developing sound work habits. To deal with this situation, the Government has launched a series of initiatives directed specifically towards jobs for younger workers.

A Youth Wage Subsidy and Internship Program has been established to help young people obtain work experience and on-the-job training. Katimavik, the Youth Job Corps Program, and the Summer Youth Employment Program have all been expanded. An Extended Youth Training and Employment Program run by the Department of National Defence has been established to provide employment and vocational training.

Young people will be major beneficiaries of the National Training Act. Under this Act, 1.2 billion dollars has been made available during the current fiscal year alone for improved job training opportunities and facilities. The Act also provides for federal assistance to people enrolled in provincial and private educational courses.

Altogether, more than 300,000 young people will have been assisted this year by these and other federal training and employment programs.

Amendments also have been made to the Canada Student Loans Act which almost double the maximum annual amount available to individual students and which broaden the eligibility criteria for loans to include those studying part-time. The program will have benefited 185,000 students this year.

A new Young Offenders Act affords increased protection to young people accused of crimes by giving them explicit rights under the law, raising the age of criminal responsibility from seven to twelve, and providing for destruction of court records when sentences have been served and certain other criteria met.

The Government has given the needs of the handicapped special consideration.

The handicapped are one of the designated groups to which the public service affirmative action program is directed. In addition, a Program for the Employment Disadvantaged has been introduced to develop private sector opportunities for handicapped workers.

Amendments have been made to the Human Rights Act to protect the disabled from discrimination.

A Parliamentary Task Force on the Disabled and Handicapped tabled its report during 1981, the International Year of Disabled Persons, recommending government initiatives to improve job opportunities and living conditions for the handicapped. Significant progress has already been made on more than two thirds of these recommendations, while steps are being taken to address the remaining third. Examples of recommendations being implemented include the allocation of five percent of housing units built under certain Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation programs to specially designed units for the disabled, and significant modifications to airports, train stations, ferries, bus terminals and other federal buildings to improve their accessibility.

The Secretary of State has been named the Minister responsible for issues affecting the disabled, and a status of disabled persons secretariat has been established within his department.

Energy Security at a Fair Price

The second major goal for Parliament set out at the opening of this session was that of achieving energy security at a fair price. The Government introduced the National Energy Program and signed agreements with the oil-producing provinces. A blended, made-in-Canada oil price, fair to producers and consumers, has resulted in average wellhead prices significantly below world levels. Recent amendments to the federal-provincial energy agreements give Canadians additional assurances of price stability over an 18 month period, as well as a guarantee that wholesale natural gas prices in the large eastern Canadian markets will not exceed 65 percent of the price of oil. In western Canada these prices are even lower. The commitment made in 1980 not to impose an 18¢ increase in the excise tax on transportation fuels has been honoured.

You were told three years ago that the Government would take steps to achieve 50 percent Canadian ownership of the petroleum industry by 1990. At that time, 28 percent of our petroleum production was owned by Canadians. Today, in large part because of a strengthened Petro-Canada and an incentive system designed to promote Canadian ownership, that figure is at 38 percent. Furthermore, a majority of all exploration expenditures now are undertaken by Canadian controlled companies, compared to three years ago when only 34 percent were Canadian controlled. As well, a new Canadian petroleum company, Co-Enerco, was established as a result of collaboration between the cooperative movement and the federal Government.

Energy conservation and the shift from oil to other fuels have both accelerated as a result of incentives put in place during the past three years. The Canadian Home Insulation Program has been extended and the eligibility criteria broadened. So far 1.8 million homes have received grants towards improved insulation, meaning average savings of 17 percent on heating bills. Natural gas pricing policy and off-oil conversion grants have helped to reduce the number of households heated by oil from 42 percent to 31 percent in the past three years. Grants have been provided for the conversion of vehicles to propane fuel, and a pilot project has been launched to investigate the feasibility of compressed natural gas as an alternative fuel. An alternate energy corporation, Canertech, has been established to carry out research and development on renewable energy forms.

The Government's vigorous promotion of conservation and oil substitution has helped reduce domestic demand so much that this year Canada achieved oil self-sufficiency. Only a few years ago, 1990 was considered an optimistic target for attaining self-sufficiency and we have hit it seven years early. Today, Canada has a cumulative 1983 crude oil trade surplus of over 300 million dollars and an overall energy trade surplus of 5 billion dollars.

The Government has aided companies willing to undertake major energy development projects. Despite softening world oil prices, several major projects were announced within the last two years—for instance, oil sands developments at Wolf Lake and Cold Lake, expansion at Syncrude in Fort McMurray, a heavy oil upgrader in Regina, and the Norman Wells project.

Since you were told that Petro-Canada would be expanded and its budget increased, it has more than doubled the value of its assets. The corporation's share of retail revenues in the petroleum industry has now risen to eleven percent, from less than two percent in 1979, reflecting an increase both in the number of retail outlets and in consumer support. Petro-Canada has been actively involved in Canadian exploration, particularly in risky frontier areas. Today, Petro-Canada is at work in every part of the country, and Canadians are proud of their national energy corporation.

Promoting Economic Development

The third objective put forth in 1980 was national economic development. In addition to the measures already cited to promote job creation, improved job training and lower inflation, sectoral and regional initiatives were undertaken as part of our economic development policy.

The government has pursued industrial development on a variety of fronts to utilize the strengths inherent in our well-diversified industrial base. It took measures to:

—preserve and rebuild Canada's industrial base;

—provide incentives for increased research and development;

—promote the expansion of export markets;

—upgrade Canada's transportation infrastructure;

—improve the health of Canadian resource industries.

Several major government departments are being reorganized to improve the process of economic policy development and the implementation of regional development concerns.

A 1 billion dollar Industrial and Regional Development Program has been established to help Canadian industry become more competitive internationally and to attract new industries. Under this program a more equitable index of regional disparities is being used to determine levels of assistance, and for the first time all economic development programs will be available throughout the country.

A large number of initiatives were undertaken during this session to stimulate disadvantaged areas, boost promising new projects and industries, spur productivity growth, upgrade infrastructure, and provide assistance to sectors experiencing temporary difficulties. Federal funds for the shipbuilding industry are promoting ship construction and assisting in shipyard improvement, while support has been extended to help Chrysler Canada and Massey-Ferguson weather periods of temporary difficulty. A major federal program of adjustment assistance is facilitating modernization and rationalization of the textile industry, and creation of new employment opportunities for displaced workers. An Office of Industrial and Regional Benefits is promoting Canadian sourcing of equipment and expertise for resource development projects. Government programs were a factor which helped Bombardier secure a major export contract for urban transit vehicles. The Canadian Space Program is providing continued support to leading-edge industries.

In view of the Government's commitment to raise Canadian spending on research and development to 1.5 percent of Gross National Product by 1985, a policy planning framework was announced. More recently, as part of a comprehensive technology policy, the Government has announced construction of fifteen new research facilities, additional funding allocations for high technology procurement and proposals to simplify and enhance tax incentives. Funding for the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council and for the Industrial Research Assistance Program was increased. Stimulated in part by these and other government measures, research and development spending as a percentage of Canadian Gross National Product has risen from 1.03 percent in 1979 to a forecast level of 1.4 percent for 1983.

Effective export promotion was the goal of several Government initiatives. The Department of External Affairs was restructured to help ensure that trade considerations receive priority in the development of our foreign policy. Funding was increased to help small and medium-sized businesses fulfill their export potential, and a new financing facility introduced to better assist Canadian companies to compete abroad. Overall funding for the Export Development Corporation was raised.

Since 1979 Canada's trade surplus has quadrupled, to a record high level of 17 billion dollars for 1983 to date. This rise contributed to the 7 billion dollar improvement in the overall balance of payments which occurred over the same period, resulting in the first current account surplus in nine years.

In transportation, a central part of the Government's approach to industrial development, the greatest single achievement has been resolution of the Crow's Nest Pass Rate issue. The legislation directs 3.5 billion dollars over four years towards implementation of a fairer freight rate structure and expansion of western rail capacity, and will lever up to 16.5 billion dollars more to these objectives. The decision to change the Crow Rate will mean a permanent subsidy to western Canada of 651 million dollars per year. Much of the Canadian National line between Winnipeg and Vancouver will be double-tracked. Altogether, 375,000 person-years of employment will thus be generated.

Steps have been taken to match increased rail capacity with enhanced port facilities. At Prince Rupert, construction is nearing completion of a new port which will include coal and grain terminals; the coal terminal will provide the facilities required for the northeast British Columbia coal development project. The Canada Ports Corporation has been established to increase local port autonomy and to improve overall efficiency of the national ports system. These improvements to our transportation system will become particularly vital when world market demand recovers.

In another major Canadian industry, the Government has already acted on many recommendations of comprehensive studies of the east and west coast fisheries, in order to improve their productivity and enhance the livelihoods of fishermen and plant workers. A federal-provincial agreement was signed to revitalize the Newfoundland deep-sea fishing industry, creating a new fishing company from the assets of several which are financially troubled, and agreement in principle was negotiated with Nova Scotia for a comparable initiative in that province. Enabling legislation was passed to authorize federal involvement in the restructuring of the Atlantic fishery. The Government has also taken action to help fishermen benefit more fully from the 200 mile zone by increasing the severity of penalties for foreign fishermen who break Canada's coastal fishing laws.

In forestry, one of the country's largest employers, Government support has been extended in the form of enhanced federal forestry facilities in St. John's, Fredericton, Ste. Foy, Sault Ste. Marie and Victoria; Unemployment Insurance funds to subsidize forestry jobs when world demand for forest products softened; assistance to forestry schools; and purchases of new water bombers.

Support has been provided to assist research and development in the mining sector. The industry has been given access to facilities of the Canadian Centre for Energy and Mineral Technology, whose work has led to important breakthroughs in occupational health and safety.

In recognition of the growing number of countries which prefer to make food purchases on a state-to-state basis, a new Crown corporation, Canagrex, has been established that will help agricultural producers expand their export markets. Other new legislation affecting farmers includes the Meat Import Act, which protects both producers and consumers, and an Act which enables the Farm Credit Corporation to borrow on financial markets.

Strengthening National Institutions

The fourth government goal set forth three years ago was the strengthening of national institutions and our country's unity.

In 1980, residents of the province of Quebec voted "no" to sovereignty-association in the Quebec referendum and the federal Government promised a process of federal renewal.

Clearly, the greatest achievements in this area have been the patriation of our Constitution with an amending formula, and the entrenchment of a Charter of Rights and Freedoms. These actions completed the final steps towards Canadian sovereignty and formally guaranteed every citizen certain basic rights and freedoms.

The task of strengthening the rights of Canadians will proceed. To this end, Parliament recently adopted a resolution urging the Manitoba Government to take early action to ensure that treatment of the province's official language minority conforms with constitutional requirements.

An important part of the process of renewal is to ensure that Canada's native peoples are able to realize their rightful aspirations within Canadian society. The First Ministers' Conference on Aboriginal Constitutional Matters last spring produced agreement on an amending resolution guaranteeing aboriginal and treaty rights equally to native men and women, and including land claims settlements under treaty rights. That amendment has now been ratified by Parliament and the required number of provincial legislatures, and will be incorporated into our Constitution next year.

Various native claims settlements have been reached within the last three and a half years. A Native Economic Development Fund was created to assist native peoples in the pursuit of their own economic development objectives. Funding for native housing programs and friendship centres has been increased. A new northern broadcasting policy is being implemented to increase native involvement in broadcasting in northern areas.

Other achievements of the past three years have contributed to the strengthening of our national institutions.

Amendments to the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Established Programs Financing Act have provided a new equalization formula and authorized transfers to the provinces of nearly 100 billion dollars over five years for equalization purposes and to help fund post-secondary education and Medicare. The federal government last year paid more than half the total cost of post-secondary education and of insured services under Medicare.

The House of Commons adopted a new experimental set of rules designed to enhance the role of the Member of Parliament and to improve the speed and efficiency of the institution.

A Joint Parliamentary Committee was established to consider options for Senate reform, and a Green Paper examining this issue was published.

Access to Information legislation was adopted to give the public wider access to government documents, and a new Privacy Act was passed with stricter controls on the transmittal of personal information.

The Post Office has been turned into a Crown corporation, and the process of streamlining its operations is well underway.

The Canada Elections Act was amended to shorten to 50 days the period required to hold elections, and to ensure a more equitable financial basis for all candidates.

"O Canada" was officially adopted as our national anthem, and July 1st officially designated as Canada Day.

Pursuing a Vigorous Foreign Policy

The last of the five major commitments made three years ago by the Government was to pursue a vigorous and active foreign policy.

The Government has pledged to fulfill its responsibilities as a member of the North Altantic Treaty Organization by increasing real defence expenditures by at least three percent annually. For the last three fiscal years the real growth of defence expenditures has exceeded that target. The Government has taken steps to acquire new F-18 fighter aircraft, Aurora patrol aircraft, military trucks, tanks, and patrol frigates. An agreement for defence systems testing has been signed with our American allies.

While honouring our international defence commitments, we have continued both publicly and privately to work towards mutual arms limitations and to advance the nuclear suffocation approach first proposed by the Prime Minister in 1978. An Ambassador for Disarmament was appointed. At the 1983 Williamsburg Summit, Canada played a key role in the process leading to the adoption of a declaration on security and arms control by the participating countries. Recently, the Prime Minister launched a new peace initiative intended to improve communication, and hence the prospects for progress on arms control and disarmament.

Canada has undertaken a number of actions to help developing nations. During the 1981 North-South Summit, which the Prime Minister co-chaired, Canada demonstrated leadership in helping to keep North-South lines of communication open in the face of international forces pressing for a retreat into isolationism and protectionism. On a per capita basis, Canada has resettled one of the largest numbers of foreign refugees of any country in the world; more than half of these refugees were government-sponsored. We have progressed towards raising official development assistance to 0.5 percent of Canadian Gross National Product by 1985.

Recently this Parliament approved amendments to the Bretton Woods Act to increase our contribution to the International Monetary Fund.

Canada played an active role with other major industrialized countries in seeking solutions for fundamental economic and political problems, and was pleased in 1981 to be host for the annual Economic Summit.

In particular, we have sought to resolve bilateral issues with our American neighbours. Many efforts were successful—for instance, in the transborder trucking and softwood lumber issues. Amendments to the Clean Air Act were passed which provide automatic Canadian matching of U.S. measures which afford environmental protection to Canada, and a bilateral agreement recently was concluded for a joint study of acid rain.

Members of the House of Commons:

I thank you for the provision you have made for the public services in the previous and current fiscal years.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

May Divine Providence continue to bless our country.

This concluded the first session of the Thirty-Second Parliament.

END OF VOLUME XXV